**Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

211

# LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 51 — 82nd Congress

Chapter 144 -- 1st Session

S. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 51 ..... 1

Index and Summary of S. 1 ..... 1

# DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 51

MILITARY TRAINING (approved June 19, 1951). The Universal Military Training and Service Act. Amends the Selective Service Act of 1948 so as to reduce the draft age from 19 years to 18½ years, but provides that no person shall be inducted below age 19 so long as eligible persons between 19 and 25 are available to a particular local board. Extends the authority to induct men into the armed forces for 4 years, until July 1, 1955. Provides for deferment of high school students until they graduate or become 20. Permits college students to be deferred until they complete their academic year. Authorizes the President to provide for deferment of persons whose activity in study, research, veterinary, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. Provides for a National Security Training Commission to exercise general supervision over a National Security Training Corps for basic military training; requires the Commission within 4 months, to submit legislative recommendations including a broad outline of such training; prohibits inductions for the corps until Congress has considered these recommendations; and provides for training of inductees for six months.

## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 1

| | |
|---|---|
| January 8, 1951 | Mr. Russell for himself and eleven other Senators introduced (by request) S. 1 which was read twice and referred to Senate Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced. |
| January 10, 1951 | Hearings: (Copy for lending purposes available in Hearings file.) |
| January 18, 1951 | Amendments (in nature of substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. Johnson of Texas, for himself and eleven other Senators (by request) to S. 1. Print of amendments as referred to Comm. on Armed Services. |
| January 19, 1951 | Mr. Vinson introduced H. R. 1752 (similar bill), which was referred to House Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced. |
| February 12, 1951 | Senate Prepardness Subcommittee voted to report to full Committee, a revised draft of S.1. Print of revised draft not included in this history. |
| February 21, 1951 | S. 1, reported with amendments. Senate Report 117. Print of bill as reported. |

MILITARY TRAINING (approved June 19, 1951). The Universal Military Training and Service Act. Amends the Selective Service Act of 1948 so as to reduce the draft age from 19 years to 18½ years, but provides that no person shall be inducted below age 19 so long as eligible persons between 19 and 25 are available to a particular local board. Extends the authority to induct men into the armed forces for 4 years, until July 1, 1955. Provides for deferment of high school students until they graduate or become 20. Permits college students to be deferred until they complete their academic year. Authorizes the President to provide for deferment of persons whose activity in study, research, veterinary, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. Provides for a National Security Training Corps for basic military training; requires the Commission within 4 months, to submit legislative recommendations including a broad outline of such training; prohibits inductions for the corps until Congress has considered these recommendations; and provides for training of inductees for six months.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 1

January 8, 1951 — Mr. Russell for himself and eleven other Senators introduced (by request) S. 1 which was read twice and referred to Senate Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.

January 10, 1951 — Hearings: (Copy for leading purposes available in Hearings file.)

January 18, 1951 — Amendments (in nature of substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. Johnson of Texas, for himself and eleven other Senators (by request) to S. 1. Print of amendments as referred to Com. on Armed Services.

January 19, 1951 — Mr. Vinson introduced H. R. 1752 (similar bill), which was referred to House Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.

February 12, 1951 — Senate Preparedness Subcommittee voted to report to full Committee, a revised draft of S.1. Print of revised draft not included in this history.

February 21, 1951 — S. 1, reported with amendments. Senate Report 117. Print of bill as reported.

| | |
|---|---|
| February 22, 1951 | Mr. Vinson introduced H. R. 2811, (companion bill) which was referred to the House Committee on Armed Services. |
| February 26, 1951 | Made unfinished business of the Senate. Text of bill is printed in the Record, (pp. 1577-80). |
| | Various Senate amendments proposed to S. 1. |
| February 27, 1951 | Senate began debate. |
| February 28, 1951 | Continued debate |
| March 1, 1951 | Continued debate |
| March 2, 1951 | Continued debate. |
| | Agreed to vote on amendment authorizing induction at $18\frac{1}{2}$ with provision for voluntary induction at 18. |
| March 5, 1951 | Senate continued debate. |
| | Agreed to modified Morse amendment changing from 26 months to 24 months the term of service of inductees. |
| | Rejected Morse amendments setting $18\frac{1}{2}$ as the age for compulsory induction with voluntary induction at 18, authorizing the calling into service of certain reserve and retired components, and authorizing tempoary removal from service of up to 150,000 instead of 75,000 persons for study or research in specialized fields. |
| March 6, 1951 | Senate continued debate on S. 1. |
| | Rejected a Morse amendment to limit enlistments to 3 years. |
| March 7, 1951 | Senate continued debate on S. 1. |
| | Agreed to an amendment by Senator Morse as amended by an amendment by Senator Robertson, to place a ceiling of 4 million on active duty personnel of the armed forces, by a vote of 49-41. |
| March 9, 1951 | Passed S. 1, 79-5, with amendments. |
| | The bill, as passed, is printed in the Record. (pp. 2274-7). |
| March 12, 1951 | S. 1 referred to House and referred to Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as referred. |
| March 15, 1951 | House Armed Services Committee reported with amendment, S. 1. As reported the bill contains |

February 22, 1951 — Mr. Vinson introduced H. R. 2811, (companion bill) which was referred to the House Committee on Armed Services.

February 26, 1951 — Made unfinished business of the Senate. Text of bill is printed in the Record, (pp. 1577-80).

Various Senate amendments proposed to S. 1.

February 27, 1951 — Senate began debate.

February 28, 1951 — Continued debate

March 1, 1951 — Continued debate

March 2, 1951 — Continued debate.

Agreed to vote on amendment authorizing induction at 18½ with provision for voluntary induction at 18.

March 5, 1951 — Senate continued debate.

Agreed to modified Morse amendment changing from 24 months to 24 months the term of service of inductees.

Rejected Morse amendments setting 18½ as the age for compulsory induction with voluntary induction at 18, authorizing the calling into service of certain reserve and retired components, and authorizing temporary removal from service of up to 150,000 instead of 75,000 persons for study or research in specialized fields.

March 6, 1951 — Senate continued debate on S. 1.

Rejected a Morse amendment to limit enlistments to 3 years.

March 7, 1951 — Senate continued debate on S. 1.

Agreed to an amendment by Senator Morse as amended by an amendment by Senator Robertson, to place a ceiling of 4 million on active duty personnel of the armed forces, by a vote of 49-41.

March 9, 1951 — Passed S. 1, 79-5, with amendments.

The bill, as passed, is printed in the Record. (pp. 2274-7).

March 12, 1951 — S. 1 referred to House and referred to Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as referred.

March 15, 1951 — House Armed Services Committee reported with amendment, S. 1. As reported the bill contains

| | |
|---|---|
| | language of H. R. 2811, which was inserted as a substitute amendment. The bill would lower the present draft age from 19 to 18½ years and extend the length of service from 21 to 26 months. |
| March 19, 1951 | House Rules Committee reported resolution for the consideration of S. 1. |
| March 20, 1951 | Mr. Barden introduced H. R. 3364, (similar bill) which was referred to Committee on Armed Services. Print of the bill as introduced. |
| April 2, 1951 | Mr. Anderson, California, introduced H. R. 3453 (similar bill) which was referred to Armed Service Committee. Print of bill as introduced. |
| April 3, 1951 | House began debate on S. 1 |
| April 4, 1951 | Continued debate |
| April 5, 1951 | Continued debate |
| April 6, 1951 | Continued debate |
| April 9, 1951 | "Daily Digest" stated that House Armed Services Committee "Approved unanimously an amendment to be offered to S. 1, which would require both congressional and Executive approval of any future legislative proposal to put universal military training into effect. The provision now in the measure being considered in the House would call for a commission to draw up details of a UMT plan as soon as possible, which will go into effect automatically unless rejected by Congress within 60 days." |
| April 10, 1951 | House continued debate on S. 1 |
| April 11, 1951 | Continued debate. |
| | Rejected an amendment to end the training program in 1954. Adopted amendments designed to repeal Executive order on deferment of students with high scholastic grades and to leave educational deferments to each local draft board; and to strengthen the provision prohibiting the sending of inductees into combat areas prior to 6 months of training. The pending question is a substitute offered by Representative Barden providing for an extension of the draft with no provisions for universal military training. |
| April 12, 1951 | Continued debate. |
| | Rejected, 140-232, the Barden amendment which would |

March 19, 1951 — House Rules Committee reported resolution for the consideration of S. 1.

March 20, 1951 — Mr. Darden introduced H. R. 3764, (similar bill) which was referred to Committee on Armed Services. Print of the bill as introduced.

April 2, 1951 — Mr. Anderson, California, introduced H. R. 3853 (similar bill) which was referred to Armed Service Committee. Print of bill as introduced.

April 3, 1951 — House began debate on S. 1

April 4, 1951 — Continued debate

April 5, 1951 — Continued debate

April 6, 1951 — Continued debate

April 9, 1951 — "Daily Digest" stated that House Armed Services Committee "A proved unanimously an amendment to be offered to S. 1, which would require both congressional and executive approval of any future legislative proposal to put universal military training into effect. The provision now in the measure being considered in the House would call for a commission to draw up details of a UMT plan as soon as possible, which will go into effect automatically unless rejected by Congress within 60 days."

April 10, 1951 — House continued debate on S. 1

April 11, 1951 — Continued debate.

Rejected an amendment to end the training program in 1954. Adopted amendments designed to repeal Executive order on deferment of students with high scholastic grades and to leave educational deferments to each local draft board; and to strengthen the provision prohibiting the sending of inductees into combat areas prior to 6 months of training. The pending question is a substitute offered by Representative Darden providing for an extension of the draft with no provisions for universal military training.

April 12, 1951 — Continued debate.

Rejected, 140-232, the Darden amendment which would

continue the draft with no provision for universal military training.

April 13, 1951 — House passed, 372-44 with amendments, S. 1, after rejecting, 121-296, a motion to recommit it.

House conferees were appointed.

As passed, the bill provides for extending the draft Until July 1, 1954, lowers the induction age to 18½ years, lengthens the training period from 21 to 26 months, and provides Congress a chance to vote later on a national security training program.

April 17, 1951 — Senate congerees were appointed.

Print of bill S1, with the amendment of the House of Representatives.

May 21, 1951 — Conferees on S. 1, reached agreement on some of the differences between the House and Senate passed versions of the bill as follows: Set the ceiling for our total armed forces at 5 million; agreed that the age for selective-service registration shall be 18, and before a registrant reaches 18½ he shall be classified and can be inducted for training at any time after 18½, provided all persons eligible in each draft board above 19 shall have been called before calling those below 19; fixed July 1, 1955 as the cut-off date for selective service; accepted the House amendments on physical standards and mental tests; agreed to allow local boards to defer conscientious objectors if engaged in defense work; and agreed to suspend until July 1, 1954, the present limitation on enlistment of women in the armed services.

May 31, 1951 — Both House received the conference report on S. 1, the military training and selective service bill. The report was discussed in the Senate, but action was postponed until today.

The revised bill includes provisions as follows: Reduces the draft age from 19 years to 18½ years, but provides that no person shall be inducted below age 19 so long as eligible persons between 19 and 25 are available to a particular local board. Extends the authority to induct men into the armed forces for 4 years, until July 1, 1955. Provides for deferment of high school students until they graduate or become 20. Permits college students to be deferred until they complete their academic year. Authorizes the President to provide for deferment of persons whose

May 31, 1951 — Both Houses received the conference report on S. 1, the Universal training and selective service bill. The report was discussed in the Senate, but action was postponed until today.

The revised bill includes provisions as follows: Reduces the draft age from 20 years to 18½ years, but provides that no person shall be inducted before [illegible]. Extends the authority to induct men into the armed forces for a period until July 1, 1955. Provides for deferments of high school students until they graduate or become 20. Permits college students to be deferred until they complete their academic year. Authorizes the President to provide for deferment of persons whose [illegible] continue the draft with no provision for universal military training.

April 12, 1951 — House passed, 372-44, with amendments, S. 1, creating [illegible], to become effective [illegible].

House conferees were appointed.

As passed, the bill provides for extending the draft [illegible] lowers the induc[illegible] years, increases the training [illegible] from 21 to 26 months, and provides Congress a choice to vote later on a universal security training program.

April 17, 1951 — Senate conferees were appo[illegible].

Print of bill S1, with the amendment [illegible] or "compromise bill".

[illegible] differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill as follows: Set the ceiling for our total armed forces at 5 million; agreed that the age for selective-service registration shall be 18, and before a veterans reaches 18½ he shall be classified; [illegible] be removed from induction [illegible] after 18½.

below 19; fixed July 1, 1955 as the cut-off date for selective service; accepted the House amendments on universal standards and mental tests; agreed to allow Local boards to defer conscientious objectors to be employed in defense work; and extended to suspend until July 1, 1955, the present limitation on enlistment of women in the armed services.

activity in study, research, veterinary, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. Provides for a National Security Training Commission to exercise general supervision over a National Security Training Corps for basic military training; requires the Commission, within 4 months, to submit legislative recommendations including a broad outline of such training; prohibits inductions for the Corps until Congress has considered these recommendations; and provides for training of inductees for 6 months.

June 1, 1951 — Senate agreed to Conference Report. Print of report.

June 7, 1951 — House agreed to Conference Report on S. 1, by vote of 339-41.

June 19, 1951 — Approved. Public Law 51 -- 82nd Congress.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 8, 1951

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MALONE) (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# A BILL

To provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) the Congress declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy;

(b) the Congress further declares—

(1) that to provide the common defense for which the Constitution of the United States was ordained and

established, every male citizen of the United States and every other male person residing in the United States owes to our country an obligation to undergo training which will fit him to contribute to its protection in time of emergency;

(2) that adequate preparedness will prevent wars against this country and the needless sacrifice of human life; and

(3) that a citizenry trained for defense is the bulwark of democracy and the keystone of preparedness and can best be assured through youth training for national security.

## TITLE I—UNIVERSAL TRAINING

### NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "National Security Training Act of 1951".

SEC. 102. There is hereby established the National Security Training Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall consist of five members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No member of the Regular services of the Armed Forces (active or retired) of the United States shall be eligible to serve on the Commission. Not more than three members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The President shall select the

Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. The Commission shall report directly to the President. The Commission shall cause a seal to be made of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

SEC. 103. The civilian member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum, and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,000 per annum. The military member shall receive the pay and allowances to which he is otherwise entitled by law. The civilian members shall serve for terms of three years.

SEC. 104. The Commission shall have an executive director who shall be the principal executive officer thereof. The executive director shall be appointed from civilian life by the Commission and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum. No member of the Commission shall be eligible to serve as executive director. The executive director shall perform such duties in connection with executing the functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. For this purpose any power, function, or duty of the Commission may, at the direction of the Commission, be exercised or performed by the executive director.

SEC. 105. Subject to the direction of the President, the Commission shall:

(a) Establish such policies and standards and issue such directives as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title and all agencies authorized to carry out any of the purposes of this title shall be governed thereby; and

(b) Provide for ascertaining the manner in which the authorized agencies carry out the functions assigned to them through a system of civilian inspection. No agency conducting training under the terms of this title shall deny to a person being trained the right of access to a member of such inspection system.

SEC. 106. The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such civilian personnel as are necessary for the performance of its functions. Civilian personnel required for the execution of this title may be employed notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the Act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946" (60 Stat. 216), with respect to the maximum limitation as to the number of civilian employees.

SEC. 107. The Commission may exercise any of its functions through such officials or agencies as it may designate.

SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby created within the Commission a National Security Training Advisory Board which shall consist of a civilian Chairman and not less than ten nor more than twenty-five other members appointed by the Chairman of the Commission, three of whom shall be members of the Armed Forces designated by the Secretary of Defense. The Chairman and other civilian members of the Board shall serve for such terms as the Commission shall prescribe and shall, while actually serving with the Board, receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Board pursuant to authorization of the Board, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their office. The members of the Armed Forces shall receive the pay and allowances to which they are otherwise entitled by law.

(b) The National Security Training Advisory Board shall advise the Commission, with particular attention to the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of universal training, and shall undertake such investigations and studies as requested by the Commission.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

SEC. 109. There is hereby created the National Security Training Corps of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"), to be composed of male persons who shall be inducted into it for training as hereinafter provided. Members of the corps shall be organized, administered, and trained by training agencies as provided herein, in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

SEC. 110. (a) An individual shall be considered to have been inducted into the corps and to have become a member thereof upon taking and subscribing to the following oath or affirmation:

"As a member of the National Security Training Corps, I, , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States of America and that I will obey the orders of the officers or other persons appointed over me according to law. So help me God."

(b) A member of the corps shall be subject to rules and regulations pertaining thereto: *Provided,* That he shall be subject to the Code of Conduct only while assigned to active training duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 111. (a) Service in the corps shall consist of

active training duty and inactive training duty. The first day of active training duty shall be the day of induction into the corps. Upon successful completion of basic training as prescribed herein, each member of the corps shall be furnished by the training agency with a certificate of completion of basic training. Such members shall be ordered to inactive training duty by the training agency as of that date and shall remain on inactive training duty while pursuing any alternative program provided by section 125 (c) except the alternative training provided by section 125 (c) (1).

(b) Upon successful completion of an alternative program, the member shall be discharged from the corps and shall be furnished in every case with a certificate of discharge issued by the training agency concerned.

(c) The Commission shall make provision for the types and conditions of discharges to be executed, which shall include: Honorable; general; undesirable; bad conduct; and dishonorable: *Provided,* That members of the corps assigned to military training shall be given a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge only as provided in the Code of Conduct: *Provided further,* That members of the corps not assigned to military training shall be given a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge in those cases where a district court of the United States, the Territories, possessions, or the District

of Columbia, or courts of the several States, have sentenced a member to imprisonment for one year or more.

SEC. 112. Upon discharge of a member from the corps, he shall not be subject to any further training or service under the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall in any way limit or prohibit the call to active service in the Armed Forces of any person who is a member of a Regular or Reserve component of the Armed Forces: *Provided, further,* That the execution of a bad-conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall forfeit any right to credit by the member for time served in training, but shall not prevent the member, upon the recommendation of the training agency concerned, from being reinducted for all or part of the training prescribed herein.

SEC. 113. Each member shall be paid, by the training agency to which he is assigned, a cash allowance during his active training duty at the rate of $30.00 per month; and under regulations prescribed by the training agency concerned, shall be furnished (1) necessary transportation, including transportation from his home to the place of induction and training and return, (2) quarters and subsistence or a monetary allowance in lieu thereof at a rate not to exceed the rate provided for enlisted members of the Armed Forces, (3) clothing and equipment, (4) hos-

pitalization, surgical, medical, and dental care, and other necessary services and supplies.

SEC. 114. (a) The head of the training agency concerned shall prescribe the uniform for members of the corps in training under his agency and the conditions under which it shall be worn, which uniform shall include distinctive insignia prescribed by the Commission and may include devices to denote grade or rank.

(b) Subject to regulations of the head of the training agency concerned, members may, upon termination of active training duty, be authorized to retain clothing and equipment. Members discharged otherwise than honorably, may be authorized to retain underclothing, toilet articles, and nondistinctive articles of outer clothing and may be furnished such civilian outer clothing as may be necessary.

SEC. 115. (a) Upon the application of a member of the corps in proper form or of any dependent of such member as hereinafter defined, a dependency allowance shall be paid, by the training agency to which he is assigned, to his dependents during the period of active training duty in the corps. The allowance shall be computed from the first day of the month in which an application is made and shall end on the last day of active training duty or on the last day of

the month in which notice of termination of or cessation of dependency is received by the disbursing officer making payment of the allowance, whichever date occurs first: *Provided,* That the total number of payments shall not exceed the total number of months actually served on active training duty in the corps by the member thereof. The dependency allowance shall be paid without regard to the pay status of the member while on active training duty: *Provided,* That if a member shall remain absent without leave for a period of thirty days, the allowance may be terminated by the head of the training agency concerned, or officer or person designated by him for that purpose.

(b) A dependent within the meaning of this section is:

(1) A lawful wife including a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable.

(2) A child including: (a) a child legally adopted in accordance with the laws of the State, Territory, or country in which the adoption took place; (b) a stepchild if in fact dependent on the member for his or her chief support, including a stepchild who after death of the natural parent or termination of marriage is in fact dependent on the member for his or her chief support; (c) an illegitimate child, but only if the member has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's

support or has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or has acknowledged in writing under oath that he is the father of such child; (d) a child to whom the member stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than twelve months prior to the date of application on behalf of such child: *Provided,* That the dependency of such child such be considered to commence at the expiration of such twelve-month period.

(3) Parent including a father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the member or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than one year prior to the member's entry on active training duty stood in loco parentis to the member concerned: *Provided,* That such parent is dependent upon the member for his or her chief support.

(c) The dependency allowance shall be paid without a reduction or charge to the cash allowance of the member in the following amounts:

(1) for one dependent, $50 per month;

(2) for two or more dependents, $65 per month.

(d) The determination of all facts, including the fact of dependency, in the administration of this section shall be made by the local board with whom the member is regis-

tered, and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government. Such local board may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this section whenever it finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this section unless such erroneous payment or overpayment be determined to have been made as a result of gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States. No recovery shall be made from any person authorizing any erroneous payment under this section unless such payment or overpayment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

(e) The monthly dependency allowances payable under the provisions of this title shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom they are paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, garnishment, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatsoever.

(f) Whoever shall obtain or aid others to obtain or

receive any dependency allowance or payment under this section, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year or both.

(g) Whoever in any claim for dependency allowance or in any document required by this section or by regulations made under this section makes any statement of a material fact, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

(h) Any person who has been entitled to payment of a dependency allowance under this section and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance with the intent to defraud, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

(i) No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any dependency allowance payable under this section. Any person violating or causing

a violation of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

SEC. 116. Members of the corps shall, during active training duty, be entitled to the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. The terms "persons in military service" and "period of military service" in section 101 of the cited Act shall be deemed to include members of the corps on active training duty and periods of active training duty.

SEC. 117. In case of the death of a member of the corps during active training duty, the costs of recovery of the body, preparation for burial, including a suitable casket, transportation to the home of the deceased or to a cemetery designated by the deceased's nearest relative or proper authority, interment, transportation of baggage, payment of only the accrued or undisbursed cash allowance owing the trainee at the time of death, and accrued or undisbursed dependency allowance owing his dependents at the time of the trainee's death shall be paid by the training agency to which he was last assigned in the same manner as prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces: *Provided,* That members of the corps shall not, solely by reason of their membership therein, be eligible for burial in a national cemetery.

SEC. 118. (a) If any member of the corps shall suffer illness or injury in line of duty while on active training duty with the corps, or die as the result of such illness or injury, he or his beneficiaries as the case may be shall be entitled to all the benefits, which are prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States who suffer disability or death while in the performance of duty, and the Secretary of Labor shall have jurisdiction in such cases after release of the member from active training duty with the corps, or in the event of his death, and shall perform the same duties with reference thereto as in the case of civil employees of the United States now within his jurisdiction: *Provided,* That employee's compensation shall not be paid concurrently with the cash allowance provided in section 113 of this Act.

(b) For the purpose of determining the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this section, the total compensation received by a member under this title in cash and in kind shall be deemed to be $150 per month.

(c) The periods of time within which notice of injury, claims for compensation, or any report or notice of inquiry, claims for compensation, or any report or notice must be made, as provided in the Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742), as amended, shall not begin to run in disability com-

pensation cases until the termination of the member's active training duty in the corps.

(d) All determinations as to line of duty and review of these determinations shall be made by the head of the training agency concerned under applicable regulations of that agency approved by the Commission for such action and shall be conclusive upon the Department of Labor whether made before or after the filing of a claim.

SEC. 119. A member of the corps shall be pecuniarily liable for the loss of and damage to property of the Government and for costs incident to his apprehension and return, including rewards paid, in case of unauthorized absence, and the amount of liability as determined by the training agency may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance not to exceed $15 in any one month: *Provided*, That the head of the training agency concerned or his designee may remit any such liability in whole or in part.

SEC. 120. (a) Members of the corps, while assigned to active training duty with the Armed Forces of the United States:

(1) shall be considered to be a member "of the military or naval forces of the United States" within the meaning of subsection (c) of section 402 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812);

(2) shall be considered to be "military personnel"

within the meaning of section 1 of the Act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662), and section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372).

(b) Members of the corps assigned to active training duty under the jurisdiction of departments or agencies of the United States other than the Armed Forces shall be considered to be employees of the Government within the meaning of subsection (b) of section 402 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812).

(c) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force and their designees are authorized to exercise with respect to claims of members of the corps, while on active training duty with their respective forces, for damages to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, the respective powers conferred upon the Secretary of War and his designees by the Act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 225), and the Secretary of the Navy or his designees by sections 2, 3, and 4 of the Act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662).

SEC. 121. Except as otherwise herein specifically provided, members of the corps shall not, solely by reason of their membership, be entitled to any rights, privileges, gratuities, or benefits provided by law or regulations for per-

sonnel or former personnel of the Armed Forces or civilian employees of the Government.

SEC. 122. Nothing contained in this title or any other Act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to members of the corps while on active or inactive training duty.

SEC. 123. (a) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this Act in the National Security Training Corps is being given, as the Commission may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of the National Security Training Corps and as the Commission shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of members of such corps, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person into any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Commission or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty

of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

(b) No person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency shall knowingly sell, give, or in any way supply any intoxicating liquors to any member in the National Security Training Corps on active training duty. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than twelve months, or both.

SEC. 124. (a) The Commission shall formulate programs and designate Federal departments and agencies as training agencies to conduct such programs under its direction and control.

(b) Training agencies shall have direct responsibility for all training operations and may utilize the services of other agencies with or without reimbursement, including non-Federal agencies and institutions, in the conduct thereof.

(c) Military personnel of the Department of Defense may be detailed for duty with the National Security Training Corps, and when so detailed are authorized in addition to and in excess of the strengths otherwise prescribed for

such establishment and section 1222 of the Revised Statutes shall not be applicable to any officer personnel so detailed.

SEC. 125. (a) The period of training provided for under this Act shall be for one year, or its equivalent in terms of a combination of basic training and training in one of the alternative programs (options) prescribed in subsection (c) below.

(b) Basic training shall be for the initial period of four months beginning with the date of induction into corps, unless sooner terminated by enlistment in the Regular Establishment of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or at the discretion of the head of the training agency, provided that the period may be extended as follows:

(1) with the consent of the member, for the purpose of furnishing hospitalization, medical, and surgical care for injury or illness incurred in line of duty, or

(2) for the purpose of requiring a member to make good time lost to training for any cause.

(c) The alternative programs to be entered into upon completion of basic training will be as follows, and subject to quotas and standards of qualifications fixed by the head of the appropriate training agencies, with the approval of the Commission, the member may enter the alternative program of his choice:

(1) Additional active training duty with the corps for a period of eight continuous months;

(2) Voluntary enlistment and service in any of the Regular services, including the Coast Guard, for such period as may be authorized by law or regulations for each service at the time of such enlistment;

(3) Enlistment and service in the National Guard or Air National Guard or Organized Naval Reserve or Organized Marine Corps Reserve for such period as may be authorized by law provided such term of enlistment is so fixed, otherwise by regulations for each service in effect at the time of such enlistment;

(4) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or the Enlisted Reserved component of the Air Force and assignment to an organized unit for which he is entitled to receive pay for attendance at drills or equivalent duty, for such period as may be authorized by law provided such term of enlistment is so fixed, otherwise by regulations for each service in effect at the time of such enlistment;

(5) Entrance into the service in either the Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academy;

(6) Enrollment and service in the Naval and Marine Corps officer procurement program as provided in

subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057, ch. 962);

(7) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve or the Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, and entrance upon a college course, including Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps training and an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service if offered upon completion of the course;

(8) Enlistment and service in the United States Naval Reserve, and entrance into either the United States Merchant Marine Academy or a Navy accredited State Maritime Academy accompanied by an agreement on the part of the trainee to accept a commission in the Naval Reserve at the completion of the course, if offered;

(9) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve or Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the Commission may prescribe, and the pursuance of an approved course of technical or specialist training in such school, college, or university as may be approved by the head of the appropriate train-

ing agency, accompanied by an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service if offered upon completion of the course;

(10) Enlistment and service in the Volunteer Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Volunteer Naval Reserve or Volunteer Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve for a period of six years: *Provided,* That during the six-year period of enlistment such trainee shall be subject to a maximum of six months' active duty training, of which not more than one month will be required in any one year: *Provided further,* That this alternative of six years' enlistment in one of the Reserve components named in this option is open only to a trainee who is unable to select any of the preceding alternatives provided in subsections (3) through (9) because they are not available to him in his community, or if available, because their quotas are already filled, or he is otherwise ineligible for reasons over which he has no control;

(11) Such other alternative programs established by the Commission which the Commission shall determine to be of comparable importance to the national security and to constitute an equal obligation on the part of the member: *Provided,* That programs estab-

lished under this subsection shall be available to those trained in the Armed Forces only within quotas established by the Commission after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and to those who are not given military training.

SEC. 126. Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, any member serving in or selected for training in any of the alternative programs provided for above, who is unwilling to enter upon or fails to complete satisfactorily the period of training in the selected alternate program, may be recalled for an additional period of active training duty not to exceed four months.

SEC. 127. The Secretary of Defense or the Commission, as appropriate, shall prescribe a system of training credits to be applied in the event of transfer from one alternative program to another.

SEC. 128. The President is authorized to determine the location of such additional permanent or temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this title, to acquire lands, and

rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended.

REGISTRATION, SELECTION AND INDUCTION

SEC. 129. Subject to the policies, standards, and quotas of the Commission, the Selective Service System shall administer all matters in connection with the induction into the corps and the registration, examination, classification, allocation, delivery, and maintenance of records, of men registered under this title, together with such other duties as are assigned by this title.

SEC. 130. The local boards, established pursuant to the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Director of Selective Service and approved by the Commission shall have the same powers and duties within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to determination of dependency, inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from induction for or allocation for training under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such

local boards as such local boards have with respect to similar questions or claims arising under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 131. The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director of the Selective Service System in carrying out his functions under this title.

SEC. 132. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien residing in the United States who has declared his intention to become such citizen, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, who is between the ages of seventeen and eighteen and of every other such male citizen or person upon thereafter attaining the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places in such manner, and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided,* That persons in any category exempted from registration pursuant to the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, shall be exempt from registration hereunder.

SEC. 133. Every person registered under this title who is not subject to induction under any other provision of law and who is not otherwise exempted under the provisions of

this title shall, until he attains the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, be liable for training: *Provided:*

(1) That every male person who is a citizen of the United States and every male declarant alien, who enters the United States at a time subsequent to the period in which he would have been required to train had he not been absent from the United States, shall be liable for training, but no person shall be inducted for training before having attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth and after having attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth;

(2) That any registrant under this title who has attained the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth and has not attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth and who is not liable for induction under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, may volunteer for induction for training, except that a registrant who has not attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth must have the prior consent of his parents, or parent having custody of him, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis to him in order to so volunteer;

(3) That any registrant who, on the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth is successfully and satisfactorily pursuing a standard course of study, on a

full-time basis in a high school or a similar institution of learning shall, if he so requests, be entitled to have his induction or assignment under this title postponed until his graduation therefrom, or until he ceases to pursue satisfactorily such course of study, or until he attains the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever occurs first, except that any such registrant whose induction or assignment has been so postponed shall be liable for training until he attains the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth;

(4) That under rules and regulations promulgated by the Director with the approval of the Commission, there are hereby authorized deferments from training under this title, for extreme hardship, physical or mental disability, or reasons vital to the national interest;

(5) That under policies established by the Director with the approval of the Commission, every registrant shall, prior to induction, be physically and mentally examined, and the local board shall classify the registrant: *Provided,* That no person shall be inducted for military training unless and until he is acceptable to the Armed Forces for training;

(6) That the President is authorized to postpone or exempt the induction of such groups or number of registrants as are necessary in order to limit inductions to

the maximum number which can be trained by training agencies designated by the Commission;

(7) That no registrant under this title shall be liable for training under this title who (a) is now serving or has heretofore served honorably for at least one year in any of the Armed Forces of the United States in active Federal service or of the Armed Forces of any nation allied with the United States at any time during World War II; or (b) shall hereafter enter into any of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty, and complete a minimum of one year honorable service therein; or (c) is enlisted and is serving, on the effective date of this title, in any one of the following Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States: (1) The federally recognized National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States; (2) the Organized Reserve of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: *Provided,* That in either case failure to complete such current enlistment shall render such person liable to induction and training until he attain the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth; or (d) on the effective date of this title is a cadet of the United States Military Academy, a midshipman of the United States Naval Academy, a cadet

of the United States Coast Guard Academy, a midshipman of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or of a Navy accredited State Maritime Academy, a member of the Senior Division Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval aviation college program, so long as he satisfactorily continues in and completes two years training therein: *Provided,* That until such time as the President determines that the program has reached full-scale implementation, the Commission may conditionally exempt from induction or conditionally discharge from training any registrant or trainee who has been accepted for admittance to any of the academies or training programs enumerated, in order that such person may enter such academy or training program wherein he shall complete not less than two years of training in order to be relieved of liability for induction or further training hereunder. (b) No exception from registration, exemption, deferment, or postponement of induction for training under this title shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

SEC. 134. (a) Subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification and selection as may be established by the Secretary of Defense to insure a proper balance of

trained manpower between the ground, air, and naval arms, each registrant eligible for military training shall be entitled to request and receive training in the service of his choice, and shall be classified therein by his local board. Each registrant found not to be eligible for military training shall, subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification as may be established by the Commission, be entitled to request and receive training in the nonmilitary training program of his choice, and shall be classified therein by the local board: *Provided,* That any such person claiming exemption from combatant training, because of religious training and belief as defined in section 6 (j) of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, when inducted or assigned under this title, be required to elect training in such other available training program of his choice as provided herein subject to such quotas and standards as may be established.

(b) Any person claiming exemption from combatant training shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal with the appeal board, the appeal board shall forthwith refer the matter to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of

the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that when the objector is inducted or assigned for training under this Act, he be required to elect training as provided in (a) above. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board, in making its decision. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training because of religious training and belief as herein defined is sustained, shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

SEC. 135. (a) Every person liable for training under this title, except those whose training shall have been deferred or postponed in accordance with provisions of this title, shall be called, inducted, and delivered by his local board for training with such training agency for which he has been classified by his local board at the time and place as directed by the director: *Provided,* That a volunteer for training under eighteen years of age may be delivered for training

to which he has been assigned, at the training period next following the date upon which he was accepted as a volunteer, whether or not he has attained the age of eighteen years.

(b) The Commission, after consultation with heads of the training agencies concerned, will determine induction schedules and numbers to be inducted pursuant to such schedules.

SEC. 136. No person liable for training under this title shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training; no substitute as such shall be received or enrolled for training; and no person liable for training hereunder shall be permitted to escape such training or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of training by the payment of money or any valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training or liability therefor.

SEC. 137. (a) Each registrant exempted or deferred from training under this title, until he shall have attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, and each trainee for a period of six years after completion of the first six months of training or until discharged from the corps whichever period of time is greater, shall be required to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in

status, including his status in the training program and completion thereof, as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the director, and approved by the Commission.

(b) Each local board shall maintain a register of registrants, which shall contain a current record of the address, occupational, dependency, training and service status, and such other information as may be required for the periods specified in (a) above.

SEC. 138. Funds appropriated to the Selective Service System shall be available in the case of registrants who prior to their induction into the National Security Training Corps suffer illness, injury, or death while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this title, for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of (1) emergency medical care including hospitalization, and (2) recovery of body, preparation for burial, including suitable casket, transportation to the home of the deceased or to a cemetery designated by his nearest relative or proper authority, and interment, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

SEC. 139. Any person having and exercising any authority under this title, who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination,

deferment, enrollment, or muster; or any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certification as to his fitness or unfitness or liability or nonliability for training under the provisions of this title, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration, induction, or training or any of the requirements of this title; or any person who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration, induction, or training, or any of the requirements of this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way by force or violence with the administration of this title; or any person or persons who conspire to commit one or more of such offenses; or any person selected for training under this title who shall refuse to complete the training as prescribed under this title, shall upon conviction in the district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such case shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 140. (a) Nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 281 and 283), or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes shall be deemed to

apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title and the regulations pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated member of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from training because of conscientious objections.

(b) All functions performed under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such Act.

SEC. 141. No individual who has been convicted of any crime not punishable by death, and no individual who has been committed to jail, corrective institution, or institution for juvenile delinquency, shall by reason of such conviction or commitment be relieved from liability for training under this title, but may be trained as directed by the Commission.

SEC. 142. Under rules and regulations promulgated by the heads of the appropriate training agencies, with the approval of the Commission, members of the corps while on active training duty may be granted leaves of absence without loss of cash allowances to which otherwise entitled: *Provided*, That no trainee shall be entitled to any payment in lieu of leave not granted to him prior to release from active training duty.

SEC. 143. There is hereby authorized to be appropri-

ated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums to the Commission as may be necessary to enable it to perform its said functions.

SEC. 144. The Commission shall report semiannually to the Congress all expenditures of appropriations in detail.

SEC. 145. If any provision of title I or II, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of said titles, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 146. The Secretary of Defense and the Commission shall submit recommendations to the President as to the time and rate of implementation of the training program established pursuant to the provisions of this Act. However, this training program shall only be implemented in whole or in part as to time and rate, as directed by the President. The recommendations shall take into consideration the intent of the Congress that operations under this Act shall not interfere with the immediate increasing of the components of the Armed Forces to their authorized strength.

## TITLE II

### CODE OF CONDUCT

SEC. 201. TITLE.—This title shall be known as the Code of Conduct (hereinafter referred to as the "code")

for the military training program of the National Security Training Corps.

SEC. 202. STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Any act or omission of a trainee, as herein defined, which tends to hinder or impede his training is hereby declared to be contrary to the purposes of title I and this title. The disciplinary punishment of trainees of the military training program as hereinafter provided shall be consistent with the maintenance of discipline.

SEC. 203. ALL TRAINEES SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS.—All trainees, as herein defined, shall, from the time of actual induction and while serving on active training duty, as herein defined, be subject to the provisions of this code.

SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.—The following words when used in this code shall be construed in the sense indicated in this section unless the context shows that a different sense is intended:

(a) The word "trainee" shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the National Security Training Corps and assigned to a component of the Armed Forces for training under the provisions of title I of this Act during the period of his active training duty.

(b) The words "active training duty" shall be deemed to mean that period of training commencing with the day of induction into the corps and consisting of the period of

basic military training in accordance with title I of this Act and ending with the completion or earlier termination of such basic training, and in addition the optional additional military training provided in section 125 (c) (1) of title I.

(c) The word "officer" shall be deemed to mean a commissioned officer.

(d) The words "civil authorities" shall be deemed to mean law-enforcement authorities of the United States and of the Territories and possessions, and authorities of the several States, including political subdivisions thereof, and of the District of Columbia.

(e) The words "commanding officer" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is empowered to exercise command of any detachment or company of trainees, or similar or higher units.

(f) The words "appointing authority" shall be deemed to mean (1) an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who commands a trainee regiment, or comparable unit; or (2) superior military training authority.

(g) The words "reviewing authority" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is next superior in the chain of command to the commanding

officer of the accused as defined in this title and who also is empowered to convene general courts martial.

(h) The words "staff judge advocate" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is a lawyer assigned to a reviewing authority to perform law duties.

(i) The words "superior military training authority" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or the Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, superior in the chain of command.

(j) The words "extra duty" shall be deemed to mean additional work or duty of any nature assigned to trainees as punishment.

(k) The term "military law" shall be construed to mean the laws governing the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps of the United States.

SEC. 205. MODE OF ENFORCING DISCIPLINE.—Violations of this code shall be punishable in the discretion of the commanding officer (a) by disciplinary punishment administered by the commanding officer of the accused, unless the accused shall request trial, or (b) by national security training courts. Trainees shall be likewise subject to prosecution in the courts of the United States and of the Territories and possessions and of the District of Columbia for crimes and

offenses against the United States, and in the courts of the several States for crimes and offenses against the States or any subdivision thereof.

SEC. 206. DISCIPLINARY PUNISHMENT BY UNIT COMMANDER.—A commanding officer of a trainee company or higher command may, for minor violations of this code, impose disciplinary punishments upon trainees of his command without the intervention of a national security training court unless the accused requests trial by that court. Punishment assessed by a commanding officer shall not constitute time lost to training within the meaning of section 278 hereof, and shall operate as a bar to subsequent trial for the same offense.

The disciplinary punishment authorized by this section may include admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not exceeding one week, extra duty for not exceeding one week, restriction to certain specified limits for not exceeding one week, but shall not include forfeiture of cash allowance or confinement under guard. A trainee punished under authority of this section who deems the punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense may appeal to the next superior military training authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged.

The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, or superior military training

authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment.

SEC. 207. NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURT.—A national security training court shall be composed of any number of officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training, of which three shall be a quorum, one of which three shall be a major or lieutenant commander or above. The senior member of the court shall be the president. One member of the court, if practicable, shall be a lawyer and shall act as a law member of the court. In the event no member of the court is a lawyer, the president thereof shall act as law member. Trials of trainees for violations of trainee discipline hereinafter set forth may be by a national security training court, which shall not include the accuser or the immediate commanding officer of the accused or the investigating officer or a witness for the prosecution or the defense.

SEC. 208. APPOINTING AUTHORITY.—A national security training court may be appointed by an appointing authority as herein defined.

SEC. 209. WHO MAY SERVE ON NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURTS.—All officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training shall be competent to serve on a national security training court. When appointing

such court, the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for such duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament. Officers having less than two years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the corps, be appointed as members of a court in excess of minority membership thereof.

SEC. 210. INFLUENCING THE COURT.—Any attempt on the part of any member of the Armed Forces to influence, by any unauthorized means, a national security training court or its members, or to admonish, censure, or reprimand the court or its members for any act or omission, is hereby prohibited and shall constitute an offense against military law.

SEC. 211. APPOINTMENT OF TRIAL COUNSEL AND DEFENSE COUNSEL.—For each national security training court the appointing authority shall appoint a trial counsel and defense counsel, who shall, if practicable, be lawyers: *Provided,* That if the trial counsel is a lawyer, the appointed defense counsel must also be a lawyer. No person who has acted as investigating officer or court member in any case shall act subsequently as trial counsel or, unless expressly requested by the accused, as defense counsel in the same case. No person who has acted for the prosecution

shall act subsequently in the same case for the defense, nor shall any person who has acted for the defense act subsequently in the same case for the prosecution.

The accused shall have the right to be represented in his defense by civilian counsel if provided by him, or by military counsel of his own selection if reasonably available, or by the duly appointed defense counsel.

SEC. 212. JURISDICTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURTS.—A national security training court shall have jurisdiction to try and punish any trainee for any offense made punishable by this code.

SEC. 213. ALLOWABLE PUNISHMENTS BY A NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURT.—The punishments authorized by this code upon conviction of a trainee for any offense herein made punishable shall consist of any of the following punishments and no others: Admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not to exceed three months, extra duty for not to exceed three months, restriction to certain specified limits with or without extra duty, for not to exceed three months, and confinement with or without useful work for not to exceed three months, and forfeiture or withholding of one-half of the cash allowance per month, for not to exceed the period of confinement, when a trainee is confined pursuant to sentence of a national security training court, and where specifically authorized, bad conduct discharge

or dishonorable discharge: *Provided,* That admonition, reprimand, or bad conduct discharge, or dishonorable discharge may be included together with or in addition to any of the other punishments allowed under this section.

SEC. 214. ARREST.—A trainee charged with an offense may be placed under arrest or in confinement, as circumstances may require, but when charged with a minor offense only, a trainee shall not ordinarily be placed in confinement. Only a commanding officer or superior military training authority or an officer duly designated as his representative shall have power to place a trainee in, or release him from confinement. Any commissioned officer shall have authority to place a trainee in arrest. The arresting officer, the commanding officer of the trainee or superior military training authority shall have authority to release a trainee from arrest.

SEC. 215. PREFERRING CHARGES.—Any person subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this Act or military law may prefer charges, which shall be under oath that he has personal knowledge of or has investigated the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact to the best of his knowledge and belief. The charges shall be set forth upon a charge sheet and shall be in the form of a charge setting forth the alleged violation, together with a specification. In the event a trainee is placed under arrest or in

confinement, charges shall be filed within forty-eight hours of the time thereof. Otherwise a trainee shall be released from such arrest or confinement unless the commanding officer, acting upon the recommendation of an officer duly designated by the appointing authority to conduct a preliminary hearing or investigation, and who having conducted or begun to conduct such a hearing or investigation at which the trainee is present and informed of the grounds of his confinement recommends that the accused be not released. directs that the arrest or confinement be continued.

SEC. 216. ACTION BY COMMANDING OFFICER.—Charges will be filed with the trainee's immediate commanding officer, who will inquire into the facts and circumstances of the case and expeditiously dispose of the matter or without delay forward the charges together with the names of the witnesses and a statement of their prospective testimony with his written recommendations to the appointing authority.

SEC. 217. FORWARDING CHARGES; DELAYS; SERVICE OF CHARGES.—Unless the charges are disposed of without trial, the unit commanding officer shall, within forty-eight hours after accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the appointing authority. If the same be not practicable, he shall report to superior authority the

reason for delay. The unit commanding officer shall cause to be delivered to the accused a copy of the charges.

SEC. 218. ACTION BY APPOINTING AUTHORITY.—The appointing authority, in his discretion, may refer the charges for trial, order them dismissed, or make such other disposition of them as he sees fit; and no charge will be referred to a court for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed herein, that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under this code, and is supported by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

SEC. 219. INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES.—An investigation of charges shall include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. The accused shall be advised of the charges against him and of his right to be represented at such investigation by counsel. Upon his request, he shall be represented by civilian counsel if provided by him, or military counsel of his own selection if such counsel be reasonably available, or by counsel appointed by the appointing authority. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may

desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation, they shall be accompanied by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides, and a copy thereof shall be given to the accused.

SEC. 220. STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE.—Every reviewing authority shall have a staff judge advocate who shall advise the appointing or reviewing authority as to all matters prescribed by this code and shall perform such other duties as may be devolved upon him by law, regulation, or custom of the military, naval, or air services.

SEC. 221. ASSISTANT STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE.—Any assistant staff judge advocate shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by this code or by law, regulations, or the custom of the military, naval, or air services upon the staff judge advocates.

SEC. 222. ACTION BY TRIAL COUNSEL.—The trial counsel of the court to which the charges have been referred shall, within forty-eight hours after receipt thereof, cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had. A failure so to serve such charges shall be a ground for a continuance. The trial counsel shall as soon as practicable upon serving the charges upon the accused notify the defense counsel thereof. No trainee shall

against his objection be brought to trial before a national security training court within a period of seventy-two hours subsequent to the service of charges upon him.

SEC. 223. TRIAL COUNSEL: PROSECUTION.—The trial counsel of a national security training court shall prosecute in the name of the United States.

SEC. 224. OATHS.—The trial counsel shall administer to the national security training court the following oath or affirmation: "You, , do swear (or affirm) that you will well and truly try and determine, according to the evidence, the matter now before you, and that you will duly administer justice, without partiality, favor, or affection, according to the provisions of the Code of Conduct of the National Security Training Corps, and if any doubt should arise, not explained by the said code, then according to your conscience and the best of your understanding. So help you God?" When the oath or affirmation has been administered to the members of the court, the president of the court shall administer to the trial counsel an oath or affirmation in the following form: "You, , do swear (or affirm) that you will faithfully and impartially perform the duties of a trial counsel?"

All persons who give evidence before the court shall be examined on oath or affirmation administered by the trial counsel in the following form: "You, .

swear (or affirm) that the evidence you give in this case shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God?"

In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration will be omitted.

SEC. 225. ARRAIGNMENT, PLEAS, AND MOTIONS.—The accused shall be arraigned, at which time the charges and specifications shall be read to him by the trial counsel. The accused may plead guilty or not guilty. If the accused makes any irregular pleading, or after a plea of guilty sets up matter inconsistent with the plea, or if it appears that he has entered the plea of guilty improvidently or through lack of understanding of its meaning and effect, or if he fails or refuses to plead, a plea of not guilty shall be entered in the record, and the court shall proceed as though he had pleaded not guilty. Prior to so pleading, or at any other time, the accused may make any pertinent motion which the court shall dispose of as justice may require.

SEC. 226. CHALLENGES.—Members of a national security training court may be challenged by the accused or trial counsel for cause stated to the court. A majority of the court shall decide the challenges by secret written ballot but challenged members have no vote. Upon a tie vote the challenge shall be sustained. Each accused and the trial counsel shall be entitled to one peremptory challenge.

SEC. 227. OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN WITNESSES AND OTHER EVIDENCE.—The trial counsel, defense counsel, and the national security training court shall have equal opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe. Process issued in national security training court cases to compel witnesses to appear and testify and to compel the production of other evidence shall be similar to that which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue and shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

SEC. 228. REFUSAL TO APPEAR OR TESTIFY.—(a) Every person not subject to this code who—

(1) has been duly subpenaed to appear as a witness before any national security training court, or before any military or civil officer designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before such court; and

(2) has been duly paid or tendered the fees and mileage of a witness at the rates allowed to witnesses attending the courts of the United States; and

(3) willfully neglects or refuses to appear, or refuses to qualify as a witness or to testify or to produce any evidence which such person may have been legally subpenaed to produce;

shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the United States.

(b) Any person who commits an offense denounced by this article shall be tried on information in a United States district court or in a court of original criminal jurisdiction in any of the Territorial possessions of the United States, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such courts for such purpose. Upon conviction, such persons shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months, or both.

(c) It shall be the duty of the United States district attorney or the officer prosecuting for the Government in any such court of original criminal jurisdiction, upon the certification of the facts to him by the national security training court, to file an information against and prosecute any person violating this article.

(d) The fees and mileage of witnesses shall be advanced or paid out of the appropriations for the compensation of witnesses.

SEC. 229. COMPULSORY SELF-INCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.—No witness before a national security training court or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before a national security training court or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to

answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue when such answer may tend to degrade him.

No statement obtained from any person in violation of this section or through use of coercion, unlawful influence, or unlawful inducement shall be received in evidence against him in a trial by a national security training court.

SEC. 230. DEPOSITIONS.—Depositions may be taken and used as evidence before national security training courts in the same manner as now or hereafter provided for courts-martial.

SEC. 231. FORMER JEOPARDY.—No trainee shall, without his consent, be tried a second time for the same offense, but no proceedings before a national security training court resulting in a conviction shall be considered a trial until the reviewing authority shall have taken final action upon the case. A proceeding which, subsequent to the introduction of evidence but prior to a finding, is dismissed or terminated by the appointing authority or on motion of the prosecution for failure of available evidence or witnesses without any fault of the accused shall be a trial in the sense of this section.

SEC. 232. LIMITATIONS AS TO TIME.—No person subject to this code shall be liable to be tried and punished by a national security training court for any offense committed

more than one year before arraignment of such person: *Provided,* That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid period of limitation: *Provided further,* That this section shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 233. EVIDENCE.—Insofar as not otherwise prescribed in this code or by regulations promulgated under authority of titles I and II of this Act, the rules of evidence for courts-martial shall be applied to national security training courts.

SEC. 234. RULINGS ON LEGAL QUESTIONS.—The law member shall rule in open court upon all interlocutory questions other than challenges arising during the proceedings: *Provided,* That any such ruling made by the law member upon any interlocutory question other than for a finding of not guilty or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may at any time consult with the court in closed session before making a ruling, and may change any ruling made at any time during the trial. Unless such ruling be final, if any member objects thereto, the court shall be

cleared and closed and the question decided by a majority vote, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank. A tie vote on a motion for a finding of not guilty or on a motion relating to the question of the accused's sanity shall be a determination against the accused.

SEC. 235. INSTRUCTIONS.—Before a vote is taken on the findings, the law member shall, in the presence of the accused and counsel, instruct the court as to the elements of the offense and charge the court—

(1) that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond reasonable doubt;

(2) that in the case being considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in favor of the accused and he shall be acquitted;

(3) that if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no reasonable doubt; and

(4) that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt is upon the Government.

SEC. 236. FINDINGS.—After both sides have rested and after any argument of counsel, the national security training court shall make its findings as to the guilt or innocence

of the accused, which findings it shall announce in open court.

SEC. 237. FINDINGS OF GUILTY.—In the event the accused is found guilty, the national security training court shall receive evidence as to the age and service of the accused, together with any evidence of previous convictions by a national security training court or a district court of the United States, the Territories, or possessions or the District of Columbia in accordance with the provisions of section 250 of this code and any other pertinent data submitted by either side, for consideration by the national security training court in fixing the punishment.

SEC. 238. SENTENCE.—The national security training court shall thereupon sentence the accused. The sentence shall be announced in open court.

SEC. 239. VOTE ON FINDING AND SENTENCES.—The findings and sentence shall be determined on secret written ballot by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

SEC. 240. POLICY AS TO SENTENCE.—The national security training court shall adjudge a minimum sentence consistent with the maintenance of discipline and shall, if it believes such action consistent with the foregoing policy, recommend to the reviewing authority that he suspend the execution of the sentence in whole or in part.

SEC. 241. BAD CONDUCT DISCHARGE OR DISHONORABLE DISCHARGE.—In the case of a trainee, as defined in this title, a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall be effected only pursuant to a sentence of a national security training court. The court upon proof of two previous convictions by courts deriving jurisdiction under the provisions of this code, or if otherwise satisfied from the evidence that the accused is incorrigible, or as an included punishment for any of the offenses denounced by sections 251 to 258, inclusive, of this code, shall have power to adjudge bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge from the National Security Training Corps, in addition to any other punishment authorized by this code. The bad conduct discharge shall be adjudged for an offense or offenses warranting separation under conditions other than honorable as included punishment, but not of nature to warrant dishonorable discharge. The dishonorable discharge shall be adjudged for an offense or offenses warranting dishonorable separation as included punishment. A bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge shall not be adjudged unless a complete record of the proceedings and testimony before the court has been made. A bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge adjudged in such cases shall be effective only when ordered executed by the reviewing authority, after the record of trial has been held legally

sufficient to support the sentence and approved by the Judge Advocate General of the service concerned. The holding of the Judge Advocate General shall be final and conclusive.

SEC. 242. EFFECT OF BAD CONDUCT DISCHARGE OR DISHONORABLE DISCHARGE.—The execution of a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall forfeit any right to credit by the trainee for time served in training, and shall not prevent the trainee, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as the case may be, in his discretion, being reinducted for all or part of the training prescribed by law.

SEC. 243. PREPARATION OF RECORD OF TRIAL.—The trial counsel shall prepare the record of trial, which shall include in narrative or other form the testimony of the witnesses. In such cases as he shall deem appropriate, the appointing authority may detail a reporter to record the proceedings of the trial. The trial counsel and the defense counsel shall agree upon the record and the statement of the testimony, and shall authenticate the record in certification of their agreement, and the record shall thereafter be authenticated by the president of the national security training court. In the event of disagreement, the testimony of the witnesses and any other part of the record in dispute shall be stated by the national security training court, whose

decision evidenced by the signature of its president shall be final.

SEC. 244. DISPOSITION OF RECORD OF TRIAL.—The record of trial shall be transmitted to the reviewing authority who shall forthwith refer it to his staff judge advocate for consideration and advice. After having been acted upon by the reviewing authority, the record of each trial by a national security training court shall be transmitted to such headquarters as may be prescribed by the head of the training agency concerned.

SEC. 245. APPROVAL BY REVIEWING AUTHORITY.—No sentence of a national security training court shall be carried into execution until it shall have been approved by the reviewing authority and in the case of a sentence involving a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge until the record of trial has been held legally sufficient and approved as provided in section 241. However, a sentence involving withholding of privileges, extra duty, restriction, or confinement shall run from the date of the announcement of the sentence by the national security training court. Neither an acquittal nor a finding of not guilty shall require approval by a reviewing authority and neither shall be disapproved.

SEC. 246. POWERS INCIDENT TO POWER TO APPROVE.—

The power to approve the sentence shall include the power to approve or disapprove a finding and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense and to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence and to order a rehearing: *Provided,* That no rehearing shall be ordered upon any charge or specification upon which the accused has theretofore been acquitted by the national security training court nor shall such court on rehearing have power to increase the sentence originally imposed. The power to approve a sentence shall include power to mitigate or remit the sentence or suspend, for a period not exceeding the period of training, the execution of a sentence or any part thereof but shall not include the power to increase the sentence. The reviewing authority, or his successor in command, or superior military training authority shall have power to vacate the suspension of any sentence, or any part thereof, and order it carried into execution.

SEC. 247. CONFINEMENT OF TRAINEES.—So far as practicable, trainees held in confinement shall not be confined with members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 248. SURRENDER OF TRAINEE TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES.—Any trainee who is accused of a crime or offense punishable by the laws of the United States or the Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, or of the

several States or a subdivision thereof shall be surrendered, upon application duly made, to the civil authorities for trial: *Provided*, That any proceedings, trial, or period of punishment resulting therefrom shall not operate to relieve the trainee from any liability for further training in the corps.

SEC. 249. RETURN OF TRAINEES HELD BY CIVIL AUTHORITIES.—The commanding officer or superior military training authority, when advised that a trainee is held in custody by the civil authorities shall in appropriate cases make application for his return to training control; the trainee unless already tried by the civil court for the offenses with which he was charged by the civil authorities may be brought to trial before a national security training court, or the case shall otherwise be disposed of, in the discretion of the commanding officer or superior military training authority.

SEC. 250. JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—The several districts courts of the United States, the Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the national security training courts of the crimes and offenses defined in sections 251 to 258, inclusive.

SEC. 251. DESERTION.—Any trainee in the military training program who deserts or attempts to desert the National Security Training Corps shall upon conviction there-

of be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for two years, or both.

SEC. 252. ADVISING OR AIDING DESERTION.—Any trainee or other person who advises or persuades or knowingly assists a trainee in the military training program to desert the National Security Training Corps, or who harbors a deserter, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for two years, or both.

SEC. 253. ESCAPE FROM CONFINEMENT.—Any trainee who, having been duly placed in confinement, escapes therefrom shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

SEC. 254. STRIKING OR ASSAULTING OFFICERS, OR OTHER PERSONS IN AUTHORITY.—Any trainee who strikes an officer, warrant officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person in authority over such trainee, or draws or lifts up any weapon or offers any violence against such person, being in the execution of his office, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for one year, or both.

SEC. 255. COLLECTIVE INSUBORDINATION.—Any trainee or other person subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this Act who attempts to create or who begins, incites, causes, instigates, encourages, or joins in any col-

lective insubordination tending to hinder or impede training under these titles shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for one year, or both. Collective insubordination within the meaning of titles I and II of this Act shall include any concerted action in the nature of a strike, including a sit-down or slow-down strike, or walk-out, picketing or boycott, which tends to hinder or impede training under the provisions of titles I and II of this Act.

SEC. 256. FAILURE TO SUPPRESS COLLECTIVE INSUBORDINATION.—Any trainee or other person, subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this Act, who, being present at any occurrence involving collective insubordination, does not use his utmost endeavor to suppress the same, or knowing or having reason to believe that such collective insubordination is to take place, does not without delay give information thereof to his commanding officer or other competent military authority, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

SEC. 257. PROPERTY LOSS, DAMAGE, OR WRONGFUL DISPOSITION.—Any trainee who willfully, or through neglect, suffers to be lost, spoiled, damaged, or wrongfully disposed of, any property furnished for or intended for use under the provisions of law providing for training in the

corps shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for six months, or both, and may be required to make good the loss or damage, in whole or in part, and when required to make good the loss or damage the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 258. WASTE OR UNLAWFUL DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.—Any trainee who sells or unlawfully disposes of or willfully or through neglect injures or loses any arms, ammunition, accouterments, equipment, clothing, or other property issued for use in accordance with provisions of titles I and II of this Act shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for six months, or both, and when required to make good the loss or damage, the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 259. ABSENCE WITHOUT LEAVE.—Any trainee who fails to report at the fixed time to the properly appointed place of duty, or goes from the same without proper leave or absents himself from his command, guard, quarters, station, camp, or ship without proper leave, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 260. DISRESPECT AND INSUBORDINATION.—Any trainee who behaves with disrespect or in an insubordinate manner toward an officer, warrant officer, petty officer, non-commissioned officer, or other person having lawful authority over him, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 261. BREACH OF ARREST.—Any trainee who, having been lawfully placed under arrest, breaks his arrest before he is set at liberty by proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 262. RELEASE OR ESCAPE OF PRISONERS.—Any trainee who without proper authority releases a prisoner committed to his charge, or suffers a prisoner committed to his charge to escape, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct

SEC. 263. DRUNK OR DISORDERLY CONDUCT.—Any trainee who shall be found drunk or disorderly in quarters, station, ship, command, or under such circumstances as to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 264. OFFENSES OF SENTINELS.—Any trainee posted as a sentinel or watch who is found drunk or sleeping upon his post or leaves his post before he is regularly re-

lieved, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 265. DISOBEDIENCE OF LAWFUL ORDERS.—Any trainee who willfully disobeys or fails to obey any lawful command of his superior officer, warrant officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person having authority over him in accordance with law, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 266. ASSAULT.—Any trainee committing an assault shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 267. ASSAULT AND BATTERY.—Any trainee committing assault and battery shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 268. COMMITTING A NUISANCE.—Any trainee who shall commit a nuisance shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 269. CARRYING A CONCEALED WEAPON.—Any trainee who shall carry a concealed weapon without proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 270. DISCHARGING A FIREARM.—Any trainee who shall through carelessness or without proper authority discharge a firearm in camp, quarters, station, ship, or com-

mand shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 271. FALSE OFFICIAL STATEMENT.—Any trainee who shall make a false official statement or report shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 272. FALSE SWEARING.—Any trainee who shall swear falsely before a national security training court of any officer thereof or in any investigation, proceedings, or course of justice had under or arising out of this code, or who shall make a false oath to an affidavit, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 273. INDECENT EXPOSURE.—Any trainee who shall indecently expose his person shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 274. POSSESSION OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR.—Any trainee having in his possession intoxicating liquor in camp, quarters, station, ship, or command, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 275. WRONGFUL APPROPRIATION.—Any trainee who wrongfully takes, obtains, or withholds, by any means whatever, from the possession of the true owner or any other person any money or personal property of the value of $20 or less, with intent to deprive or defraud any person of the use and benefit thereof or to appropriate the same

to his own use or the use of any person other than the true owner shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 276. MISCELLANEOUS OFFENSES.—Though not mentioned in the preceding sections, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and trainee discipline, all conduct of a nature to hinder or impede training or to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, of which a trainee may be guilty shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 277. COMPLAINTS OF WRONGS.—Any trainee who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer or any other person having authority over him and who, on due application to his commanding officer, is refused redress may complain to the next higher military training authority who shall examine into the complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrongs complained of.

SEC. 278. MAKING GOOD TIME LOST.—Every trainee may be required to make good any time lost to training as a result of his own willful act of neglect, and this shall include time lost in desertion or absence without leave and time lost

by a trainee due to restraint prior to trial resulting in conviction or restraint imposed as a result of a sentence by a national security training or civil court.

SEC. 279. PRESIDENT MAY PRESCRIBE RULES.—The President may, by Executive order, which he may modify from time to time; and which shall be published in the Federal Register, prescribe the procedure including the rules of evidence and maximum limits of punishment, not exceeding the maximum limits of punishment authorized by this code, in cases before national security training courts: *Provided,* That nothing contrary or inconsistent with this code may be so prescribed.

SEC. 280. CERTAIN SECTIONS OF CODE TO BE READ AND EXPLAINED.—Sections 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 213, 214, 241, 242, and 250 through 278 of this code shall be read or explained to every trainee at the time of his induction or within six days thereafter and shall be read or explained once every three months to all trainees.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# A BILL

To provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MALONE

JANUARY 8, 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 18 (legislative day, JANUARY 8), 1951
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

## (IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE)

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. FLANDERS) (by request) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Service and Training Act'.

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate

armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, health, and education, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(e) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in training for civilian and military service and to prepare for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and to provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques to assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation including civil defense."

(b) Section 2 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 3 of said Act is amended by striking out the word "eighteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "seventeen".

(d) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen".

(e) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act."

(f) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service, has been satisfactorily determined under standards

prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard)."

(g) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate basic training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty, other than for training duty, at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of United States."

(h) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-seven consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title."

(i) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(j) Subsection (d) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be obligated to serve, on active training and service and inactive service, for a total period of eight years unless sooner discharged in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled

by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the National Guard and other Reserve components. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall apply only to persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to the enactment of this paragraph. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(k) The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for active training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members

of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that when the President shall so provide in an Executive order pursuant to subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(l) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(m) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of said Act is amended by striking out the words "subsections 6 (j) and 6 (o)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection 6 (j)" and by striking out the words "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twenty-seven".

Said subsection (i) is further amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof.

(n) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (1) increasing the initial periods of basic training to not to exceed six months, (2) changing or modifying the basic training given thereunder, (3) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (4) eliminating periods of service required under this title."

(o) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

(p) Section 6 of said Act is amended by deleting therefrom subsection (c) (2).

(q) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard;".

(r) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually, who shall be selected by such civilian officials or agencies of the Government as the President may designate, in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4

of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057) as amended, or the Reserve Officers' Candidate program of the Navy, or the Platoon Leaders' Class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while

undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service

in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases

satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who upon attaining the eighteenth anniversary of his birth is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution shall, if he has not completed the academic year during which he attained the eighteenth anniversary of his date of birth, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(u) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) for not more than four years shall, if such enlistment is his first enlistment in the Armed Forces subsequent to the date of enact-

ment of this title, be entitled, upon the expiration of his enlistment (including any extension thereof by law but not including any voluntary extension thereof) or upon his discharge under honorable conditions prior to the expiration thereof, to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this title enters upon active duty, whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted or otherwise entering the Armed Forces of the United States. If rejected by such forces the employee shall be reinstated in his position without loss of seniority or status, or reduction in his rate of pay."

(v) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended

by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(w) Section 16 of said Act is amended by striking out the words "eighteen" and "eighteenth" in subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words "seventeen" and "seventeenth", respectively, and adding the following subsection at the end thereof: "(j) The terms 'active training and service' shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted in the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when prescribed by the President) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(x) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated,

out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

(y) Section 21 of said Act and section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (ch. 939 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session), are hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1953". Section 21 of said Act is hereby further amended by striking out the words "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twenty-seven".

(z) Said Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) The President is hereby authorized to establish a committee to advise and consult with him on such phases of this title concerned with the initial periods of basic training of those inducted for training and service as he may designate.

"(b) The committee shall be composed of not less than five nor more than eight citizens of the United States. Members of the committee shall be appointed by the President without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, and shall be paid such per diem rates of compensation and such subsistence and travel expenses as the President may determine to be appropriate. The commit-

tee shall have a chairman designated from among its membership by the President.

"(c) The committee shall have a staff headed by an executive secretary who shall be appointed by the committee and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the committee, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the committee in connection with the performance of its functions.

"(d) To perform its functions the committee shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government."

(aa) Said Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I a new section as follows:

"SEC. 23. The President, acting through such nonmilitary executive departments and agencies as he deems appropriate, is authorized to provide for the physical and mental rehabilitation of individuals examined for induction under this title and rejected for failure to meet the standards for physical and mental fitness prescribed by the Secretary of Defense under section 4 (a) of this title. In carrying

out this section the President may provide such medical or hospital treatment and such other training or education as he deems fit, including but not limited to the establishment of schools for the illiterate, providing psychiatric treatment, in- or out-patient medical, dental, or other treatment, and the providing of necessary prosthetic devices. The benefits of this section shall be provided only to those persons who voluntarily accept them and who are found to have sufficient physical and mental capacities to warrant the opinion that they can be rehabilitated for training and service under this title. Upon the successful completion of such treatment, training, or education such persons may be inducted into the Armed Forces."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session), is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1953" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose entlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (ch. 537, 64 Stat. 408), is hereby amended by striking out "July 31, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1961".

SEC. 4. The Act of August 3, 1950 (ch. 537, 64 Stat. 408), is hereby amended by inserting the words "sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371)" immediately following the word "including".

SEC. 5. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing Universal Military Service and Training, and for other purposes."

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENTS

(IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE)

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. FLANDERS) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

JANUARY 18 (legislative day, JANUARY 8), 1951
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 1752

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 19, 1951

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Service and Training Act'.

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, health, and education, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(e) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in training for civilian and military service and to prepare for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and to provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques to assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation including civil defense."

(b) Section 2 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 3 of said Act is amended by striking out the word "eighteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "seventeen".

(d) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4

of said Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen".

(e) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act."

(f) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard)."

(g) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate basic train-

ing for service in the armed force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty, other than for training duty, at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of United States."

(h) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-seven consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title."

(i) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(j) Subsection (d) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be obligated to serve, on active training and service and inactive service,

for a total period of eight years unless sooner discharged in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be

as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the National Guard and other Reserve components. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall apply only to persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to the enactment of this paragraph. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(k) The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for active training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that when the President shall so provide in an Executive order pursuant to subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable

to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(l) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(m) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of said Act is amended by striking out the words "subsections 6 (j) and 6 (o)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection 6 (j)" and by striking out the words "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twenty-seven". Said subsection (i) is further amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof.

(n) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of

the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (1) increasing the initial periods of basic training to not to exceed six months, (2) changing or modifying the basic training given thereunder, (3) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (4) eliminating periods of service required under this title."

(o) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

(p) Section 6 of said Act is amended by deleting therefrom subsection (c) (2).

(q) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard;".

(r) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually, who shall be selected by such civilian officials or agencies of the Government as the President may designate, in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of

service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a

commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish

officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to pre- under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who upon attaining the eighteenth anniversary of his birth is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution shall, if he has not completed the academic year during which he attained the eighteenth anniversary of his date of birth, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in

this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(u) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) for not more than four years shall, if such enlistment is his first enlistment in the Armed Forces subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, be entitled, upon the expiration of his enlistment (including any extension thereof by law but not including any voluntary extension thereof) or upon his discharge under honorable conditions prior to the expiration thereof, to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this title enters upon active duty, whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty

shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted or otherwise entering the Armed Forces of the United States. If rejected by such forces the employee shall be reinstated in his position without loss of seniority or status, or reduction in his rate of pay."

(v) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(w) Section 16 of said Act is amended by striking out the words "eighteen" and "eighteenth" in subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words "seventeen" and "seventeenth", respectively, and adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(j) The terms 'active training and service' shall be

deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted in the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when prescribed by the President) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(x) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

(y) Section 21 of said Act and section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (ch. 939 of the Laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session), are hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof

the words "June 30, 1953". Section 21 of said Act is hereby further amended by striking out the words "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twenty-seven".

(z) Said Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) The President is hereby authorized to establish a committee to advise and consult with him on such phases of this title concerned with the initial periods of basic training of those inducted for training and service as he may designate.

"(b) The committee shall be composed of not less than five nor more than eight citizens of the United States. Members of the committee shall be appointed by the President without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, and shall be paid such per diem rates of compensation and such subsistence and travel expenses as the President may determine to be appropriate. The committee shall have a chairman designated from among its membership by the President.

"(c) The committee shall have a staff headed by an executive secretary who shall be appointed by the committee and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the committee, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,

to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the committee in connection with the performance of its functions.

"(d) To perform its functions the committee shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government."

(aa) Said Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I a new section as follows:

"SEC. 23. The President, acting through such nonmilitary executive departments and agencies as he deems appropriate, is authorized to provide for the physical and mental rehabilitation of individuals examined for induction under this title and rejected for failure to meet the standards for physical and mental fitness prescribed by the Secretary of Defense under section 4 (a) of this title. In carrying out this section the President may provide such medical or hospital treatment and such other training or education as he deems fit, including but not limited to the establishment of schools for the illiterate, providing psychiatric treatment, in- or outpatient medical, dental, or other treatment, and the providing of necessary prosthetic devices. The benefits of this section shall be provided only to those persons who voluntarily accept them and who are found to have sufficient physical and mental capacities to warrant the opinion that

they can be rehabilitated for training and service under this title. Upon the successful completion of such treatment, training, or education such persons may be inducted into the Armed Forces."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session) is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1953" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (ch. 537, 64 Stat. 408) is hereby amended by striking out "July 31, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1961".

SEC. 4. The Act of August 3, 1950 (ch. 537, 64 Stat. 408) is hereby amended by inserting the words "sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371)" immediately following the word "including".

SEC. 5. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 1752

## A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

JANUARY 19, 1951

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Feb. 13, 1951
For actions of Feb. 12, 1951
82nd-1st No. 26

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....8
Agricultural Act.....20
Budget.....3
Buildings and grounds....35
Committees.....11
Contracts.....7,23,33
Electrification.....15,32
Expenditures.....25
Flood control.....16
Food investigations.....10
production.....31
Foreign affairs.....5
aid.....1,30
Forests and forestry.12,19
Housing.....31
Livestock and meat.....29
Loans.....22
farm.....31
Organization, legislative.....26
Peanuts.....9
Personnel.....17,27
Prices.....28
Prices, control.....18,29
farm.....2
Purchasing.....7,23,33
Selective service.....6
Small business.....13,34
Soil conservation.....4
Tobacco.....21
Trade, foreign.....14
Transportation.....32
Water utilization.....24
Wheat.....30

HIGHLIGHTS: Both houses received President's message recommending relief for India. Sen. Humphrey inserted and commended Secretary's recent statement on farm prices. Sen. Bridges defended legislative record on last year's budget and urged cuts in new one. House committee ordered reported bill to revise law on peanut allotments and quotas. House committee on chemicals in foods appointed.

SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received the President's message recommending that authorization be given for shipment of about 75,000,000 bushels of grain to India (H. Doc. 56); to Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee (pp. 1235, 1283-4). Several Senators discussed the proposal (pp. 1235-7).

2. FARM PRICES. Sen. Humphrey inserted and commended Secretary Brannan's recent press release, "Farm Prices in the Price-Control Picture," explaining that farm prices are not too high in relation to other prices (pp. 1252-4).

3. BUDGET. Sen. Bridges defended the legislative record on the Budget last year and stated that Congress would examine closely the Budget for 1952. Sen. McMahon said $6,000,000 could not be cut out of non-defense items, and Sen. George said that much could be taken from the Budget as a whole. (pp. 1232-5.)

4. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Wiley inserted a resolution of the Soil Conservation District Supervisors, of Wis., favoring a strengthening of SCS and its continuation as a separate USDA agency (p. 1223).

5. FOREIGN RELATIONS. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee submitted its 5th report on studies of the relationships between the U. S. and international organizations (S. Rept. 90)(p. 1224).

6. SELECTIVE SERVICE. The Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee voted to report to the full Committee a revised draft of S. 1, the selective service bill (p. D85).

7. CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION. The "daily Digest" states that the Finance Committee "voted to report with amendments, H. R. 1724, to provide for the renegotiation

of contracts. As approved, the amendments would provide principally for: Add RFC in list of departments with whom contracts are negotiable; limit the power of the President to designate other departments to those exercising functions having direct and immediate connection with national defense; permit a 1-year carryover of net losses; reduce the rate of interest from 6 to 4 percent; raise the minimum amount subject to renegotiation from $100,000 to $500,000; broaden exemptions for agricultural commodities, and products of a mine, oil, or gas well, etc., to conform to exemptions in 1943 act; mandatory exemption of contracts with regulated utilities and common carriers; and mandatory exemption of charitable and educational organizations if income from such contracts is not 'unrelated business income' for Federal incom-tax purposes." (p. D86.)

8. RECESSED until Thurs., Feb. 15 (p. 1267).

HOUSE

9. PEANUTS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) to the House a clean bill, to be introduced by Chairman Cooley, which will supersede the amended version of H. R. 2085, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with regard to peanut marketing quotas and acreage allotments (p. D87).

10. FOOD INVESTIGATIONS. Reps. Delaney (chm.), Abernethy, Hedrick, Jones (Mo.), Miller (Nebr.), McDonough, and Horan were appointed members of the Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Use of Chemicals, Pesticides, and Insecticides in and With Respect to Food Products (p. 1273).

11. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Chairman Cooley announced subcommittees of the Agriculture Committee.

Most of the bills referred to the committee will be handled by the legislative subcommittees, Mr. Cooley said. These committees embrace the entire membership of the full committee with the exception of the chairman, the vice-chairman (Rep. Poage) and the ranking minority member (Rep. Hope), who are ex-officio members of each of the regular legislative subcommittees.

The subcommittees are as follows:

Subcommittee No. 1: Grant (Chm.), Albert, Abbitt, Jones, Andresen, Hoeven, and Belcher.

Subcommittee No. 2: Gathings (Chm.), Lind Thompson, Patten, Murray, Simpson, and Lovre.

Subcommittee No. 3: McMillan (Chm.), Albert, Polk, McCarthy, Hall, Bramblett, and Harvey.

Subcommittee No. 4: Abernethy (Chm.), Sutton, Wheeler, Herlong, Hill, Dague, and Ostertag.

Special Fertilizer and Farm Machinery Subcommittee: Abernethy (Chm.), Albert, Polk, Lind, Hoeven, Simpson, and Harvey.

Special Farm Labor-Livestock Subcommittee: Poage (Chm.), Gathings, Patten, Herlong, Hill, Bramblett, and Dague.

12. FORESTS. Reps. Colmer, Miss., and D'Ewart, Mont., were appointed to serve on the National Forest Reservation Commission (p. 1273).

13. SMALL BUSINESS. Reps. Patman (Chm.), Mansfield, Evins, Burton, Multer, McKinnon, Halleck, Hill, Richlman, Seely-Brown, and Curtis (Mo.) were appointed members of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business (p. 1273).

# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on aid to India.

Senate committees, during recess, acted on draft, contract renegotiation, Federal dispersal, and postal service bills.

Membership of Select Committees on Small Business, GI Education and Training, and Use of Chemicals in Food Products appointed by Speaker.

# Senate

## Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages 1222–1226*

**Bills Introduced:** Twenty-three bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 844 to S. 866; S. J. Res. 32; and S. Res. 73. Page 1224

**Bills Reported:** One report was made, as follows:

Fifth report of Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with respect to relationships between U. S. and international organizations in which the U. S. participates (S. Rept. 90). Page 1224

**Bill Referred:** One House-passed bill was referred to appropriate committee. Page 1240

**President's Messages:** Received messages from President (1) recommending food assistance to India—referred to Committee on Foreign Relations; and (2) transmitting rules and regulations implementing uniform code of military justice—referred to Committee on Armed Services. Pages 1222–1235, 1283–1284

**Appointments to Boards:** Senators Ellender, Chapman, and Young were appointed to the Board of Visitors to the U. S. Military Academy, and Senators Maybank, Stennis, and Saltonstall were appointed to the Board of Visitors to the U. S. Naval Academy. Page 1222

**GI Insurance, and Contract Renegotiation:** Committee on Finance was authorized to file reports during recess on H. R. 1, veterans' gratuity insurance bill, and H. R. 1724, renegotiation of contracts. Page 1222

**Confirmations:** Nominations of 60 civilians, including 59 postmasters, were confirmed, along with numerous nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Pages 1267–1271

**Nominations:** Twelve civilian, including five RFC and two Navy, nominations were received, along with the withdrawal of twenty-seven Coast Guard nominations. Page 1267

**Program for Thursday:** Senate recessed at 5:50 p. m. until noon Thursday, February 15, when H. R. 1, veterans' gratuity insurance bill, possibly will be considered.

## Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

### NOMINATIONS

*Committee on Armed Services:* In executive session, on Friday, February 9, the committee voted to report favorably 1,082 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

### NATIONAL SECURITY—DRAFT

*Committee on Armed Services:* On Friday, February 9, in executive session, the Preparedness Subcommittee voted to report to the full committee, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, S. 1, National Security Training Act of 1951. The full committee meets in executive session on Tuesday, February 13, to receive the subcommittee's report on the bill and to consider it for reporting to the Senate.

### DEFENSE HOUSING

*Committee on Banking and Currency:* Continuing hearings on S. 349, to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense (Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951), the committee received testimony from Earl Devendorf, State sanitation engineer, New York State Department of Health, and Mrs. Jack B. Fahy, American Parents Committee, in support of the legislation, with recommendations for slight modification, and placing emphasis on the administration of defense activities for community facilities. B. Alden Lillywhite and A. T. Lundberg, Arlington County Board, also testified requesting a provision for the advancement of Federal funds for planning activities caused by the influx of Government workers.

CONTRACT RENEGOTIATIONS

*Committee on Finance:* In executive session, on Friday, February 9, committee voted to report with amendments, H. R. 1724, to provide for the renegotiation of contracts. As approved, the amendments would provide principally for: Add RFC in list of departments with whom contracts are negotiable; limit the power of the President to designate other departments to those exercising functions having direct and immediate connection with national defense; permit a 1-year carry-over of net losses; reduce the rate of interest from 6 to 4 percent; raise the minimum amount subject to renegotiation from $100,000 to $500,000; broaden exemptions for agricultural commodities, and products of a mine, oil, or gas well, etc., to conform to exemptions in 1943 act; mandatory exemption of contracts with regulated utilities and common carriers; and mandatory exemption of charitable and educational organizations if income from such contracts is not "unrelated business income" for Federal income-tax purposes.

Instead of a Board appointed wholly by the President, the amended bill would provide for a Board of five members, one each to be appointed by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, the GSA, and the Chairman by the President, at salary of $17,500 for Chairman and $15,000 for each of the other members. The Board is authorized to employ personnel without regard to civil-service laws, but subject to pay scale of the Classification Act.

Committee meets Wednesday in executive session on H. R. 1, veterans' gratuity insurance bill.

DEFENSE MINERALS

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:* In a closed session, Secretary of Interior Chapman presented a progress report under the Stockpiling Act of 1946 and the program under the Defense Act of 1950, on domestic mineral resources and stockpiling of strategic materials. Following the report, a round-table discussion of the subjects was held, in which the following witnesses also participated: James Boyd, Administrator of Defense Minerals Administration; Jess Larson, GSA Administrator; and Edwin Gibson, Deputy Administrator of the Defense Production Administration. Committee meets again tomorrow.

Following the meeting, the chairman announced public hearings on February 19, 20, and 21 on S. J. Res. 20, the tidelands bill. He also announced meetings on March 7, 8, and 9 on fuels industry, including coal, petroleum, hydroelectric power, and natural gas, in pursuance of S. Res. 33 of the Eighty-first Congress.

POSTAL SERVICE

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:* Subcommittee, on Friday, February 9, voted to report favorably to the full committee the following three bills: With amendments, S. 618, to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the U. S. for postal purposes; and without amendment, S. 803, to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and S. 804, to rescind certain details required by law to be included in the annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System.

It discussed the agenda for its next meeting, to be held on Wednesday, February 21, and decided that hearings would be started as early as possible on four postal-pay bills (S. 355, 376, 414, and 415), possibly to begin on February 26.

FEDERAL DISPERSAL

*Committee on Public Works:* Subcommittee, on Saturday, February 10, held an executive session to consider S. 218, providing for construction of Federal buildings outside but accessible to D. C.; it reached a tentative agreement on reporting the bill to the full committee at its next meeting.

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

**Bills Introduced:** Twenty-three public bills, H. R. 2554–2576; thirty-one private bills, H. R. 2577–2607; and eight resolutions, H. J. Res. 160 and 161, H. Con. Res. 58–60, and H. Res. 129–131, were introduced.

Pages 1285–1286

**Bills Reported:** Reports were made as follows:

Eighteen private bills, H. R. 31, 661, 1966, 2066, 2070, 2110, 2205, 2276, S. 59, H. R. 664, 824, 963, 1111, 1165, 1475, 1722, 1823, and 2068 (H. Repts. 99–116, respectively);

H. R. 1090, to extend the period for the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the U. S. Armed Forces, amended (H. Rept. 117); and

H. R. 2339, to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens, amended (H. Rept. 118). Page 1285

**Reciprocal Trade:** Pursuant to a unanimous-consent request the House vacated the proceedings of the passage of H. R. 1612, extending for 3 years the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to enter into foreign trade agreements; corrected an error in the so-called escape-clause amendment; and again passed the bill. Pages 1272–1273

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Feb. 23, 1951
For actions of Feb. 21 & 22, 1951
82nd-1st, Nos. 32 & 33

CONTENTS

Accounting.....3
Adjournment.....13,20
Banking and currency.....12
C.C.C.....3
Dairy industry.....9
Decentralization.....8
Defense functions.....32
Education.....33
Electrification.....4,16,19
Emergency controls.....39
Expenditures.....38
Flood control.....17
Foods, surplus.....35
Foreign affairs, aid.....6
Grain.....6
Inflation.....38
Labor, farm.....26,34
Lands, reclamation...18,27
Military training..5,15,25
Monopolies.....23
Natural resources.....4
Personnel.....22,30
Prices.....39,29
foods.....2,9
support.....36
Property, surplus.....21
Purchasing.....1,14,24
Reports.....16
Rubber.....31
Taxation.....30
Transportation.....10,11,19
Water utilization.....28

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported selective-service bill. Sen. Ellender analyzed recent food-price changes. Senate passed contract-renegotiation bill. Sen. Williams criticized "discrepancies" in CCC accounts and sale of cheese to Britain. Rep. Vinson introduced new bill on military training, etc.

## SENATE - February 21

1. CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 1724, to provide for renegotiation of defense-program contracts. Senate conferees were appointed. Before passing the bill, the Senate agreed to the Douglas amendment to restrict exemptions to general classes or types, the George amendment regarding certain suspensions of profit limits, the George amendment on composition of the Renegotiation Board, the Saltonstall amendment affecting the definition of wool under the agricultural commodities listed, and the Case amendment on permissive exemptions. The Douglas amendment, to eliminate the provision for permissive exemptions, was among those rejected. (pp. 1475-96.)

2. FOOD PRICES. Chairman Ellender of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, inserted analyses of recent increases in the prices of beef and canned fruits and vegetables. The statement said, in part: "The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is concerned about recent advances in food prices and statements which have appeared in the press blaming farmers for these increases. Many of the farm products were already sold by farmers before the price increases occurred. In fact, a number of cases farmers received lower prices for their products in 1950 than in 1949 even though these products are now selling at sharply higher retail prices." (pp. 1471-2.)

3. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Sen. Williams again criticized CCC for not being in a position to reconcile all of its accounts on services to other Government agencies during World War II. He stated that, following his charges, further progress has been made by GAO on this reconciliation, and that he will continue to insist that the funds be "fully accounted for." Sen. Williams also criticized the recent sale of cheddar cheese to Britain at below-market prices at the same time that the United States was importing cheese from Canada at a reduced tariff rate under the trade-agreements program. He inserted a letter from the Budget

Bureau which, he said, shows a total cost of over $3 billion for CCC. (pp. 1498-1500).

4. ENERGY RESOURCES. Chairman O'Mahoney, of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, described a recent monograph of the Committee's staff, on "Basic Data Relating to Energy Resources," which is being printed as S. Doc. 8 (p. 1499).

5. MILITARY TRAINING. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendments S. 1, the military training, selective service, and manpower utilization bill (S. Rept. 117)(p. 1468).

6. AID TO INDIA. Sen. Martin's name was added to the list of sponsors of S. 872, to provide for shipment of grain to India (p. 1469).

7. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Received from the Wis. Legislature a resolution favoring the proposed project (pp. 1465-6).

Sen. Douglas inserted Secretary Marshall's recent statement favoring the project (pp. 1473-4).

8. DECENTRALIZATION. Received a Md. Legislature resolution favoring decentralization of Federal offices to the Cumberland, Md., area (pp. 1466-7).

9. MILK PRICES. Sen. Wiley inserted a resolution from the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, Fond du Lac, Wis., favoring the retention of the provision in the Defense Production Act for minimum price ceilings on milk in non-Federal order areas (p. 1467).

10. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 683, authorizing Canadian vessels to transport iron ore between U. S. ports on the Great Lakes during 1951 (S. Rept. 119)(p. 1468).

SENATE - February 22

11. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 435, to make various amendments in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (S. Rept. 128)(p. 1509).

12. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Sen. O'Mahoney discussed and inserted various statements regarding the controversy between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board concerning interest rates (pp. 1516-37).

13. RECESSED until Mon., Feb. 26 (p. 1538).

HOUSE - February 22

14. CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION. Reps. Doughton, N. C.; Cooper, Tenn.; Dingell, Mich.; Mills, Ark.; Reed, N. Y.; Jenkins, Ohio; and Simpson, Pa. were appointed conferees on H. R. 1724, the contract renegotiation bill (p. 1539). See also item 1.

15. MILITARY TRAINING. The Armed Services Committee agreed to introduce a new bill to be considered in lieu of H. R. 1752, to authorize a military training program and provide for the utilization of manpower (p. D119). See item 25.

16. REPORT. Received the annual report of the Federal Power Commission, fiscal year 1950 (p. 1543).

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
*1st Session*

SENATE

REPORT
No. 117

# UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

## REPORT

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

TO ACCOMPANY

## S. 1

SUBMITTED BY MR. JOHNSON OF TEXAS

FEBRUARY 21 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1951

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, *Chairman*

| | |
|---|---|
| HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia | STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire |
| VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN, Kentucky | LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts |
| LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Texas | WAYNE MORSE, Oregon |
| ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee | WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California |
| LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming | HARRY P. CAIN, Washington |
| JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi | RALPH E. FLANDERS, Vermont |

J. NELSON TRIBBY, *Clerk*

# CONTENTS


| Section | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Purpose of the bill | 1 |
| II. | Development of the bill | 1 |
| III. | Need for the bill | 2 |
| IV. | National manpower pool | 5 |
| | The civilian manpower force today | 5 |
| | The military manpower pool | 5 |
| | Status of selective service registrants age 19 through 25 | 5 |
| | Brief analysis of foregoing classifications | 6 |
| | Status of women | 7 |
| | Men 26 and older | 7 |
| | Summary | 8 |
| V. | Expanding the military manpower pool | 9 |
| | Deferment of nonveteran husbands to be removed | 9 |
| | Period of induction and of reserve service on active duty to be 26 months | 9 |
| | Certain enlistments to be extended | 10 |
| | Provision to be made for inducting 18-year-olds | 10 |
| | Summary of arguments for and against lowered induction | 13 |
| VI. | Brief discussion of important issues | 33 |
| | The necessity for 26-month term of service | 33 |
| | The necessity for an interim program for 75,000 students for special study and research | 41 |
| | Effect on ROTC programs | 52 |
| | Integration of military training with the national educational system | 53 |
| | The necessity for universal training and service | 53 |
| | The necessity for obligatory reserve service | 55 |
| | The necessity for maintaining National Guard strength | 56 |
| VII. | Discussion of other provisions of the bill | 57 |
| | Call of Reserve and retired personnel to active duty | 57 |
| | Apportionment of various physical and mental profiles among the services | 57 |
| | Extension of enlistments | 58 |
| | Enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army | 58 |
| VIII. | Administration recommendations | 58 |
| IX. | Section-by-section analysis | 62 |

Comparison of 1948 Selective Service Act, and related statutes, with changes recommended by S. 1, as required by Cordon Rule ..... 72

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
*1st Session*

SENATE

REPORT
No. 117

# UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

FEBRUARY 21 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951,—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany S. 1]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal military training program, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with committee amendments in the nature of a substitute and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

### I. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is, first, to raise immediately the manpower necessary to build and maintain an armed force of the size determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to be our minimum security requirement, and, secondly, to provide for the maintenance of an adequate force of trained Reserves for the future security of the United States.

### II. DEVELOPMENT OF THE BILL

Shortly after the Korean fighting began, the Senate Armed Services Committee of the Eighty-first Congress initiated a series of hearings on S. 4062, a bill intended to inaugurate a system of universal training consistent with the recommendations of the Compton Commission. As a result of these hearings, the committee reached substantial agreement on a modification of S. 4062 which would have instituted a system of universal training on a stand-by basis, to become operative at such future time as the size of the Armed Forces on active duty and the character of the world situation would permit such a program to be undertaken.

The President requested that the Armed Services Committee suspend action on the bill at that time because it was improbable that a final decision could be reached before the expiration of the Eighty-

first Congress. In complying with this request, the committee instructed its Preparedness Subcommittee to assume the responsibility for further study of the subject of universal training, and be prepared to report to the full committee early in the Eighty-second Congress.

Numerous conferences and studies were held during the recess period in an effort to lay the groundwork for a military manpower bill which would have the most thorough and up-to-date coordination among all interested branches of the Government. These studies extended to persons outside the Government as well.

Early in the Eighty-second Congress, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for himself, for the other members of the committee, and for Senator Malone, introduced by request a bill which was designated as S. 1. This bill was substantially the same as the bill on which the Armed Services Committee had begun hearings at the time of Korean crisis, and referred to above as S. 4062.

On January 10 the Preparedness Subcommittee began the first of what developed into a series of 37 sessions, or over 100 hours, of hearings devoted to an examination of the subject of the relationship of our national manpower potential to our national security. The committee feels that it is pertinent to observe that the treatment of the problem was thorough, impartial, and objective.

The initial sessions of the hearings did not concern any formal legislative proposal, but were devoted to a survey of the over-all manpower picture and an examination of the details of our manpower resources. The administration's formal legislative proposal was presented through the Department of Defense at the beginning of the second week of the hearings. This was introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee, for himself and other members of the full committee, by request, and it took the form of an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 1. This was in accordance with an agreement reached between Chairman Russell, and the national commander of the American Legion, and others.

It is this bill, with modifications aimed to bring it into harmony with the aims of the original version of S. 1, and other changes recommended by the committee, to which this report addresses itself.

It should be noted at this point in the report that all members of the Armed Services Committee are ex officio members of the Preparedness Subcommittee. The efforts of the subcommittee, throughout the development of this bill, were aided immeasurably by the advice and cooperation of the subcommittee's ex officio members, all of whom from time to time sat with the subcommittee and assisted in the examination of witnesses and the formulation of decisions.

It should also be noted at this point in the report that the views of those at whose request the original version of S. 1 was introduced in the Eighty-second Congress have been given detailed consideration by the subcommittee, and that the subcommittee is informed that the bill as reported meets the basic objectives which they were seeking.

## III. Need for the Bill

Since 1939, 10 nations have fallen under the boot of international communism. Three of those nations plus nine other territorial acquisitions have been absorbed into the Soviet Union proper. Over 300,000 square miles of territory have been added to the Soviet Union in that brief span of 11 years.

Eighteen months ago it was announced that an atomic explosion had taken place in Communist Russia.

Nine months ago North Korean Communists invaded South Korea and thereby precipitated a struggle into which an unprepared America has committed nearly all of its available combat troops.

Four months ago the Communist hordes of Red China were unleashed without warning upon American forces in Korea.

The grim fact is that the United States is now engaged in a struggle for survival. The dimensions of that struggle cannot be measured. We do not know how long it will continue; we do not know how or where a decision will be ultimately reached; we do not know what will be required of us.

We do know that the balance of manpower is against us.

The passage of time has tipped the manpower scales against us.

In 1945 there were 193,000,000 people in the Soviet sphere.

In 1945 there were 1,820,000,000 people in the western sphere.

In 1950 there were 795,000,000 people in the Soviet sphere.

In 1950 there were only 725,000,000 people in the western sphere.

Action must be taken.

Of these things we can be sure: Our strength is not adequate for the present, nor has our strength, in past years, been adequate at the moment of initial need. With this knowledge, it behooves a responsible Nation to meet immediately the clear necessities of the present and to prepare for the future by correcting the acknowledged errors of past experience.

On January 1, 1951, there was within the continental United States only one fully equipped, ready division of Army troops. This is testimony to the inadequacy of our strength.

No nation aspiring to preserve its security or to protect its freedoms can long sustain such a clearly critical deficit in its strength. There is no validity to the suggestion that this deficit could be corrected by withdrawing our troops from their tasks abroad. The effect of such withdrawals would be only to increase the deficit and magnify our ultimate task.

We must remember this: Whatever we might abandon would only be added strength for our enemy. The stronger our enemy, the greater our danger. We cannot, must not, knowingly contribute to our own peril.

To avoid increasing our national jeopardy, it is imperative that we now take those necessary steps to make our strength equal to the peril of the hour. The first, and most essential step, is to bring our Armed Forces to the strength which minimum security requires.

The Congress, recognizing the basic necessity for this step, acted last year to remove statutory ceilings upon the size of the Armed Forces. In doing this, Congress relied on the Joint Chiefs of Staff—our top military strategists—to exercise their grave responsibility of determining the security requirements of the Nation. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that our minimum security needs, at the moment, require an armed force of approximately 3.5 million men.

If we accept that determination, we shall be accepting the best strategic judgment of the men whose life work has been—and is now—the planning of the defense of the Republic. If we reject that determination and deny the minimum security requirements of the Nation,

we would be assuming a dreadful responsibility of depriving the Nation of an adequate defense.

We recognize that it is not a coveted responsibility—to say that any of our citizens, especially our young men, must sacrifice a portion of their freedom, comfort, or ambition to defend this Nation. It must be recognized, however, that if we should withdraw from this responsibility now, we would place in jeopardy the freedoms of all of our citizens, and all the freedoms enjoyed in the world today. Unpleasant though the choices may be, we face the decision of asking temporary sacrifice from some of our citizens now, or of inviting the permanent extinction of freedom for all of our citizens.

That is our immediate choice.

There is another choice we must make about our future.

Our present danger, as pointed out, cannot be defined by the measurements of time, effort, or even of geography. Secretary of Defense Marshall said, January 17, 1951, in a letter to the committee:

> We are confronted with a world situation of such gravity and such unpredictability that we must be prepared for effective action, whether the challenge comes with the speed of sound or is delayed for a lifetime.

How can we meet such an indefinable challenge? We could, perhaps, await a moment when the shape of the challenge becomes evident and distinct. That moment, however, would likely be too late. The ultimate challenge will not materialize slowly; it will come in a blinding flash. We would have light with which to see that challenge, but we would not have the power with which to respond to it.

The more prudent course is to pursue the teachings of history—that weakness attracts aggression as the rod attracts the lightning. Two global wars have been thrust upon us because we were weak, and our weakness sanctioned the aggression which ultimately embroiled us in war and bloodshed.

The course of courage is to make ourselves strong, confident that strength may save us from war—and if not from war, certainly from extinction.

The course of strength requires sacrifice. It requires us to mobilize our young men, to ask of them a period of active military duty, and a longer period of Reserve duty. It requires us to maintain, at all times, a reservoir of manpower strength which will have meaning in the eyes of our enemies, and substance in the plans of our stategists.

This is the course least fraught with danger for our institutions and concepts of freedom. No democracy can long survive the burden of a large standing armed force. Likewise, no nation can permanently endure the waste of frenzied periods of mobilization and demobilization. Just as frequent periods of destructive illnesses ultimately wither the healthiest body, so would frequent periods of hasty mobilization ultimately wither our national strength.

Maintaining an adequate Reserve—properly trained to give it meaning in terms of effectiveness—is the best insurance freedom can have. This bill is expressly designed for the purpose of adding to the arsenal of American strength a meaningful reserve of trained, seasoned men, capable of instantly bearing arms.

We believe the program in this bill can be the cornerstone of American security.

## IV. The Nation's Manpower Pool

Our basic problem in manpower is this: we must, with fewer men, do more than our enemy does, with abundant men.

America's manpower pool is shallow; our enemy's pool is deep. From this fact, there is no relief. We must stand or fall, succeed or fail, with what we have.

Our success or failure will depend upon how efficiently we utilize the manpower that is available. We must appropriate our strength wisely between two supreme tasks: First, the maintenance of superior industrial production, and, second, the maintenance of adequate military forces, both under arms and in reserve.

This is a delicate task. To undertake the task intelligently, we must understand what strength is available in our manpower pool.

### THE CIVILIAN MANPOWER FORCE TODAY

In December 1950 the Nation had a labor force of 64.5 million, which included 45.5 million men, 19 million women, and 2.2 million in the Armed Forces.

Of that total labor force, 54.1 million were employed in nonagricultural occupations—an all-time high. Unemployed numbered 2.2 million, which is considered unusually small.

This means, as Secretary of Labor Tobin emphasized, that we do not now have a reserve force of manpower.

In measuring our potential, certain facts are pertinent. There are now 30.5 million children under age 10, compared with 21.2 million under 10 in 1940. Thus, because of the duties and responsibilities at home, a smaller number of women under 35 will be available for expansion of our civilian labor force.

Likewise, the number of youths in the age group 10 through 19 has declined by 2.1 million. This means a decrease in the availability of young workers, under military service age, for civilian occupations.

Expansion of the civilian labor force may depend upon recruiting women over 35, and those retired from the labor force. This would add probably 5,000,000 under conditions of all-out mobilization. Increasing the workweek to 48 hours would add the equivalent of 1.5 million.

### THE MILITARY MANPOWER POOL

At the present time, the ages of liability for induction for military service are 19 through 25.

The breakdown of status within this age bracket is as follows:

*Status of selective service registrants, age 19 through 25*

The following tabulation shows the classification status of registrants in the 19–26 age group as of October 31, 1950. It is the same as shown on chart A, page 1228, of the hearings, and was presented by the Department of Defense based on statistics furnished by the Selective Service System. A detailed analysis of the manpower situation appears in the hearings, beginning on page 86, in a series of charts beginning on page 1228, and another series beginning on page 688.

| | |
|---|---|
| In class I–A | 1,632,249 |
| In service | 460,502 |
| Deferred as students and for occupations | 763,062 |
| In class III–A, for dependencies | 1,184,893 |
| In class IV–F, rejected | 799,513 |
| In ROTC, Reserves, and National Guard | 182,915 |
| Veterans | 2,862,960 |
| Other statutory deferments | 71,062 |
| Total, 19 through 25 | 7,957,156 |

*Brief analysis of foregoing classifications*

In considering this analysis, it should be borne in mind that by far the greater proportion of the strength of our Armed Forces is now being raised by voluntary enlistments. It is intended that this emphasis on voluntary enlistment shall be continued, so that the number of men in the manpower pool who are inducted into service shall remain as small as possible.

*Class I–A.*—The tabulation lists 1,632,000 men now classified as I–A. This is misleading, because not all men now classified I–A are actually available. Of this total, only 50 percent, or 816,000, are estimated as available for induction. The other 50 percent will be subsequently reclassified as unavailable through occupational deferments, dependency deferments, certain statutory deferments, and because of physical unfitness.

*Occupational deferments*—The tabulation lists 763,000 deferred by reason of occupation, including 570,000 students. Of the nonstudent deferments, 129,341 are farm deferments, 63,713 industrial deferments.

It is noted that occupational deferments for farm and industrial workers total 193,954, only 2.4 percent of the manpower pool. This low rate is not likely to continue as defense production expands. The committee was advised that "occupational deferments will have to be raised considerably in view of the new program if war plants are to be staffed quickly with the skilled workers they will need."

*Dependency deferments.*—The tabulation shows 1,184,893 deferred because of dependencies. If dependency deferments were totally removed, a maximum of about 630,000 of these men would initially be available for induction. The remainder, approximating 554,000, would be unavailable because of occupational, physical, or other reasons.

The 630,000 men are divided into two classes: 290,000 are married men without children; 340,000 are married men with children. The number actually to be secured from this pool of 290,000 is drastically affected by the fact that inductions are for the Army only; hence these men cannot all be taken at once, and the number of availables decreases rapidly if not inducted.

The committee was informed that if these 630,000 men were inducted in preference to an equal number of individuals who are without dependents, military payroll costs would be increased by more than $456,000,000 annually to cover the costs of dependency allotments.

| | |
|---|---|
| Cost for 290,000 without children at $540 per year | $156,600,000 |
| Cost for 340,000 with children: | |
| Assume 170,000 have only 2 dependents at $744 per year | 126,480,000 |
| Assume 170,000 have 3 or more dependents at $1,020 per year | 173,400,000 |
| Total | $456,480,000 |

This is the amount by which military payroll cost would be increased if all available husbands and fathers were inducted in preference to an equal number of younger men—presumably 18-year-olds—who are without dependents.

*Class IV–F, rejects.*—The tabulation shows 799,513 men as IV–F, rejected for physical or mental reasons. This is 10 percent of the total manpower pool, but probably the number will increase as those now shown as class I–A are actually examined and given a final classification. The World War II rejection rate was 21.8 percent. Generally, physical standards are now at World War II levels; mental standards are slightly higher, partially because the services wished to avoid the task of educating illiterates.

The Department of Defense's reluctance to utilize more fully men now classified IV–F is based on several factors:

1. The Department has considered the heavy future pension burden on the country of taking lower standards.
2. The low profile, mental or physical, must be so fitted into the military unit that he will not hamper its movement.
3. Care must be taken that too many of the low profiles are not frozen within the zone of the interior (continental United States), making it impossible to rotate men from combat areas.
4. The services are "very loath to lower mental standards" because of the fact that the bulk of disciplinary problems come from that group.

On the other hand, the argument for utilizing IV–F's more fully was expressed by Dr. Karl Compton, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

> Within the group which is not eligible for military service on present standards, there are many who are as well qualified to perform certain essential military duties as are those of higher standards of fitness . . . The Seabees did a remarkable job but were generally outside the selective service standards . . . I feel that a decided improvement in manpower utilization is . . . one of the directions in which a major increase in the strength of our Armed Forces might be achieved.

*Veterans.*—The tabulation shows 2,863,000 men deferred as veterans of prior military service. They are reaching age 26, and disappearing from the pool, at the rate of 60,000 per month. Of the 2,863,000 it is estimated that 245,000 had less than 12 months of service. These individuals are now liable for induction unless they join one of the Reserve components. From this 245,000, about 160,000 would be available for induction or call to active duty, and of this number, only about 40,000 would be single men without dependents.

*Status of women*

No compulsory military service for women is contemplated. However, the services indicated that more women could be used to replace men if the present ceiling of 2 percent on women in the Armed Forces were lifted. The Air Force indicated they could use up to 10 percent women; the Navy and Marines could use 7 percent women "in time of war."

*Men 26 and older*

The Selective Service System estimates that within the 26-to-30 age bracket there are 20,000 bachelors and 40,000 husbands without children who are not veterans, and who would be qualified for military service. To secure the services of this comparatively small number it

would be necessary to register many million men, above present age limits, to secure these relatively few individuals. Also, the older the man, the more deeply his roots are sunk in community life, and the more likely his civilian activities would be of greater value than military service.

*Summary*

Within the present ages of military service eligibility, 19 through 25, there are 7,957,157 men. Of this number, 1,632,000 are class I–A. From the I–A's, however, only 50 percent will be available—a total of 816,000. The armed services will need to enlist or induct approximately 862,000 to reach and maintain the projected military strength of 3.5 million which the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider necessary as a minimum fighting force.

Thus, a numerical deficit exists of 46,000 between the need and the men now available.

The problem, however, is greater than merely securing 46,000 additional men. If all I–A's were enlisted or inducted, without expanding our pool of manpower, we would be confronted with the untenable situation of having no manpower available to sustain the size of our Armed Forces or to meet emergencies.

Between October 31, 1950, and June 30, 1951, an estimated 457,000 young men reach the age 19 and will be available for enlistment or induction under present practices. These 457,000 added to the 816,000 available already provides a net of class I–A availables of 1,273,000 young men. Subtracting enlistments and inductions (862,000) from availables (1,273,000) leaves a pool of 411,000 class I–A availables as of June 30, 1951.

During the next fiscal year (1952), 641,000 enlistments and inductions would be necessary. This would leave at the end of the fiscal year a pool of 469,000 young men, assuming that college deferments were reduced by 200,000, and assuming also that there will be no battle casualties hereafter.

Using the same calculations, at the end of fiscal 1953 the pool would be depleted to 127,000 young men and at the end of fiscal 1954 to 181,000 young men.

In considering these figures, it must be kept in mind that if we are to get the men we need when we need them we must have a "safety margin"—a reservoir of men numbering five to six times the average monthly calls.

The reason for this "safety margin" becomes at once apparent when we realize that the individuals who make up these totals are human beings. They move about the country, they become older, they are faced with many real personal problems, they require a reasonable time to arrange their affairs, they become ill or are injured. For example, out of the surplus remaining on June 30, 1951, nearly 2,000 attained age 19 on that day, and the same number on the preceding day; and it takes the Selective Service System about 90 days to process an individual registrant, from the date he becomes liable for induction.

There are approximately 3,700 local selective-service boards in the United States. Each board receives its proportionate share of a national call. Thus, when a call is issued for 80,000 young men during 1 month, this might mean that a particular local board must

deliver 50 inductees. If the board had only 50 men classified I–A, it would be impossible to meet the call for 50 inductees because of the varying length of time which the men would require to clear up their personal affairs.

Trying to get by with a minimum safety margin jeopardizes the functioning of selective service, and seriously jeopardizes the armed services. When men are most needed, they may be unavailable.

As a result of the factors enumerated, in part, in the preceding paragraphs, the Director of Selective Service has found that there must at all times be in the selective-service pool a safety factor equal to 6 times the estimated monthly rate of induction, a total of between 500,000 and 600,000. If this safety margin is not available, the local boards are required to become progressively more arbitrary in effecting the induction process.

Thus, so long as our present pool of manpower is confined to present standards within the 19-through-25 bracket, we will have no assurance that we can, through selective service, even supported as it is by the present highly successful enlistment programs, meet our military manpower requirements as they arise.

## V. Expanding the Military Manpower Pool

Obviously, we can gamble on "getting by" for a few more months without making additional manpower eligible for military service. But the gamble is dangerous. Under present circumstances, it could be fatal.

First, if the gamble failed—as it is very likely to do—we would not be able to meet the demands of the military for the manpower that is necessary to our defense.

Second, the gamble is predicated upon one unlikely assumption: that there will be no more casualties in Korea. The weekly casualty lists are testimony to the insecurity of this assumption.

Third, the gamble is ultimately doomed. Our available pool of manpower will be in a progressive decline through the months and years immediately ahead. Eventually, if not now, the manpower pool must somehow be increased.

This bill proposes a considered, prudent course, free of any unnecessary gamble. To expand our pool of eligible manpower, this bill proposes that:

### THE DEFERMENT OF NONVETERAN HUSBANDS BE REMOVED

The bill would eliminate the President's authority to defer a married man who is not a veteran and whose only dependent is his wife. This would add, at the most, an estimated 290,000 men to the induction pool, from the 19-through-25 age brackets. This is not a recurring item.

### THE PERIOD OF INDUCTION AND OF RESERVE SERVICE ON ACTIVE DUTY TO BE 26 MONTHS

The bill would extend the period of induction by 5 months, for a total of 26 months, inclusive of leave. This has the immediate equivalent effect of adding to the induction pool a number equaling approxi-

mately 25 percent of those inducted or ordered to active duty. It will have no long-term effect, however, because it is to be hoped that in the future the induction period can be reduced, instead of staying constant at 26 months.

The committee considers that it is well to point out in this general connection the specific manner in which present leave practices relate to the period of induction. Under the present law, a man accrues leave at the rate of 2½ days per month. Consequently, in serving 26 months he would become entitled to slightly over 2 months of leave, exclusive of week-end passes and sick leave, since week-end passes and sick leave are not charged against an individual's annual leave. Emergency furloughs, however, are chargeable against this annual leave, and reduce that leave whenever they are taken.

Under present procedures a man cannot use his accumulated leave to actually shorten his induction period. However, the Department of Defense has agreed to attempt to solve this problem. The object of such a solution would be to provide, under uniform administrative military leave regulations, for the maximum feasible accumulation of leave, in order to provide the earliest possible return to civilian life.

### CERTAIN ENLISTMENTS TO BE EXTENDED

The act of July 27, 1950, authorizes the President to extend all expiring enlistments for a period of 12 months. This authority expires on July 9, 1951. Thus, enlistments expiring prior to July 9, 1951, may be extended for 1 year. This bill proposes to move the expiration date to July 1, 1953. This would be equivalent to adding 147,000 men to the armed services during the fiscal years 1953 and 1954 and would reduce the necessary number of inductions by that amount, but would have no long-term effect.

Even with the above additions, it will be seen that the surplus of men in the manpower pool is not comforting, and falls off rapidly. It cannot be too strongly emphasized, moreover, that the calculations are estimates, and are based upon the assumption that the strength of the Armed Forces will be maintained at slightly below 3.5 million men. Any worsening of the international situation which would require an increase of the Armed Forces to a figure greater than 3.5 million would adversely affect the surplus of men in the manpower pool.

It is therefore necessary to provide a further source of manpower, but one which is to be used only when and as needed. Such an amendment, aimed at expanding the manpower pools, is discussed in the next section of this report.

### PROVISION TO BE MADE FOR INDUCTING 18-YEAR-OLDS

The committee believes that it is now necessary to make 18-year-old men eligible for military service, and for induction for universal military training when periods of service are no longer required.

The committee believes, however, that men of this age should actually be inducted for service only when and as they are needed.

This bill therefore provides that 18-year-olds shall be made eligible for induction, but that they shall not be taken for service by a local

board until all men in the 19-through-25 age bracket found by the local board to be available have been inducted. In other words, the 18-year-olds would be taken after—and only after—the I–A's in the 19–25 age bracket had been inducted, after the IV–F's in that bracket capable of limited service had been inducted, and after the childless husbands in that bracket had been inducted.

American tradition and American experience are studded with the deeds of 18-year-olds in all our past wars. In our Colonial period, the minimum age limit reached 16. In the War of the Revolution, 16 was the minimum conscription age. George Washington advocated registration for all men between 18 and 50 for service in the militia; this became law in 1782 and the militia was used in the War of 1812. It is estimated that 305,000 18-year-olds served on the Union side in the War Between the States. In the Confederacy, men between 17 and 50 were conscripted.

During World War I, 75,000 18-year-olds saw service. During World War II, the draft law was extended to 18-year-olds in November 1942, and a total of a million and three-quarters were inducted. Sixteen thousand 18-year-old Americans fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

From our experience, we have learned that 18-year-old men make excellent soldiers—they have stamina, resourcefulness, and adaptability. Furthermore, there is no basic dividing line on physical development or emotional maturity between men 18 years old and those 19 years old.

It is important to consider that the calling of the young man who is 18 years old imposes a minimum impact upon his life, and the life of his community. While the median age of high-school graduates is slightly over 18, the median age of college entrants is under 18. This apparent inconsistency is due to the fact that the younger high-school graduates go on to college in larger numbers. There is no arbitrary age which fits every individual case, either for the boy who continues his studies or the boy who goes to work; but age 18 appears to actually be better as far as the interruption of studies or work careers is concerned. The average age of high-school graduation is 17½. Inducting young men a short time thereafter imposes the least disruption on both their schooling and their working careers.

During the committee hearings, Secretary of Labor Tobin pointed out:

> Since we require a training program, 18 would be best from the youngster's point of view. The boy graduating from high school at 17½ and not subject to draft until 19, is likely to find his employment opportunities are limited to casual or blind-alley jobs.

Of the impact upon education, President Bronk, of Johns Hopkins University, testified:

> I believe that 18 is the most satisfactory period for the man and for the Nation. I think that service after completion of university training or after the development of a skill would affect our economy and disrupt the normal development of family life.

The committee feels that lowering the induction age to 18 is entirely justifiable, on the basis of our national experience and ordinary com-

mon sense and justice. However, we strongly feel that the drafting of 18-year-olds should not relieve any men in the 19-through-25 group from military duty. That is the reason we have specified that the 18-year-old will be taken by the local board only after the supply of older men is exhausted.

The fact that 18-year-olds are to be taken after older groups applies only to individual local selective-service boards. Thus, some local boards may be calling 18-year-olds, while other boards are still filling calls with older men. It would be unworkable to require that all men, 19 through 25, be taken on a Nation-wide basis before 18-year-olds anywhere could be inducted. This might produce a situation in which one or two States would be supplying the total national draft quotas from older men, while the remaining States would be unable to contribute to the national quotas.

It must be kept in mind that the only dependable alternative to the lowered induction age would be to induct veterans within the 19-through-25 age bracket. This is the only group, presently ineligible, which contains sufficient numbers to contribute materially to the relief of our military manpower shortage. Calling men from the veterans group would mean calling again some men who themselves were drafted during World War II at age 18; it might mean calling some such men who had served 4 years or longer, often in combat; it might mean calling men who had spent time in prison camps. Faced with this choice, the committee believes that justice makes it highly preferable, if not imperative, that the 18-year-olds be asked to stand ready to give now what the veterans have already given in service to their country.

The bill requires that men inducted at age 18 shall not be sent into combat or overseas with less than 4 months' training, the period which the military deems adequate and essential for proper basic training and seasoning.

If it should become necessary to reinforce the 19–26 age group by induction of 18-year-olds, the bill provides that the available older persons among this group, in the jurisdiction of a particular local board, must be inducted first. A local board could not induct a man 18 years and 6 months old before it exhausts the supply of available 18-year-olds above the age of 18 years and 9 months. The older go first; the younger go later.

Another factor dealing with the induction of 18-year-olds is related to the program for universal training, which will begin at such time as it is no longer necessary to induct persons for service.

A great deal of testimony is available on the question of whether 18 is the best age for the individual to undertake his period of military training. The Compton Commission explored this question in great detail, and concluded that it was. The Preparedness Subcommittee also explored this question in great detail, taking advantage of the advice and experience of many prominent educators. The opinions expressed during this independent examination of the question by the subcommittee overwhelmingly supported the views of the Compton Commission. The committee, therefore, recommends that the induction age which shall govern the selection of trainees for their initial basic training when the military-training program takes effect should be 18 years.

The committee considered the possibility of setting the age of induction at the age of 18½ rather than at 18. After studying the problem it was determined by the committee that the placing of the age of induction at 18½ would be unwise.

The reasons are as follows:

(1) The requirement in this bill that the induction of young men below the age of 19 for service shall be closely geared to relative ages, makes it unnecessary that the 18½-year provision be written into the bill.

(2) If a young man wishes to meet the requirements of school enrollment or employment opportunity to his best advantage, he may wish to avail himself of an opportunity to volunteer for induction at the age of 18, rather than 6 months later.

(3) Such a provision would make the universal-military-training program extremely difficult because it would so greatly shorten the period in which individuals would be liable to begin their training, and greatly increase the requirement for facilities. Also, all trainees would be delayed at least 6 months in completing their training.

(4) In case of a serious emergency, it might well be imperative to have the services of many who are below 18½ on very short notice—and such an emergency would find them completely untrained.

### SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST LOWERED INDUCTION AGE

The arguments listed below concern themselves with the age issue which emerged during the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings.

Included are not only the contentions advanced by the witnesses who appeared, but also those presented by individuals and organizations who requested that their material be inserted in the record. There may be arguments other than those presented, but this study summarizes only those which appear in the record.

Not all arguments presented as opposing the Department of Defense proposals are directly in conflict with those proposals. Any time a variation of the proposals was presented, it was placed in the opposing column.

It will be noted that some witnesses are listed as both "For" and "Against" the same measure. This is due to the fact that occasionally a witness would either point out arguments on the other side or would present evidence which could be interpreted as being a variation of the Department's proposals. All such arguments have been included for the purpose of securing a more balanced picture. Also, it should be carefully noted that not all of these extracts are in their full context. Every effort was made by the staff to present an accurate summary, and the committee hopes that no inaccuracies have crept in due to the need for condensing the wealth of material into the briefest possible space. Not all of the material is in the nature of direct quotes. Frequently remarks from different parts of the record have been combined into one statement. Occasionally, in answer to a long question, a witness would say "Yes" or "No," or "I agree." In these instances the content of the question has been attributed to the witness. Care has been taken to see that no witness is quoted out of context to secure a meaning other than the one intended.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROPOSALS ON UMTS LOWERED INDUCTION AGE

### Testimony Favoring

#### A. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

*1. Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense*

(*a*) We would be operating too closely to the danger line if we had to satisfy our present military manpower ceiling of 3.5 million men with no changes in the present selective-service law, other than a 27-month period of service and a 1-year extension of enlistments.

(*b*) Because it is the best way to meet our immediate need for an enlarged combat force and, at the same time, provide an enduring base for our military strength, I know of no other that will give us so much protection at a cost in men and money that is within the capacity of our economy to bear. . . . It makes it possible to get the trained manpower and to build the balance of a military structure at a minimum of cost. It is at once the most effective, the most economical, and the most democratic way to safeguard our Nation.

(*c*) It would . . . be possible to call up husbands and fathers among the nonveteran group between the ages of 19 and 26, but the social damage . . . would be . . . greater than that . . . in calling 18-year-olds . . .

(*d*) . . . broadening the liability . . . to take in 18-year-olds . . . will make it easier for us to build our military strength to the required levels with minimum disruption of the industrial, agricultural, scientific and educational resources . . .

(*e*) Men of 18, 19, 20, make our finest soldiers . . . this physical superiority often determines the issue in heavy and prolonged fighting. . . . Experience in both World Wars has shown that men of 18 are among our bravest and best fighters. . . .

(*f*) . . . no youth under the age of 19 could be sent overseas with less than 4 months of training . . . it is our strong fear that . . . a specific prohibition against sending men out of the United States before their nineteenth birthday would cripple the services in meeting a sudden . . . action.

*2. General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower*

(*a*) Every single generation of Americans, tragic as it may be, has had to go to war, and mostly we have sent them to war without one blankety-blank item of training. It has been a crime. There are more Americans occupying graves overseas because they were not trained than I think for almost any other reason; not trained to take care of themselves, not trained to know what to do in combat, so when it comes to this one crisis that comes to every generation, we suddenly say, "Oh, let's don't train the boy for that. Let's decide whether or not he ought to be trained." It is the most important thing that ever happened to him. We have got to train him . . . he deserves it, entirely aside from the Government's, the country's, requirement.

(*b*) I firmly believe in the principle of universal military service at this critical stage in our affairs. . . . As a soldier it matters little to me at what specific age you take the men. The young man is a good soldier.

(*c*) As a college president, we studied this problem . . . and came to the conclusion that 18 was the least harmful to the man in terms of interruption of educational process or in his industrial employment in case he is going no further in school.

(*d*) (On the question of the mental deferments) . . . you do finally strike a level below which you are just wasting your time. . . .

(*e*) The National Guard needs trained men. The source for National Guard men should be after the man has had his training and not before he goes into it.

(*f*) (Speaking of alien troops.) Remember this, none of this we are talking about should be as a substitution for meeting our own duties, performing our own obligations . . . When Rome tried to solve its problems by going out and hiring mercenaries outside, it fell.

(*g*) I do not believe it is disturbing (for a 17-year-old to register) as long as they know what is going to happen to them.

(*h*) . . . in Africa, I conducted a Gallup poll and found that instead of beer, they wanted Coca-Cola. . . .

*3. General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff*

(*a*) . . . if a full mobilization is called for, we must have an effective military manpower program worked out in advance. . . . We are face to face with a long-

range struggle—a struggle in which the enemy will use all means . . . to bring about our capitulation. This long-range struggle is a struggle for survival of our Nation. . . .

(*b*) (Speaking of the 3,462,000 goal of the armed services.) I think you are going to have to maintain at least that strength for some time to come. . . .

(*c*) . . . it would interfere much less with their education and their getting established in their lifetime careers, if they could start their service sometime around 18 years old . . . a man 18 years old is less apt to have family obligations. . . .

(*d*) . . . the man who goes to school after his service is going to get more out of it than he would otherwise.

(*e*) . . . all the youngsters around 18 to 20 years old are very fine soldiers. They can stand more hardships than an older man. . . .

(*f*) . . . they (18-year-olds) are subject to no more temptations or no more apt to be diverted from a straight life than they would out of service . . . a man's character is very largely molded long before he is 18. If he has been brought up in the proper environment in the home he is pretty well set . . . before he is 18. . . . I do not think . . . that 18-year-olds would be any more susceptible to being tempted than a 19- or 20-year-old . . . when you take him into service, you do not take him away from the church. We have chaplains. Everybody in the service is not in there just to corrupt him. . . . When a man becomes 18 and goes into service, that does not mean that he would have stayed at home otherwise.

(*g*) (Overseas duty for 18-year-olds) . . . any time you have to line a unit up and take out any considerable percentage of it and put in new men . . . you have spoiled your teamwork . . . spoiled the value of your unit training . . . and you lower the efficiency of the unit. . . . it may result in greater losses and possible set-backs. . . .

(*h*) A man who cannot meet the mental qualifications becomes a liability . . . in the service . . . Somebody has to look after him . . . if you try to take him into combat he does not last long. . . .

*4. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service*

(*a*) . . . I believe it to be the best act we can hope for at the present time, and I have tried to point out that it is not only for now, but it is an act looking forward to a future, and not an emergency shot in the arm for the present.

(*b*) . . . the tax upon the time of the citizen for service with the Armed Forces should occur at the earliest practicable time. This is to the advantage of the Government and for the citizen as well. The youth has more of the qualities required for service in the Armed Forces than any other age. The responsibilities of family are generally nonexistent, skills have not been acquired, nor has professional or scientific competence been achieved.

(*c*) (I recommend) That the present pool of single nonveterans, nonfathers, 19–25, be augmented by the extension of liability to those who have reached the eighteenth year. If necessary to go beyond that, the following priority should govern: Nonfathers, nonveterans, 18–25, inclusive.

(*d*) (The Defense Department) made all assumptions favorably and I think they are dangerous.

(*e*) (If the number in the Army were increased beyond the limits that are contemplated at present, it would necessitate increasing that term to live on income) because you have borrowed this year by increasing for 1 year every contract, which is an emergency measure.

(*f*) (As a safety margin) I would like to have six times the number of people they are going to call in every month. (That would be 480,000.)

(*g*) . . . if you ever go, as we went during the war at times when I had calls for 300,000 and 400,000, then I have got to get a million in the pool. . . . one of the things I watch is the fall of my I–A's, and I have lost about a half-million out of that pool since July. . . . You can see what would happen if in my I–A I have got two or three hundred thousand postponed students that I should defer (until) next June. . . . My pool suddenly collapses.

(*h*) You are forced inevitably to take 18-year-olds, or to take veterans, because the nonfathers who are not veterans are so small that they will not make more than 1 month's call. . . .

(*i*) There are 2,700,000 veterans under 26. They are disappearing at the rate of 60,000 a month. The next year and the year after, the veteran problem is not going to be much of a problem because it is disappearing.

(*j*) . . . whenever you reach the 3,462,000, the figures show, assuming a safety factor of 400,000 that you actually have a deficit of 126,000, . . . and when you add the additional safety factor of 80,000 that you require, you are 206,000 short.

(*k*) The qualities required for service under varied conditions are found to a greater extent in the late teens and the early and middle twenties than any other age. . . . Acceptability decreases with age and with accelerated rapidity once the late twenties have been passed.

(*l*) The numbers with dependents tend to increase as age increases.

(*m*) Occupations and professions possessed by individuals are important in any analysis of manpower. They are found infrequently among the late teens and early twenties. They are found in ever-increasing numbers as the age increases.

(*n*) . . . graduation age from high school, on the average, is 17 years and 6 months—therefore this is a normal break period. . . .

(*o*) Temporary or short-lived programs for the training of manpower cannot be applied with fairness and justice. It is impossible to institute a plan which would permit of deferments for the purpose of education unless there is assurance that the plan will be continued long enough for those receiving deferments also to meet their service obligations, otherwise a deferment becomes a means of evading service. . . .

(*p*) . . . the numbers that are being inducted from the 18-year-olds would indicate that the great majority would certainly come in the next year or two from those who were in the last several months of it . . . the application of our present regulations (would permit you to take boys 18 years and 11 months, get all of them, and then take 18 years and 10 months, etc.) . . . I am going to plead guilty to 3 or 4 months' variation but not quite 9.

(*q*) . . . I would be very careful of restrictions on the policeman who was in front of my door on what he could do and what he could not do to protect me. . . . Any government which allows its citizens to do voluntarily that which they will not compel the rest of the citizens to do, had better not talk too much about being fair and just.

*5. Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations*

(*a*) . . . unless international conditions improve we may well have to set a new target as we approach this target (of 3,462,000).

(*b*) We concur in the principles and the details of the plan as it has been presented here. . . . I . . . share responsibility for recommending to you a long-range plan for the mobilization of the manpower of the country in a manner which will meet the needs of all the fighting services in time of peace, in a limited emergency, and in a full-out general war. . . . The plan . . . is . . . soundly conceived and will provide for building forces needed now and will eventually provide the services with badly needed reserves of trained people.

(*c*) I have been in contact with 17- and 18-year-old sailors for a considerable number of years. . . . There is no sharp cut-off point in the characteristics of the 18- and the 19-year-olds. . . . I would challenge most people to tell which ones are which.

(*d*) It would indeed be unfortunate if when we ordered the fleet to sea at the outbreak of hostilities, we had to weed out of it every man who was under 19.

*6. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army*

(*a*) I am thoroughly in accord with the legislation which is under consideration before your committee and with the principles that are involved in that legislation.

(*b*) I do not regard it (3,462,000) as an ultimate figure if the world situation stays in its current state or worsens.

(*c*) We are now making use of men who are not fully physically fit . . . and are prepared to extend that even further.

(*d*) We are very loath to lower mental standards because . . . (men with lowered) standards are a pain in the neck all along the line and instead of being an asset are a hindrance because somebody has always to be taking care of them.

(*e*) . . . the soundest all-around solution is to initiate the selection of 18-year-olds now . . . an additional factor is that it would interfere with his schooling and his ultimate future less if he were taken at this particular time rather than to take him later on after he had married and had acquired a family.

(*f*) The youngsters of 18 and 19 years of age . . . make excellent soldiers.

(*g*) I do not believe (that there is any more likelihood of average boy 18 or 19 years old becoming addicted to the use of intoxicating beverages if he is in the

Army than if he remains at home or college). . . . the corner poolroom is . . . far more dangerous than any Army post I have ever lived on.

(*h*) . . . If, . . . just before a unit sailed, we had to take out all men who were 18 years old, we would wreck the teamwork of our small units. . . .

*7. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force*

(*a*) . . . the Air Force strongly endorses and supports the program presented to you by the Department of Defense. . . . It will provide us, as well as the other services, with a dependable, enduring, and flexible system, which will insure a continuing capability of meeting our manpower requirements—both in the active Air Force and in our Reserve components.

(*b*) . . . all of our increased number of combat units will be attained through the ordering to duty of Air National Guard and Air Reserve units . . . this will not be enough. . . . It will be necessary to order to duty approximately 60,000 personnel from the Volunteer Reserve. . . .

(*c*) (The Reserves) are composed to a great degree of men who have been in the last war.

(*d*) (Many of) our Reserve units are fighter units, and they reach an age very rapidly where a man is too old to utilize his skill . . . the age limit of some of our Reserve units, especially those of the National Guard, is getting almost to the limit of where we can be really effective.

*8. Hon. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense*

(*a*) General: (The present program or other programs to expand the Armed Forces) would be more costly, . . . more disruptive of family, . . . educational, . . . industrial life, and would fail to supply equally dependable safeguards for the United States in the years to come.

(*b*) Need:

(1) The figure of 3,462,205 must be met by June 1951 or as early as possible.

(2) It is going to take everything we have, including the 18-year-olds, to give us what we need to get a 4,000,000 Armed Force strength . . .

(3) (If we have to go to 4.5 million) you take 2.5 million veterans. . . . (If you took the 18-year-olds and the 19-year-olds, giving us 4,000,000, we would have to take half a million from the veteran group . . .)

(4) We are not figuring in this at all letting any reserve go sooner than the full legal date.

(5) The maximum probable estimate of those who might be subject to service and training through the rehabilitation program is about 20,000 . . .

(6) . . . in these 100,000 or 150,000 (physically unfit), . . . (many) are so physically handicapped that community living of any kind, travel of any kind, the hours required in a Federal service of any kind, would be dangerous to their life.

(7) . . . our physical standards today are down to World War II.

(8) . . . in the National Guard and Reserve units, we do not know how many, on physical examination, . . . on acquired dependency, or on an acquired occupational deferment, might fall out. . . .

(9) In 1952 we make no allowance at all for (casualties.)

(10) . . . one-third of the men discharged with less than 12 months of service were given medical discharges . . . many men discharged with a limited period of service were found to be mentally, morally, or psychologically unsuited for military service. . . . Very few veterans with less than 6 months of service would qualify for military service under current standards . . . a maximum of 160,000 veterans under 26 years of age with less than 12 months of service would be available for induction. . . . Of these . . . about 40,000 would be single men without dependents (and) three-fourths would be fathers and men with dependents other than children.

(11) A low industrial deferment rate will not be satisfactory when impact of contracts hits industry . . . because . . . of more technical equipment we will have to defer more skilled men. . . .

(12) . . . we are certain that as we require more in farm production it will mean they will need more industrial equipment, more parts, and also deferments for more skilled men who can operate the machines.

(13) . . . If we are to have a long-term production and a long-term sustaining economy, . . . we must give more deferments to students.

(14) (This is) the height of optimism . . . makes allowances for enlistments and reenlistments at same rate that we were getting men when we had no Korea . . . makes allowances for men to enlist with permission of parents.

(*c*) Social and economic advantages of taking 18-year-olds:

(1) (The proposed program will permit) a larger number of deferments than otherwise possible in the present selective service pool of men between 19 and 26, and thus would give industry and agriculture continued access to engineers, technicians, and skilled laborers. . . . It (will help) maintain a stable educational system and our preeminence in scientific and technical knowledge.

(2) The need of industry and agriculture for engineers and technicians would be met by our ability to maintain a larger number of occupational deferments in the 19- to 26-year group.

(3) By taking these 18-year-old men it would reduce the draft call for your upper classmen in colleges . . . assisting to keep the small colleges open and letting men finish their education . . . student deferments are as high as 570,000 or 600,000. . . . If we do not take 18-year-old ones we must ask General Hershey to squeeze that deferment down 200,000.

(4) It is . . . apparent that a draft of husbands and fathers would be much more destructive in its family and community consequences than the calling of 18-year-olds. . . .

(5) . . . the domestic, financial, and emotional shock to the young man of 18 is far less acute to all concerned than uprooting of an older family man. The same . . . is true of the impact on business, science, education, and life of the community generally.

(6) . . . this is without translating into dollars and cents the great loss to our industries and farms and to the purchasing power of families that would be involved in calling up married men.

(7) . . . the total (cost of calling up) 630,000 young men in both married groups (is) . . . $979,000,000 for a year. . . . (The cost for) an equivalent number of 18-year-olds . . . would come to $466,000,000 a year . . . the difference . . . would be $513,000,000 . . . one would be more costly in dollars and cents besides being more costly in social values.

(8) . . . the time when it is best to take a young man, if you must take him out of his educational, his civilian, his working life and his community life, is at the age of 18.

(9) . . . if a boy is in high school . . . and has not finished, he can finish his high school . . . if he is (in) college, he can finish that year of college. . . .

(10). . . educators . . . have come to the conclusion . . . that 18 years of age is the best time of a man's life to take him.

(11) 18-year-olds would be less likely to possess essential skills in industries and farming.

(12) If we say that we are going to take the boy at 18½, he has a 6-month period during which he does not want to go to school. It will be difficult for him to get a job . . . 18 is the age when boys have the least family ties as far as wives and children are concerned. . . . Social and emotional impact at 18 is much less than at older ages. . . . We have followed the thinking of the best educators and psychologists, psychiatrists.

(*d*) History of 18-year-olds:

(1) During the colonial period, military duty was required between ages of 16 and 50.

(2) During the Revolutionary War . . . many men under 19 ably served their country. In 1782 the Congress provided for national defense by requiring that all who are or shall be of age of 18 years, should be enrolled in the militia.

(3) During the War of 1812, men under 19 fought in both the Regular Army and the militia.

(4) In the Mexican War, many soldiers were under 19.

(5) In the Civil War, about 305,000 18-year-olds saw service with the Union forces . . . Confederate forces were raised by . . . draft of men between ages of 18 and 35. . . . In 1864, the lower and upper age limits were 17 and 50.

(6) The Spanish-American War included many men who were under 19 years of age.

(7) World War I. In 1918 the President signed an act for liability for military service of "all male citizens and aliens between the ages of 18 and 45 . . ."

(8) World War II. Shortly after the Pearl Harbor attack, the registration age was reduced to 18 years. . . . The maximum number of 18-year-olds on active duty at any one time was about 643,000.

(*e*) 18-year-olds in other nations:

The following countries conscript men at 18 or below:

Chinese Communists, age 16; Chinese Nationalists, age 18; Egypt, age 18; Greece, age 18; Iran, age 18; the Netherlands, age 18; New Zealand, age 18; United Kingdom, age 18.

(*f*) Call of 18-year-olds:

(1) During 4 months of training, no man will be allowed to leave the continental United States.

(2) The (Armed Forces) feel that they will be able to absorb about 450,000 18-year-olds for service and training in the first year. . . . This would leave many thousands of 18-year-olds who could not be called up in the first year.

(3) We have agreed with General Hershey that the first men who would be called up would be those 18 years and 11 months. . . . We would not go down below 18 years. . . . We at no time feel that in that phasing-in we would take in a man less than 18 years and 6 months. . . .

*9. John G. Adams, Assistant General Counsel, Defense Department*

(*a*) The figure of 3.4 million plus will show an actual deficit of men in fiscal 1951, unless we make administrative changes or unless we ask you to make changes in the existing law, or unless the age limit is lowered.

(*b*) The figure 3.2 millions at the end of this fiscal year will leave us 100,000 men net in the pool available for induction. If the figure went up to 3.3 million, we would be even; 3.4 million, we would be a hundred-thousand short. Each hundred thousand men above 3.2 millions will reduce the availables at the end of the year.

(*c*) . . . On June 30, the total Armed Forces will be 3,325,000. We have available 1.2 million, and take in 862,000, and have a surplus of 411,000. . . . General Hershey considers a figure of 400,000 to be a logical and adequate safety margin which he should have available as class I–A availables, while inductions are scaled at rate of 80,000 a month. . . . At the end of this fiscal year, there will be 411,000 or a total of 11,000 over and above the Selective Service System's safety margin. If you go to the approved force in being of 3,462,000, you will be short 126,000 men.

(*d*) During 1952 fiscal year, adding to the pool the young men who come of age 19, adding also the 200,000 college students, there would be a total of 699,000 young men available for induction. . . . Will induct 641,000 under present plans. There was a 411,000 surplus, based upon our present planning, not taking into consideration the 126,000 lost, so not considering that we meet the force of 3,462,000, as now planned, there would be a surplus of 469,000 on board.

(*e*) When those 1,632,249 present I–A's are called, a substantial proportion of them appear with new deferment authority. Many have married and entered school, many have or had physical reason. . . . Of all the I–A's called, and distinguished from all of the group, approximately 50 percent are rejected or are reclassified. . . . Selective Service System estimate is that 50 percent will be available for induction under existing standards, or 816,000 young men is final end.

(*f*) Out of the 8,000,000 between the age of 19 and 26, you will get 816,000; out of 1,052,000 18's you will get 684,000. . . . Induction practices during World War II indicate we would get 61.4 percent of those young men (i.e., 18-year-olds), based upon class IV–F rejects for physical and mental reasons of 21.8 percent. . . .

(*g*) Subsequent to October 31, between then and June 1, or July 1, there will be a total of 354,000 individuals in organized, unorganized, units of the Reserve, and the National Guard, including Army, Navy, and Air Force, called to duty. . . .

(*h*) Present induction practices, particularly physical, are identical with World War II.

(*i*) General Hershey feels he needs a 4-month-lead-time over and above the monthly calls he gets . . . the minimum he could have was 4 to 5 months and he feels that 400,000 (5 months) was the best minimum. . . . During World War II they felt they should have as high as 6 to 8 months. . . . There are 3,700 local boards throughout the country . . . 400,000 gives less than 100 persons per local board.

(*j*) Indication has been made that additional request for 50,000 above the 3.2 million is going to be made by the military services to replace battle casualties.

(*k*) Based upon the present law, 21 months for the young men who are inducted at the beginning of fiscal year 1952, under present law 103,000 are ready for separation from the service, having served 21 months . . .

(*l*) During the fiscal year subsequent to today, we will have terminating not only the enlistments which should terminate but those enlistments which were extended, meaning there is double the number of enlistments terminating under present law during fiscal year 1952. . . . Those enlistments which terminate amount to 730,000 young men, over half of your regular force.

(*m*) Of the 1,500,000 who are enlistments, 314,000 are the career-soldier type who will offer to reenlist, but 418,000 are made up of men whose enlistments ordinarily terminate.

(*n*) 872,000 people, by statute, are authorized to leave the military service next year whom we do not expect to reenlist. 872,000, plus 314,000 entitled to go, and we expect 872,000 to go—the 21-month inductees, term expired; National Guard men who have served 21 months; and men whose enlistment expire.

10. *Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor*

(*a*) A number of far-reaching changes in the size and composition of the United States population have occurred in the past decade. These changes have affected unfavorably the availability of manpower for building up the Armed Forces and expanding the labor force.

(*b*) . . . additions to the population of military and working age during the next several years will be substantially smaller than in the corresponding period of the past decade, since the age group 10–19 decreased by over 2 million as a result of the low birth rates in the 1930's . . . our phenomenal population growth over the decade has brought less than commensurate gains to the age groups upon which the Armed Forces and the civilian labor force make their immediate major demands.

(*c*) . . . we are not going to have as many young men arriving at the age of 18 until 1959 as we did successively during the period of 1940 to 1945 . . . two-fifths of the men employed in critical occupations are between the ages of 19 and 35; this group, however, constitutes only about 4 percent of all men in that group . . . the indiscriminate withdrawal of skilled and professional workers into the Armed Forces could create havoc with our defense production program. . . .

(*d*) . . . you would probably have 1 in 50 with a critical skill under the age of 26, and most of those would be close to 26 . . . there would be none at the age of 18. . . . In age groups 18 to 26 it is about 2 percent of the total.

(*e*) In the 18-to-19-year-old group I do not think in the whole country, you would have one that would appear on the critical list.

(*f*) . . . if we got into serious trouble, your occupational deferments will be greatly increased especially if we were to go above the 26-year-old level.

(*g*) (Chart) There were approximately 200 apprentices in critical occupations under 19 years of age, as of October 1950.

(*h*) . . . a program which inducts young men for training and service at age 18, at the point when they have had an opportunity to complete secondary school but before they have established themselves in a civilian occupation, would clearly have a smaller impact on the civilian economy than the current 19–26-year-old draft. . . . Under the present selective service law, the typical young man who graduates from high school at age 18 but is not subject to the draft until age 19 is likely to find that his employment opportunities are limited to casual or blind-alley jobs, since few employers would be inclined to initiate extended training of young men for such short periods of employment. Dependency problems are also minimized since only a very small proportion of men—about 1 percent—are married before 18.

*11. Edward J. Overby, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Agriculture*

(*a*) This Department concurs in the policy of the proposed program for universal military training and service and the change in age limits. . . . I think it is true also for the young man who is helping his father on a farm (i. e., that 18 is best age).

(*b*) . . . even though a farm-reared boy in the 18- or 19-year group may already possess substantial farm skill, the men in the higher age groups liable for military service possess even greater farm skills. . . . The proposal for broadening the age group liable for service will provide a larger pool from which to draw men for the armed services. By the enlargement of the available pool in this manner, it should be possible to obtain a given size military force with less adverse effect on farm production. This is extremely important from the viewpoint of agriculture in this period immediately ahead when expansion of the Armed Forces and expansion of agricultural production are both required.

*12. Dr. Charles A. Thomas, chairman, Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee, National Security Resources Board*

(*a*) a. (The committee) endorses the basic principle of 4 months of basic training and 23 more months of military service for all 18-year-olds. . . .

(*b*) . . . the industrial potential of this country is being weakened on a day-by-day basis as reservists occupying critical scientific and engineering positions are drawn to active military duty.

B. SENATORS

*13. Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Senator from Massachusetts*

. . . I do not think 3,400,000 is too high. Any study I can make of what the demands are going to be leads me to the conclusion that 3.4 million is not going to be at all too high . . . if the world is in a dangerous situation—every young man who has not had military training has a right to demand that the Government give it to him, and he has a right to object very strongly if the Government does not give it to him.

C. NEWSPAPERS

*14. Editorial from New York Times, January 12, 1951, on UMTS*

"Eighteen years is the right age to call up youth. . . . Possibly there are some risks in the program, but we live in a period when risks are unavoidable. The greatest risk of all lies in weakness and inaction."

D. PROFESSIONAL, LABOR, AND FARM GROUPS

*15. J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel, the National Grange*

(*a*) . . . farm boys during this time really do become skilled earlier in their lives in mechanical operations than industrial boys . . . an indiscriminate and undifferentiating draft of the 18-year-old boys could do a lot more damage in taking skilled and necessary boys from the farm than it would do in industry.

(*b*) Senator CHAPMAN. You are for the remainder of the bill?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, sir.

*16. Paul H. Robbins, executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers*

. . . there are approximately 65,000 engineers and scientists within the present draft age limits. If any substantial part of this group are taken into the armed services it will obviously mean an even more intense strain on our production potential.

*17. Clarence E. Davies, secretary, American Society of Mechanical Engineers; director, Program of the Engineering Manpower*

Avoid induction of engineering manpower into armed services for nontechnical assignments.

*18. Lewis Sanders, consulting engineer, New York*

(*a*) The question of calling 18-year-olds into the Armed Forces resolves into whether to take the same man when he is 18 or 19. There seems to be no dispute over the necessity of taking the man at age 19. An analysis of our manpower inventory shows conclusively the necessity of calling men at 18.

(*b*) . . . at 18 is the optimum point for interrupting his educational career or of letting him perform his military service before he has established himself in industry. . . . S. 1 contains ample safeguards against interrupting a man's education in the middle of a scholastic year.

(*c*) . . . the 18-year-old is a prime fighting man.

(*d*) . . . the 18-year-old will not be subject to any greater demoralizing influences by reason of being called into military service.

*19. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO*

. . . we believe that lowering the induction age would prove least disruptive to our way of life and at the same time serve as a great source of strength to our Armed Forces.

E. VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

*20. Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander, the American Legion*

As national commander, I speak for the 3,000,000 members of the American Legion and, in this instance, for an additional million members of the American Legion Auxiliary. . . . If you do not take 18-year-olds, you will in effect be ordering the redraft of World War II veterans, many of whom already have served their country when they were themselves 18. I do not believe that the American people want that to happen, gentlemen . . . it would seem unfair and unnecessary to exempt the present crop of 18-year-olds from service while reaching out for those who served previously—at that age—and under conditions of total war.

*21. Omar B. Ketchum, Legislative Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States*

(*a*) My organization . . . indicated that all male persons in the age group from 18 to 35, inclusive . . . who have not had previous military service . . . should be subject to military service.

(*b*) . . . our organization believes 18-year-olds can accept the responsibilities of soldiers and adequately serve our country either inside or outside of the United States.

*22. Francis M. Sullivan, National Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans*

The Disabled American Veterans, in the . . . belief that the keystone to national security lies in military preparedness, endorses the principle of universal military service . . . any system of compulsory military service and training should be directed toward the age group, or groups, whose service and training will cause the least impact on the Nation's social and economic structure.

*23. Harold Russell, National Commander, AMVETS*

(*a*) AMVETS now feel that the present proposal to dovetail both UMT and universal military service is, by every yardstick, the most intelligent and economical answer to America's present military danger . . .

(*b*) . . . the age of 18 is the logical time to interrupt the normal life of the American citizen for military service. It is logical (*a*) because it comes at the conclusion of high-school training; (*b*) because it creates the least disruption of the individual's life; the least disruption of our national economy; the least interference with the educational pattern of America.

(*c*) The most colossal fraud that the Congress of the United States can foist on the young men of America at this time would be to deprive them of military training and then, at some late date, in the face of an urgent emergency, hastily call them to the colors and send them into combat with hasty or inadequate training.

*24. Michael Straight, the American Veterans' Committee*

(*a*) We . . . believe that this Nation requires immediately at least 4.5 million men in our Armed Forces who will join together with those of our allies to defend the free world. . . . We believe that the present official Defense Department goal of 3.5 million men is insufficient. . . .

(*b*) . . . we feel that Congress must authorize now the drafting of all able-bodied American men between the ages of 18 and 26. . . .

(*c*) Youths of 18 are at the height of their stamina and endurance, and if properly trained make the best fighting men.

(*d*) . . . 18-year-olds should not be sent overseas without a minimum of 4 months' training.

(*e*) Eighteen seems to be the most convenient age.

(*f*) AVC represents thousands of veterans who have found that it is more practical to start and finish a college training program in consecutive years, rather than have a lapse of several years in the middle of that training program.

(*g*) . . . any effort to call up a large alien army of mercenaries is a will-o'-the-wisp in the sense that the manpower does not exist, cannot be brought from the other side of the iron curtain, and is not present in Europe today to serve as any adequate substitute for a continuous flow of able-bodied young Americans. . . .

*25. Maj. Gen. Milton G. Baker, commander in chief, the Military Order of the World Wars*

National military service more accurately describes the type of program that is needed in this present dire emergency. We must buttress our economy, our people, and our defenses.

*26. Col. Edwin S. Bettelheim, Military Order of World Wars*

. . . we are in favor unanimously of this bill.

*27. Annapolis Chapter, Military Order of the World Wars*

The Annapolis Chapter of the Military Order of World Wars has taken a strong stand in favor of universal military training and urges you to assist in every possible way to insure the enactment of such legislation in the present Congress.

*28. Bernard Weitzer, national legislative director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America*

(*a*) The present bill, in my opinion, is the most practicable plan for meeting the manpower needs of our Armed Forces with the minimum disturbance of our

social and economic fabric and our needs for the products of our industry and our farms.

(*b*) I would prefer the 18-year-old (to a nonveteran parent or father or husband . . .). I think that when a man has set up a home and a family, that the disturbance to our social fabric would be greater. . . .

*29. Frank E. McClernan, national commander, Regular Veterans Association*

(*a*) The Regular Veterans Association . . . has advocated enforced universal military training starting at age 18.

(*b*) . . . it is more desirable to put 18-year-old boys in uniform now, in order to provide them with proper training than it is to procrastinate and be found unprepared, as we have been in other wars when it was necessary to put them in uniform without the proper training.

(*c*) The educators of our country have given us phony reasons that this should not be so. They claim that it retards the boy's normal education. We maintain that the normal education should be retarded at this time rather than have the possibility of all education being stopped in the future.

### F. NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

*30. Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers' Association*

(*a*) It is our strong belief today that a universal military service and training bill is essential to the well-being of this Nation.

(*b*) Commenting on the lowering of the draft age to 18, it is our judgment that this should be done.

*31. Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association of the United States*

For 33 years the National Guard of the several States . . . has urged that there be established in this country, a system of universal military training and service.

*32. Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, National Guard Association of the United States*

By the time he gets his basic training, especially if you follow my thought that it should be in the United States, he could not be sent overseas until he was 19 years of age.

### G. EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

*33. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

(*a*) . . . the comments which I have heard from my academic and other associates since Secretary Marshall and Assistant Secretary Rosenberg submitted the outline of the Department of Defense's plan to you last week have been unanimously favorable.

(*b*) (Quoting from editorial, Boston Herald, January 12, 1951) . . . ". . . But we are now in a state of emergency verging upon war. And for the particular set of circumstances which we face the Secretary seems to have produced as painless a solution as we can hope to get . . . Secretary Marshall's program is not ideal, but we do not live in a world whose problems always permit of ideal solution . . ."

(*c*) I think a little more maturity is a good thing, but I think the record is also clear that those men make good soldiers, and the record is also clear that men, on the whole, who have come back from service in World War II have come back in good shape.

(*d*) I would not stop at 18½, as some have suggested. The important thing seems to me to be the stage in the young man's career—the break between high school and job or college—not the matter of a few months more or less in age.

(*e*) . . . It certainly seems to me better to go below the 19-year age level than to disrupt young families and careers. . . .

(*f*) . . . We would hope that the early stages of training would be done in this country, would be carried out in places where there would be some community interest, civilian community interest, in the welfare of the group of those young men. . . .

(*g*) . . . I think the moral surroundings of the group of 18-year-old boys is likely to be rather better than the moral surroundings of the group that are twice that age brought together under the same circumstances, because I think there is a lot of idealism in these young men.

(*h*) . . . there is far more liquor per capita drunk outside the military than drunk inside it . . . for one thing, . . . there is no liquor sold on the post, . . . if a boy wants liquor he can get it much more easily at home than he can when he is in the Army.

(*i*) I know there was a report (on liquor consumption) and also on venereal disease in the Fort Knox experiment. . . . I remember that the report was exceedingly favorable, almost too favorable to be believed, but it was very good.

*34. Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College and Tufts Medical and Dental Schools; member of the American Council on Education*

(*a*) . . . it is my personal opinion that age 18, all things concerned, is the proper age at the present time.

(*b*) . . . the issue was never clearly presented to the great assembly of 650 college presidents . . . had there been time and had it been possible to present all the facts that have been presented here today . . . that assembly would have overhwelmingly voted in favor of 18.

(*c*) . . . the drafting of a sufficient number of 18-year-old young men to make possible the continued postponement, until graduation, of the induction of all present college and university students now in good standing, would be in the national interest . . . they would be of more value to the Armed Forces because of the engineering and other skills which they would then have.

*35. James P. Baxter III, president, Williams College; chairman of the committee on manpower of the Association of American Colleges*

(*a*) . . . the need for an Army of 3.5 million can be met within the 19 to 26 age pool, but there are certain things about meeting it that way that scare the educators very seriously . . . in the first place it cleans the 19-to-26-year-old pool out of most of the students now deferred.

(*b*) (The) question of the date at which they will have finished their military service is of very great importance in the minds of the educators that I have talked with . . . 18 years . . . is a natural break between a man's secondary education on the one hand, and either obtaining a job or going to college.

(*c*) . . . when you pull these Reserves and National Guard in a recall of a Reserve group, you are pulling out people who . . . not only have done a lot of service for the country but are people who have just completed their education, . . . are getting a start in business, they are mostly married, many with small children, and you get, in proportion to those you call, a lot of hardship cases and a lot of dependency cases where you are not going to get any of those with the 18-year-olds or the 19-year-olds.

(*d*) I did not meet a single fellow that would not prefer to complete a senior's education even if it meant a delay on the 18-year-olds.

(*e*) . . . if you have not done a job by your children before they are 18, you cannot count on doing an awful lot in 1 year more.

(*f*) (In) the War Between the States . . . there were more 18-year-olds in the armies of the North and of the South . . . than of any other age group, unless it was the 17-year-olds.

(*g*) (The) tremendous record of boys of 17 and 18 who have done well in military service and who have gone through it without moral damage and with a lot of maturity was very striking to the educators when they came back after the war.

(*h*) . . . the GI's, were, in my opinion, the best people we ever taught in American colleges. More mature, more earnest, more ready to make the most of their opportunities. . . .

*36. Harold W. Dodds, president, Princeton University*

(*a*) The proposal to call young men at 18, or upon completion of high school, is correct timing. Both for the young men who want to go on to college and for those who want to enter trade or industry directly, the break comes when it is least costly to them and when the experience may be best capitalized in later life. . . . The longer the service is postponed the more disruption it will be to the individuals themselves, to higher education and to our economy in general.

(*b*) I think the young man is morally able to withstand temptation at 18 as he is at 19.

*37. Detlev W. Bronk, president, Johns Hopkins University; president, National Academy of Science; president-elect of American Association for Advancement of Science*

(*a*) I am in favor of this program because I believe that 18 is the most satisfactory period for the man and for the Nation . . . to interrupt university training and training for the trades is unsatisfactory. . . . I think that service after com-

pletion of university training or after the development of a skill would affect our economy and disrupt the normal development of family life.

(*b*) I am in favor of the program because it will . . . relieve the demands upon selective service which would thus permit men already well advanced in their training to complete their training, so that the Nation can effectively cash in on the foundations which they have already laid.

*38. Leonard Smith, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky.*

. . . I am in favor of lowering the age for induction to 18 years with the provision however that only in case of emergency would 18-year-olds be used in foreign service. . . .

*39. George R. Harrison, dean of science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

I favor the concept that all young men should be obligated to render for a certain period some form of "time tax" toward national security. . . . The time should be taken between graduation from high school and subsequent activities' since in most cases this is the least disruptive time in the career of the individual.

*40. H. E. Jenkins, president, Tyler Junior College*

. . . every young man who attains the age of 18 will receive his military training as required by national defense. He may meet this obligation in either of the following ways: (1) (*a*) Enlistment in any of the Regular Military Establishments or (*b*) appointment to the National Military Academies. (2) In addition to these plans it is proposed that new plans be inaugurated to meet the new situation which confronts the Nation.

*41. Eugene B. Chaffee, president, the American Association of Junior Colleges*

The National Defense Act of 1951 should provide for the following features: "Every able-bodied male citizen on reaching the age of 18, if he is not still in high school (and in that case the age should not be later than 20), should begin a program of military training which when completed will be not less than 12 months as a minimum of continuous training, or its equivalent.

*42. William G. Saltonstall, principal, Phillips Exeter Academy, New Hampshire*

We can find this manpower either by drafting young married men and veterans, or we can find it by drafting 18-year-olds. Neither alternative is pleasant, but I believe the latter is preferable.

*43. W. R. White, president, Baylor University*

(*a*) The general concepts and specifications in the proposal before you seem to be sound and appropriate in the light of our present emergency.

(*b*) I think if it is necessary to have the 18-year-olds to safeguard our country's future, that should be done. . . .

*44. W. W. Kemmerer, University of Houston*

Place all 18- and 19-year-old men in universal military training with no exemptions and no deferments. . . .

*45. E. H. Hopkins, vice president, Washington State College*

. . . Congress should adopt a National Service Act for all men between the ages of 18 and 28, inclusive, with the additional provision that the upper age limit could be raised when and if conditions require it. . . . Upon reaching 18, or upon completion of the twelfth grade (whichever was later), but in no event later than age 19, a period of military training and service would be required, in one way or another, of all able-bodied and mentally fit young men. To this, there should be no exceptions. . . .

*46. Lloyd M. Clark, Saltsburg, Pa.*

The "Kiski plan." Induct all youths 18 years old into active service to start on June 1, 1951.

*47. F. G. Macomber, Miami University*

. . . all men should be subject to military training upon reaching their eighteenth birthday. . . .

*48. Association of American Universities, resolution on mobilization of manpower*

That male citizens be prepared for their critical roles by a system of universal training and service to be undertaken at the age of 18, or upon completion of the twelfth grade, whichever is later (with the proviso that it be not later than the age of 19 and that those who have completed the twelfth grade may volunteer at the age of 17 for induction with their parents' consent).

*49. Report on manpower, Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York*

Time is of the essence . . . we propose . . . that provision be made for such training at the earliest possible moment after a young man reaches age 18 . . . we propose that provision be made for basic military training immediately a young man reaches the military age . . . that induction for his subsequent period of service normally commence with the breaking-off or completion of his schooling at either the high school or post high school level.

*50. Association of American Junior Colleges*

Every able-bodied male citizen on reaching the age of 18, if he is not still in high school (and in that case the age should not be later than 20), should begin a program of military training which when completed will be not less than 12 months as a minimum of continuous training, or its equivalent.

*51. The Georgia Association of Junior Colleges*

The American Association of Junior Colleges has presented a "Suggested plan for national defense." . . . The copy attached is a part of this testimony, which has generally been approved by those who hold membership in the Georgia association.

H. OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

*52. Dunlap C. Clark, United States Chamber of Commerce*

Eighteen-year-old males should be drafted to serve 27 months in the Armed Forces.

*53. Donald W. Wyatt*

The 18-year-old represents Secretary Marshall's greatest weapon. The age group is the one group which can be called with the least harm to the Nation and to them.

*54. Julius Ochs Adler, Co-Chairman, National Emergency Committee of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States*

(*a*) Experienced instructors and trainers of 17- and 18-year-old young men are confident that these men have more endurance and are capable of quicker reactions than older men. If drafted at the eighteenth birthday, their education and future careers, whether on the farm or in industries or in the professions, will be least interrupted.

(*b*) Few have contracted family obligations. Most of them will have completed high school or be near to doing so and thus have reached a point at which formal education can be interrupted without undue hardship.

*55. Arthur L. Williston, Citizens' Committee for Universal Military Training*

(*a*) 18 is . . . the time when they have finished, by and large, their high school.

(*b*) . . . the moral and even spiritual effects of this training on boys of 18 will be more beneficial and more lasting than on the boys at an older age when they might be more sophisticated.

(*c*) . . . a provision of the utmost importance in the bill lies in the fact that, starting with the 18-year-olds and a total period of 27 months, it becomes possible to build up after the universal service a formidable reserve, and in time before these young men are too old to be effective. . . . It is this reservoir of highly trained young men which, through the years, will furnish the greatest protection.

*56. Tracy S. Voorhees, Committee on the Present Danger*

(*a*) The Committee on the Present Danger endorses the bill because we believe it provides a flexible, democratic, and equitable means of meeting our Nation's requirements for military manpower.

(*b*) . . . service should begin at age 18 or end of high-school year after reaching 18.

(*c*) I believe that you are going to have to take both 18-year-olds and fathers for the next couple of years in order to meet the need. . . . I would favor taking the 18's before the others . . . in a study which was made in England of young soldiers who were married, who were separated from their wives, separation of a year resulted in approximately 25 percent divorce rate.

*57. Dr. Vannevar Bush, Committee on the Present Danger*

. . . we should call all young men at 18 without exception.

*58. Dr. William C. Menninger, Committee on the Present Danger*

Because there is a natural break in the life program of the youth as he finishes high school, it would seem practical that this training and service should begin at age 18. . . .

*59. Mrs. William L. Slagle, Dayton, Ohio*

Of course they will make the best combat troops. They are filled with the good old high school football spirit which would cause them to be willing to sacrifice life and limb for the glory of the school.

*60. Joseph C. Grew*

. . . universal military service and training are today of far more urgency even than they were then. . . . In the interests of our national security we simply cannot afford further to delay this essential legislation.

*61. Rocco B. Bunino, vice president, National Licensed Beverage Association*

. . . all of the States, with two exceptions, have made it unlawful to sell intoxicating beverages to persons under 21 years of age. . . . Enforcement requires mainly identification, such as draft cards, service identification cards, both of which show the date of birth.

*62. A. Ray Warnock, National Interfraternity Conference*

. . . the executive committee of the National Interfraternity Conference, representing 59 men's social fraternities and their 2,975 undergraduate chapters; resolve, that a program of UMT should be enacted by the Congress of the United States to train all physically able young men on graduation from high school or at equivalent ages of 17 to 19 years in basic military science . . .

I. YOUTH GROUPS

*63. Lewis A. Rivlin, student, Swarthmore College, Students for Democratic Action*

(*a*) On December 29, 1950, the national board of SDA, in view of the national emergency, caused by the Communist offensive in Korea, made the following formal recommendation for the utilization of manpower during the emergency. Selective service in the Armed Forces for men upon completion of high school or upon reaching the age of 18.

(*b*) If the choice is made in favor of selection of the 18-year-old the drain on the long-run effectiveness of the country will be less as relates to the colleges, and the country's needed talents.

(*c*) . . . it will be to the interests of the 18-year-old and the college student as well.

TESTIMONY AGAINST

A. EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

*1. Ralph W. McDonald, National Education Association of the United States*

(*a*) Under the most optimistic view that can realistically be taken, the proposals made by the Defense Department before this subcommittee would greatly reduce the contribution of higher education to the life of America at a time when it is most urgently needed.

(*b*) We urge that the age of 19 years be retained as the threshold of induction into the Armed Forces. On this point the opinions of educators are conclusive: 81.25 percent of the college and university faculty opinions received hold that the induction of students should not be before the end of the school year during which they reach age 19.

(*c*) The accumulated pool of availables above 19 years of age should be used to achieve the necessary force-in-being of 3,460,502 during the tide-over period necessary to reach the point when the induction of 19-year-olds will yield exactly the same intake into the Armed Forces as would the induction of 18-year-olds.

(*d*) To reject for educational reasons a person who has completed satisfactorily the eighth grade in our schools is absurd. To reject for physical deficiency a young man who plays on a varsity football team is likewise ridiculous.

(*e*) . . . educators oppose the induction of 18-year-olds (because) the taking of 18-year-olds would, over the years, liquidate a substantial portion of the higher education of men in the United States.

(*f*) . . . The number of young men who attended college even with veterans' benefits has been substantially less than the number who would have attended if they had had the opportunity to go to college under normal conditions.

(*g*) The inducting of young men at the end of the school year during which they become age 19 would permit the majority to complete 2 years of college work. . . . If these same boys could secure only 1 year of college before they would be called, tremendous numbers of them would never go to college at all. . . . At least one-third of these 18-year-old potential college students would never go back to college even with the most generous program of veterans' benefits. . . .

(*h*) . . . Approximately a third of (the boys being graduated from high schools) are 17 years of age. . . . It is from that 17-year-age group that the greater proportion of the college students come. . . . The majority of the persons who go to college are already in college at age 18. . . . The truth of the matter is that if your committee were seeking the age at which you could establish the best gap in terms of college attendance, it would be to take the 17-year-olds. But then you would run into a very serious impact with the high schools, because while those who go to college graduate at age 17 or early 18, in the main, the average at the high school, at the time of the high school graduates, is a little bit older . . . if you were to take 17-year-olds you would strike right at the heart of the high schools even more than you do by taking the 18-year-olds.

(*i*) Not all or nearly all of (the 18-year-olds) have completed high school. There are about 30,000 in elementary and junior high schools below tenth grade; . . . estimated to be 220,000 in the senior high schools, . . . approximately 300,000 in the colleges. . . . Obviously the 18-year-old young man is not marking time between high school and college waiting to be called. The majority of those who are destined to go to college are already there and are well along with their college programs.

(*j*) . . . if the choice is between taking the juniors and seniors in college and establishing a continuing policy of cutting off the 18-year-olds from college, . . . it would be better to take the juniors and seniors without hesitation, because that is only one class of juniors and one class of seniors, whereas we are going into every class of 18-year-olds from now on. . . .

*2. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers*

(*a*) . . . we conclude: that an Armed Force of 3,462,500 can be raised by July 1, 1951, without other than comparatively minor changes; . . . that it is therefore unnecessary to induct boys less than 19 years of age to meet the President's goal for defense of the country.

(*b*) We believe all the groups mentioned, and perhaps others, should be utilized before 18-year-olds are drafted.

(*c*) We oppose the draft of 18-year-old boys because many of them are too immature.

(*d*) . . . accelerated high school and college programs can provide 2 years or more of college work for the college bound group before age 19.

(*e*) . . . demoralization of the high school which will result from drafting at 18 is far more important to the Nation and its future strength than whatever damage may result to college students, serious as this may be.

*3. Resolution adopted by the faculty of Appalachian State Teachers College*

. . . retain the minimum draft age at 19 for regular military service, providing that if military training for boys under 19 becomes necessary, such training be coordinated with high school and college work.

*4. Paul E. Elicker, executive secretary, National Association of Secondary School Principals*

(*a*) Approximately 250,000 or 25 percent of total 18-age group of male youth, are in the elementary and secondary schools. . . . A large number of the 18-year-olds are living with families and parents. . . . It is . . . evident that the drafting of the 19-year-old group of 95,000 in our schools is less damaging to our schools and to fewer boys themselves than drafting of 250,000 18-year-olds.

(*b*) . . . Youngest group to graduate from high schools are those planning to go to college. Many in this group . . . enter college for 1 or . . . 2 years. This too, is highly desirable because those who once enter college are most likely to return and continue.

(*c*) . . . The older group, who do not generally go on to college but enter industry or military service (for them) the opportunity to complete their high-school education is highly advantageous to them and the country. If (they) . . . are compelled to leave school before graduation, they will not return to high school to complete their secondary-school education.

(*d*) 21.2 percent of the decrease in high school enrollment (from 1941 to 1946) was caused by the loss of boys in their last year in school. The primary reasons

for this decrease in . . . enrollment was the 18-year induction age pattern and the 17-year age enlistment, and the influences of the war on our youth.

B. CHURCH GROUPS

*5. Rev. Ezra Ellis, chairman, Public Affairs Committee of the Minneapolis Church Federation and Minister of Wesley Methodist Church, Minneapolis, Minn.*

(*a*) . . . the Minneapolis Grange reaffirms its long-standing policy opposing UMT and UMS. Selective Service will furnish ample men for armed services and now is not the time to rush legislation of no immediate consequence for which our Nation will later suffer.

(*b*) Boys of 18 years of age are immature. If taken into UMST their minds will be regimented. . . . They will be allowed the freedom to seek their own recreation in strange places under no discipline, with gambling, prostitution, and drinking sources of unusual temptation.

(*c*) . . . why take these boys if the Defense Department statistics indicate that they will not be needed? . . .

(*d*) . . . why do we need to draft the 18-year-olds when Italy starts with the 21-year-old; Belgium and Spain start with 20-year-olds; Russia, France, and Norway start with the 19-year-old; and Canada relies entirely on volunteers.

C. YOUTH GROUPS

*6. Robert W. Lyon, Young People's General Assembly for Peace, Metropolitan Community Church, Chicago, Ill.*

We appear to oppose the proposed draft of 18-year-olds and the permanent conscription which is written into your bill. . . . The draft is part of a general program designed to militarize our country and its people. The 18-year-old does not want a future in a uniform and at war.

*7. George Harper, Administrative Secretary of the National Conference of Methodist Youth, Nashville, Tenn.*

(*a*) "The National Conference of Methodist Youth is opposed to Universal Military Training or conscription in peacetime. Compulsory military training and service are a threat to the principles of democracy and to civilian control over government and other areas of national life."

(*b*) Put immature 18-year-old boys in service overseas where the normal restraints of home and friends are gone and the resulting moral hazards are obvious.

D. TEMPERANCE AND RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

*8. J. Raymond Schmidt, the International Order of Good Templars*

(*a*) . . . the measure cannot be looked upon as doing otherwise than establishing compulsory peacetime military service in democratic America.

(*b*) There will be complete military dictatorship for young men between the ages of 18 and 21. . . . If the young men who have attained 21 do not like the laws passed by Congress they can go to the polls and express their disapproval with their ballots.

(*c*) The military authorities should voluntarily ban all alcoholic beverages from training camps and military establishments and forbid the sale of said beverages anywhere to men wearing military and naval uniforms.

*9. John H. Eberly, Brethren Service Commission*

We believe we are voicing the sentiment of millions of Americans as well as our own organization in protesting what appears a planned and willing movement toward war while preventative measures are thus rendered unpopular . . . the drafting of 18-year-olds and thus eliminating all other educational experiences in their lives.

*10. Gilbert F. White, the Friends Committee on National Legislation*

(*a*) Universal military training is an unprecedented and undemocratic program which would be established under the bill on a permanent basis.

(*b*) The drafting of 18-year-olds would work serious injury. . . . An 18-year-old draft would (*a*) set Army service as the immediate object of most high-school students, (*b*) throw such students into the coarseness of Army life while many of them are too young to understand or resist it, (*c*) prevent some students from continuing with college work, and (*d*) make it difficult to select suitable students to continue with professional work.

E. INDIVIDUALS

*11. Mrs. William L. Slagle, Dayton, Ohio*

I am very much opposed to the conscription of 18-year-olds and the sending of them all over the world. . . . Our country is not in such dire straits that we need to conscript our babies for a global crusade comparable to the Children's Crusade of the Middle Ages.

*12. William H. Neblett, USAFR, retired, Los Angeles, Calif.*

(*a*) Universal military service and training for the 18-year-olds, or any other ages, proposed by amendments to the Selective Service Act of 1948, S. 1, is conscription of the true Prussian type—and that is why I oppose this bill S. 1.

(*b*) . . . I would say that 85 percent of the manpower in the Pentagon was wasted completely, devoted to nothing but comments, making speeches, public relations.

(*c*) I am just as much opposed to the 19-year-olds being taken in as the 18-year-olds—neither the 18- or 19-year-old can take it. . . . They are not sufficiently developed, either emotionally or physically, to stand the rigor and hardships of battle. I found that out in my experience in the First World War.

*13. Hamilton A. Long, veteran of World War I and II*

America does not need to raise a mass army and should not do so.

*14. Charles W. Elliott, Chicago, Ill.*

I fail to see how Mrs. Rosenberg can reconcile her statement that the services will not corrupt nor debase men to the fact that lectures and movies on venereal disease as well as the issuance of preventatives and the location of prophylactic stations is part of GI indoctrination.

*15. Mrs. Thalia D. Thomas, Landover Hills, Md.*

I do not believe that most of the so-called expert advisers in Government know much more about what they are doing than the 18-year-olds whom they will soon be sending to war.

F. MISCELLANEOUS ORGANIZATIONS

*16. Elmer W. Henderson, Director, American Council on Human Rights, Washington, D. C.*

. . . it is likewise important to consider whether armed services are using men to their maximum efficiency. . . . It is a fact that the armed services cannot achieve this goal under a system of segregation based on race.

*17. Dr. Ruth Bleier, Chairman, Maryland Committee for Peace*

The drafting of 18-year-olds must be defeated as a measure that is, in the real sense, an un-American act. It violates the long tradition of freedom from compulsory military training which for so long has made our country a haven for the millions fleeing a Europe ridden by militarism.

*18. Frederick J. Libby, Executive Secretary, National Council for Prevention of War*

I urge . . . that you report out to the Senate no permanent conscription law, no drafting of 18-year-olds, no build-up of the Armed Forces to 3 or 4 million men—or 6 million.

*19. Sidney Aberman, executive secretary, War Resisters League*

(Our reasons against enacting a universal military training and service law) are not based primarily on the harmful effects such a wholly unprecedented system of permanent conscription will unquestionably have on our educational processes, our moral standards, our tradition of individual liberty, and other important aspects of democratic life. . . . Adoption of permanent conscription will distract further attention away from these methods that can avail against Communist growth.

*20. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*

(*a*) We believe the present amendments to Senate bill 1 should be opposed because they provide both permanent universal military training and service.

(*b*) (It would seriously interfere) with the educational career or homemaking plans of young men . . . and would seriously (affect) our economy for as the years pass we would find our economy more and more geared to a war economy rather than a peace economy.

(*c*) The 18-year-old is not usually emotionally stable enough to withstand the effect of the kind of life he finds when put in occupation armies in Europe or the Far East. . . .

*21. John M. Swomley, Jr., director, National Council Against Conscription*

(*a*) . . . we have taken the position that at the present we must oppose any attempt by amendment to the present law to lower the draft age to 18 or to make the draft universal in its application . . . or to extend the life of the act for more than a year or two at a time.

(*b*) . . . a draft of 18-year-old boys does not, except in the first few years, add additional numbers to the Army.

(*c*) For most boys this is the period when they enter college or begin work.

(*d*) An 18-year-old boy is in most cases an immature person. . . . The Army recognizes the immaturity of 18-year-old boys by not using them as officers. Even 19-year-old boys are seldom used as noncommissioned officers even after 6 months or a year. . . .

(*e*) The Army has also discovered there is a higher prevalence of neurosis among younger persons in the Army.

## Summary of Arguments on Lowered Induction Age

### in favor of 18 years

1. There is a compelling need to take 18-year-olds at this time.

(*a*) An expanded manpower pool is necessary in order to meet a sudden emergency in which the size of our Armed Forces might have to go up suddenly. This act looks to the future.

(*b*) Enough men must be in the manpower pool available to furnish a 6-month safety margin for selective service.

(*c*) Eight hundred seventy-two thousand men are authorized by statute to leave the service next year. Many are not expected to reenlist.

(*d*) Reservists with critical skills are being called up today. This is dangerous to our economy.

2. Other sources of manpower are inadequate:

(*a*) Mental standards of those now subject to selective service cannot be lowered too far, since men of low mentality are of little use to the services.

(*b*) We are already using World War II physical standards. Not many men can be found in the physically unfit now deferred.

(*c*) We can add only 20,000 men to the selective-service pool by rehabilitation programs, if we had such programs.

(*d*) Most of the veterans with less than 12 months of service are unfit for further military duty.

(*e*) The nonfather, nonveteran group is so small that it would furnish only a few months' supply of men for the pool.

(*f*) The age group from 10–19 has decreased by over 2,000,000 men over the last decade even though our population has risen. Not until 1959 will as many reach 18 as in the years 1940–45.

(*g*) Foreign troops alone will not solve our problem.

(*h*) We have the choice of taking either the 18-year-olds or all veterans up to 26 years of age.

(*i*) Many of our Reserves, especially in the Air Force, are too old to be effective much longer.

(*j*) Voluntary enlistments from outside the selective service pool may go down.

3. Industrial and farm deferments will go up when the impact of war contracts hits the present 19–26 age group.

4. The induction of 18-year-olds may enable us to release many Reserves who saw service in World War II.

5. More men per capita can be secured from the 18-year-old group than from any other.

6. Preservice training for Russians starts at the age of 10.

7. Men of 18 make the best soldiers. They have great physical superiority. Historically they have a fine record in all of our wars.

8. The 18-year-old will serve sooner or later anyway, hence it is better from his viewpoint to take him at that age:

(*a*) It is unfair to the 18-year-old not to give him "survival" training.

(*b*) Educationally, it is better to go at 18.

(1) It is the natural break between high school and college.

(2) They will be permitted to finish their school year.

(3) If men are taken at 18 rather than later, more of them will return to college since they will be discharged from active duty at an earlier age.

(4) The more mature a young man is when he enters college, the better student he will make.

(c) It is economically better to take a young man at the age of 18.

(1) This period is a natural break between high school and a career.

(2) The year from 18 to 19 will be largely wasted unless the young man is taken at age 18 due to the fact that few would care to start a career or begin further schooling knowing that they would be taken a year later anyway.

(d) Socially the age of 18 is the best for a young man because few of them are married and have dependents.

(e) It is emotionally better to take a man at 18.

9. From the viewpoint of society it is better to take a young man at 18 rather than take other groups.

(a) It is far better socially to take an 18-year-old than to take older men with families. The loss of purchasing power of these families would disrupt the families and the national economy.

(b) It is better to take 18-year-olds than to take present students from college.

(c) It is better to take 18-year-olds than to take men from special skills and trades.

(d) It is better to take 18-year-olds than to take veterans.

10. It will cost the Government $513,000,000 more per year to take men with dependents than to take a like number of 18-year-olds.

11. It is not morally harmful to the 18-year-old to take him at that age.

12. It might well lead to military disaster to require that all 18-year-olds be taken from their units before going overseas.

OPPOSED TO TAKING 18-YEAR-OLDS

1. There is no need to take 18-year-olds at this time.

(a) We can use more mental rejectees in our Armed Forces.

(b) We can lower our physical standards.

(c) We can get 630,000 husbands and fathers.

(d) We can use 160,000 veterans with less than 12 months of service.

(e) There is a great waste of personnel in the supporting units of our armed services.

(f) After a short period of time the 19-year age group will yield exactly the same number of men as the 18-year-old group.

(g) It is better to take present juniors and seniors in college than to take 18-year-olds.

2. It is morally dangerous for 18-year-olds to be subjected to service life, due to the fact that they are too immature and lack emotional and physical development.

3. Young men of 18 and 19, due to immaturity, make very poor soldiers.

4. Few nations draft men as young as 18.

5. Educationally the drafting of 18-year-olds is undesirable:

(a) The higher education of our young men will be ruined since less will attend college after getting out of the service. Even with veterans' benefits one-third never return to college.

(b) High schools will be demoralized by the enlistment of 17-year-olds who are attempting to join the service of their choice.

(c) One-third of all high-school graduates are 17. This group goes to college and thus the age of 18 for induction does not hit them between high school and college but rather in their first or second college year.

6. The drafting of 18-year-olds will not help to alleviate the manpower shortage to a great extent due to the fact that many young men of 18 do not finish high school until they are almost 19 and they are thus deferred. Also, one-third of the young men of this age are already in college and are deferred until the end of their college year.

7. The draft of 18-year-olds is a step toward militarism.

8. The draft of 18-year-olds is a part of an arms race which will lead to war.

9. It is undemocratic to draft these young men who do not have the right to vote.

## VI. Brief Discussion of Important Issues

### THE NECESSITY FOR A 26-MONTH TERM OF SERVICE

The committee believes that a 26-month term of training and service is necessary at the present time, but not as a fixed long-term policy.

One factor is of particular importance in considering this problem; that is, the selective-service program is primarily a program to build and maintain the Army.

The Air Force and the Navy are built upon 4-year enlistments. The Army, at present, is made up of 21-month inductees and 3-year enlistees. By comparison, this situation tends to reduce the Army's efficiency, even under normal circumstances.

There is an immediate emergency, however, which makes a 26-month term of service particularly advisable. Our Ground Forces have suffered heavily in Korea. Casualties totaling more than two full divisions have been suffered. These losses are extremely costly, because they represent the finest, best-trained troops of the Army.

If the Army is to continue to fulfill its mission, it must be assured a supply of effective seasoned troops. It cannot fulfill its mission if the bulk of its troops never have sufficient service to attain peak efficiency.

Under the present 21-month term, an inductee is entitled to 1¾ months of leave. This results in a 19¼-month period of active training and service, exclusive of leave. The period of effective service is further reduced by time spent in processing, traveling to training camp, basic training, schooling, processing and traveling to and from overseas areas, and in hospitals. This amounts to 8½ or 9 months. Thus, the period of effective overseas service is reduced to approximately 11 months. Under a 26-month training and service program, the period of effective service is correspondingly increased.

This means that under a 26-month program, the services will benefit from a substantially longer period of peak efficiency from the inductees or reservists ordered to active duty than is the case under the present 21-month program.

The committee believes it especially important to realize that this longer term of service has the effect of reducing the number of men in transit to and from overseas stations. This means an even greater saving in personnel, because more men are thus available for longer service overseas and fewer men are committed to the costly task of maintaining the pipeline for shipping men to and from overseas duty.

The additional length of time permits the Armed Forces to give inductees and reservists a more effective training course, because the longer time will permit more emphasis upon technical and advanced training. Such training makes men more useful, both as members of an active organization, and eventually of the Reserve. Also, the longer period permits development of better trained potential cadres, whose service would be invaluable for the training of large forces in times of sudden emergency.

It is of particular importance to note that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, testified that the armed services gain nearly 50 percent in practical military utility by having the longer period of service.

Also it is pertinent in this discussion again to point out that the increasing of the induction period substantially relieves the pressure on the manpower pool because it reduces the numerical rate of turnover which is made necessary by a shorter period of induction.

### SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST

The arguments listed below concern themselves with the length of service issue which emerged during the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings.

Included are not only the contentions advanced by the witnesses who appeared, but also those presented by individuals and organizations who requested that their material be inserted in the record. There may be arguments other than those presented, but this study summarizes only those which appear in the record.

Not all arguments presented as opposing the Department of Defense proposals are directly in conflict with those proposals. Any time a variation of the proposals was presented, it was placed in the opposing column.

It will be noted that some witnesses are listed as both "for" and "against" the same measure. This is due to the fact that occasionally a witness would either point out arguments on the other side or would present evidence which could be interpreted as being a variation of the Department's proposals. All such arguments have been included for the purpose of securing a more balanced picture. Also, it should be carefully noted that not all of these extracts are in their full context. Every effort was made by the staff to present an accurate summary, and the committee hopes that no inaccuracies have crept in due to the need for condensing the wealth of material into the briefest possible space.

Not all of the material is in the nature of direct quotes. Frequently remarks from different parts of the record have been combined into one statement. Occasionally, in answer to a long question, a witness would say "Yes" or "No," or "I agree." In these instances the content of the question has been attributed to the witness. Care has been taken to see that no witness is quoted out of context to secure a meaning other than the one intended.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROPOSALS ON LENGTH OF SERVICE

### Testimony Favoring 27 Months or More

#### A. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

*1. The Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense*

(*a*) Twenty-seven months is the shortest period of service that is consistent with national security in this period when so much of our effort and our personnel must be devoted to the training of men entering military duty for the first time. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, has estimated that we would gain nearly 50 percent in practical utility by the extra 6 months of service we recommend.

(*b*). It takes so long and requires such an outlay in both funds and training personnel to impart the basic military skills required in our highly mechanized military forces that the release of men in less than 27 months at this crucial stage of world history represents a major element of military weakness.

*2. General of the Army, Dwight D. Eisenhower*

(*a*) . . . the 27 months must have been put in in the hope of getting 2 years complete service out of a man. They have calculated that on the size of their

force, the number of reenlistments probably they can expect, and also the time needed in this modern age for the proper training of a soldier so he can take care of himself in an emergency and do his duty.

(*b*) . . . a good lengthy term of service in terms of 27 months is essential, both for the efficiency of the training, the usefulness you get out of a man, and also in the size of your unit.

*3. General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff*

(*a*) It is obvious we will have to extend the term of service in order to meet our requirements. . . . Any amount over 21 months' that you extend his term of service aids materially in this problem. Twenty-seven months would appear to be a logical term. Allowing 2 months' furlough to which he is entitled by law, and 1 month to cover induction and discharge, a man would render approximately 2 years' service. When you add 6 months to his present term of service, his military usefulness is increased almost 50 percent.

(*b*) I have grave doubts that you can maintain your Armed Forces at the figure we think is necessary . . . by 21 months, because out of the 21 months a man is in his unit possibly not more than 14 months . . . if you keep these people 21 months only, you are not going to be able to furnish more than, let us say, 1,200,000 continually by selective service.

(*c*) . . . you are going to have a hard time maintaining the required strength by additional voluntary enlistments. This is our biggest danger in 21 months.

(*d*) . . . on a 21-month basis you require a much heavier training establishment and overhead than you do for 27. You have got to have more training camps and more training cadres.

(*e*) (None) are going to miss out on that training in the next year and a half, because you take in the same number for 27 months as 21 months.

(*f*) If you try to tie this to the next year or year and a half, the 21-month man might be as good as the 27-month man. In our opinion the situation is not going to get any better in the next year or year and a half. It may get worse. . . .

(*g*) With 21 months' service, you are limited in assigning men to certain technical jobs. . . . You just cannot train them and get any service out of them in 21 months.

(*h*) After you have used up this reserve between the ages of 19 and 26, you are going to be getting in selective service mostly those that become of the draft age. . . . If we keep them 2 years, you can get about 1,600,000. . . . I mean 2 years' actual duty. . . . That is why we suggest 27 months. That still leaves about 1,900,000 to obtain by voluntary enlistments. . . . I am not too sure you can (get 1,900,000) because a lot of them were getting their first enlistments before going to school. You will get those in your selective service. . . . So your 1,900,000 will have to be made up mostly by reenlistments. . . . Anything you do to cut down the total number is going to very seriously endanger your ability to maintain your armed strength around three million four, or three million five.

*4. Maj. Gen. Louis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service*

(*a*) (I believe) that the period of service should be increased to at least 27 months. I am doubtful that this will be long enough to maintain the required strength with the numbers available from the annual manpower income. It will require rigid reductions in rejections and limited withdrawal for all other reasons. . . . I am supporting 27 because it is nearer 30 than any other number that I have heard.

(*b*) 622,000 in 27 months provide the same service as 800,000 in 21 months.

*5. Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations*

(*a*) From the point of view of my naval responsibilities, I regard the 27-month period of service as being too low to meet the needs of the Navy, except for a small proportion of our people. We have always felt that 4 years was about the minimum. . . .

(*b*) . . . we must do everything possible to increase the combat readiness of the forces in being, which, I think, will impress the potential aggressor. . . .

(*c*) In calculating the figure of 3.4 million there have been used factors derived from the assumption that it would be 27 months . . . if you change the plan as to length of service, you automatically raise the numbers of people in the total strength, because it does include the training establishment. . . . If you have a shorter period, you must plan on a larger structure. . . .

(*d*) . . . our experience leads us to believe that you have 15 months in a combat unit (if you have them 21 months).

*6. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the U. S. Army.*

(*a*) The shorter term of service, the less time you have for men actually on duty with our units in field, the greater rotation, and therefore greater wastage of manpower in the so-called pipeline . . . in the course of movement overseas and movement back home again . . . in the longer period of service we can have the experience of these men, which they take time to gain, for a much longer period of time on active duty . . . that gives us a more effective Army in the field.

(*b*) (In) 21 months you can hardly expect to secure more than 12 months of actual service. . . . That is a very ineffective way to run any business.

(*c*) I would have preferred to see it at 30 months. . . . the longer the period of service, the more effective soldier.

(*d*) The point . . . made about the necessity of the immediate present being the determining factor, I agree with, and that is the reason I say that the period of service must be 27 months and not a shorter period . . . in the current situation . . . it is infinitely better to have a 27-month period than to have a 21-month period.

*7. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force*

(*a*) (Twenty-seven months) is the minimum period I think the Air Force could get adequately trained men. . . .

(*b*) We prefer not to depend upon enlistments entirely because that source is very unpredictable.

(*c*) It takes 8 to 12 months in our higher specialties to train him. . . . If we were to have (the 21 month program) in the Air Force, we would have to take a different group and give it a different type of training, because in the 21 month bracket we could not afford to give them the longer type of training . . . about the time that they began to find out what it was all about, they would have to go out. . . . The only ones that we could afford to train would be the people who are in for 4 years. Now, if we had only 21-month people, we'd have to train them only in the lower skills. . . . (They) would then go into the reserves, and instead of building the reserves, as we ought to have them built, we would find that the great majority there were only the lower skilled individuals, and the higher skills would have to be in only the regular Air Force.

*8. Brig. Gen., H. C. Parks, United States Air Force*

(*a*) . . . nine months is an awfully small return for 12 months of extensive technical training . . . we could not justify giving that type of training to a 21-month-term-of-service individual.

(*b*) We would much rather have a smaller reserve force of highly trained individuals than a large force of inadequately trained reserves.

*9. Hon. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense*

(*a*) . . . the reason that the Department of Defense is anxious to get men for a 27-month period is because their usefulness in these last few months becomes far greater to us . . . we are asking for 27 months during this emergency period, where we are trying to build up our force. We need trained men, and we need men to be in service instead of to use them as trainees. . . .

(*b*) . . . for the immediate objective, for our immediate effectiveness . . . (we) prefer to have less trained men, better trained, than more trained men less well trained on the 21 versus the 27 months.

(*c*) The added 6 months between 21 and 27, during which time we feel the men are increasing in their effectiveness, gives our force 50 percent additional effectiveness.

(*d*) (Condensed) With the 21 months' service, we have 4 months' training out of 21, giving him 17 months. If he leaves the continental United States for the European theater, it would take 1 month in transit. If he leaves for the East, it would take from 6 to 8 weeks. In the East, we'll say it brings it down to 15 months. We then have to figure on the return. The same length of time is taken, so we get either 13 or 14 months. A man who has 21 months is entitled to leave of almost 2 months. We are training many men as specialists, and that is another average 4 months, so it really brings down the service that we get to either 10 months or 9 months from a 21-month man.

(*e*) Our enlistments represent what we call the hard core of the services. As such they cannot provide the entire quota of technicians because they have a basic mission and they must be equally balanced in training and administration to carry on that mission . . . many times these enlistees may not have all the necessary educational qualifications to take on the more technical service . . . the expansion requires more technicians and therefore it would be disproportionate if we train all our Regulars only.

(*f*) . . . the difference of the use of men at the figure we have set to you for 27 months would mean close on to three-quarters of a billion dollars saving in our defense budget.

(*g*) The difference between 21 and 27 months periods of service: I have here information that in the civilian population . . . the age group between 19 and 9 months and 20 and 3 months—which would be the last 6 months (Senator Russell) asked for—five and three-quarters of the civilian men get married, and half of 1 percent during that time acquire children. We figure that with lack of opportunity, being out of the country, it is safe to count that about half or 2¾ percent would be married during that time. . . . The fact that a man acquires a child in those last 6 months causes no additional cost to us because we are already paying for the dependent, and the cost is the same.

*10. (Summary) L. S. Garlock, Assistant Comptroller, Department of Defense*

On a 27-month term of service you will take 58,000 men per month, or a total for the year of 696,000, which will cost you $5,427,000,000. On 21 months' service you will be forced to increase the intake from 58,000 per month to 77,600 per month, or a total of 931,000 men, because instead of getting 21 months' service you only get 15 months' service. That will cost you $3,200 a man, roughly $20,000 a month difference, in the sum of $6,176,000,000. Five billion four hundred and twenty-seven million dollars from $6,176,000,000 gives you a net saving of $749,000,000 because of the 6 months' additional service you get out of the men. That $749,000,000 that you would save is further reduced by $40,000,000 in pay increases which accumulate in that 21-to-27-month bracket, giving you a net saving of $709,000,000. By determining the length of service to be 21 months instead of 27 months, we are going to have to be prepared to pay $709,000,000 for it.

*11. John G. Adams, Assistant General Counsel, Department of Defense*

(*a*) Assuming the extension of enlistments in the fiscal year 1952, in fiscal 1953 the pool would be 211,000. Assuming now the changes on the 24, 27, and 30 months, in addition to the extension of enlistments, if we change to 24 months, the figure 211,000 would become 221,000. Changing to 27 months, the pool becomes 343,000, and changing it to 30 months, the pool becomes 602,000.

(*b*) . . . we find that if there are no changes in the act at any time between now and fiscal year 1954 there would be remaining in the selective service pool, assuming 3.5 remains constant, a total of 181,000 young men . . . if enlistments have been extended during fiscal 1952–53 there would be in pool 244,000 young men. Assuming that in addition to extending enlistments, the length of service under selective service and reserves on duty was changed from 21 to 24 months, the total remaining in . . . pool would become 399,000. If . . . period were changed from 21 to 27 months, the numbers on board becomes 415,000 . . . if period is changed from 21 to 30 months, there remains in the pool at end of fiscal year 1954 a total of 455,000 young men . . . based on 27 months as suggested by the Department of Defense, the figure is 415,000 in 1954, 343,000 in 1953, and 682,000 in 1952. (That is without any allowance for your safety factor.)

*12. Office of Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, Intelligence, Department of Army*

(*a*) Mrs. Rosenberg, presenting a chart prepared January 11, 1951, indicated the length of service in Egypt as 3 years, and in the U. S. S. R. as 3 years.

(*b*) Mrs. Rosenberg, presenting a chart prepared January 11, 1951, by the Department of Army, Office of Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, Intelligence, indicated the length of service in foreign countries: Bulgaria, 2 years; Greece, 2 years; Hungary, 2 years; Iran, 2 years; Poland, 2 years; Spain, 2 years; Turkey, 2 years; United Kingdom, 2 years; and Yugoslavia, 2 years.

*13. Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor*

(In answer to question.) I approve of the 27-month suggestion that was recommended by the Department of Defense.

*14. Edward J. Overby, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Agriculture*

This Department concurs in the proposed program for universal military training and service.

*15. Dr. Charles A. Thomas, Chairman, Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee, National Security Resources Board*

(We) endorse the basic principles of 4 months of basic training and 23 more months of military service for all 18-year-olds. . . .

B. PROFESSIONAL, LABOR AND FARM GROUPS

*16. Lewis Sanders, consulting engineer, New York City*

It will take approximately 2 years of service to make a man into an effective reservist. To function effectively on the field of battle and with the maximum chance of survival, a man must be trained until his reactions in battle are instinctive. . . .

*17. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations*

. . . we do not oppose this provision because of the urgency with which our top military leaders have insisted that the additional period is necessary to adequately train men for the various armed services.

C. EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

*18. Harold Dodds, president, Princeton University*

(*a*) Two years of service . . . 27 months, would mean, with terminal leave and discharge and that sort of thing, that a boy would virtually lose from the college standpoint 2 years.

(*b*) No other proposal that I have seen or been able to dream up myself provides the element of long-term durability with a minimum of possible violence to higher education and the lives of young men generally.

*19. James P. Baxter III, president of Williams College, chairman of the Committee on Manpower of the Association of American Colleges*

If this bill is adopted, there will be an opportunity for education after a man has had 2 years training. . . . Suppose that he goes through with 2 years and 3 months, he will still have an opportunity to start in a lot of professional careers.

*20. W. R. White, president, Baylor University*

The general concepts and specifications in the proposal before you seem to be sound and appropriate in the light of our present emergency.

*21. E. H. Hopkins, vice president, Washington State College*

Increasing the months of required service to a minimum of 24 months would reduce the number of replacements required during the next few years.

*22. Association of American Universities resolution on mobilization of manpower December 4, 1950*

Approves extending the period of service to 27 months, with the proviso that the President may raise this term by 3 months or lower it to the extent necessary to bring military manpower demand and resources into effective balance.

D. RESERVE OFFICERS

*23. Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States*

. . . we are in favor of the present bill which calls for 27 months of service. . . . the principal reason for preferring the 27-month figure is because of the fact that according to the figures submitted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the number of young men required to maintain the 3½ million strength operates to leave a surplus of some 300,000 young men, which we believe very strongly and most sincerely should be utilized at the present time in the civilian component forces of all the services.

E. VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

*24. Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander, the American Legion*

It is far more probable, in our judgment, that the present tension will continue for a considerable length of time, and in view of that prospect we feel that 27 months of continuous service is a reasonable and necessary plan. We are advised by officials of the National Guard and Organized Reserves that a 27-month period of service would enable those organizations to build up and maintain authorized strength. . . . They would have difficulty doing this if the service were left at 21 months.

*25. Omar B. Ketchum, legislative director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States*

We support the recommendation of the Department of Defense that the period of service be increased from the present 21 months to 27 months.

*26. Harold Russell, national commander, AMVETS*

AMVETS feel that the proposed 27 months of service is both just and wise for this reason: In any prolonged period of military activity, the cost of efficient and economical utilization of military manpower becomes of paramount importance under those circumstances.

*27. Col. Edwin S. Bettelheim, Military Order of World Wars*

We are in favor unanimously of this bill.

*28. Maj. Gen. Milton G. Baker, the Military Order of the World Wars*

National military service more accurately describes the type of program that is needed in this present dire emergency.

*29. Bernard Weitzer, National Legislative Director, Jewish War Veterans of The United States of America.*

The present bill, in my opinion, is the most practicable plan for meeting the manpower needs of our Armed Forces with the minimum disturbance of our social and economic fabric and our needs for the products of our industry and our farms.

F. MISCELLANEOUS ORGANIZATIONS

*30. Tracy S. Voorhees, Committee on the Present Danger.*

The 27 months of service and training authorized in the bill—after deduction for customary terminal leave—in reality means about 25 months of total actual military service. As such it need represent for students a break of only two academic years.

*31. Dunlap C. Clark, United States Chamber of Commerce.*

Eighteen-year-old males should be drafted to serve 27 months in the Armed Forces.

*32. Arthur L. Williston, Citizens Committee for Universal Military Training*

I . . . unqualifiedly endorse the 27-month period of training and service. . . . In the present 21 months' requirement, the service after training is too short to be either efficient or economical.

*33. Julius Ochs Adler, Cochairman, National Emergency Committee of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States*

. . . many universities have already formulated . . . a more compact curriculum by reducing college terms from 4 to 3 years; the total time loss for securing a college degree caused by 27 months of training and service would not exceed 15 months. . . . Four years is the present undergraduate course, with vacations from 3½ months to 4 months each year. The man who goes to work is very lucky to get 2 weeks vacation, so they will not be giving up anything in the way of vacations if they go from 4 years to 3 years.

G. YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

*34. Lewis A. Rivlin, student, Swarthmore College, Students for Democratic Action*

It would seem . . . there is need to expand the length of service beyond 21 months. If the length of service is somewhere around 27 months, at the end of that period the 18-year-olds will go out of the services and be ready to start in with their higher educations or their work in farming or industry, thus not being too much of a danger to the continued flow of abilities and talent.

## Testimony Opposed to 27 Months or More

A. EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

*1. Ralph W. McDonald, National Education Association of the United States*

(*a*) A 27-month period of service would inevitably mean the loss of 2½ or 3 years of potential college study for every young man inducted, with the consequent further diminution of his chance to return at all.

(*b*) A 24-month service period would give many students a better chance to hold their loss to a minimum of 2 years of study.

(*c*) . . . the committee should give consideration either to a period of service which would mean a 2-year interruption or to a period of service that would mean a 3-year interruption . . . the 27-month period is probably as disadvantageous to the continuity of education as any specific number of months that could be

chosen. A 27-month service period would cut off 3 years of schooling almost as effectively as would a 30-month period of service.

*2. John Scott Everton, president, Kalamazoo College*

. . . consider the possibilities of lowering the period of service to not more than 24 months so that a student may continue his college training after an interruption of not more than 2 years.

B. FARM GROUPS

*3. J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel, the National Grange*

We should oppose any plan to extend the period of individual service.

C. OTHERS

*4. John J. Swomley, director, National Council Against Conscription*

We oppose any attempt to extend the length of service.

D. PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

*5. Dr. Rudolph H. Friedrich, American Dental Association*

On behalf of its many members who hold Reserve commissions, the association protests such extension to 27 months until it is clearly and unalterably demonstrated by changing conditions to the people of this country that additional service of such length is necessary.

## Summary of Arguments on Length of Service

### FOR 27 MONTHS

1. A 27-month period of service will greatly increase our combat readiness since we will have the services of well-trained men for a longer period of time. This will greatly impress any potential aggressor.

(*a*) We gain 50 percent in practical military utility by having a 27-month period of service rather than a 21-month period. This results in an average increase of 6 months of service for each man over the present "actual service" period of from 8 to 14 months.

(*b*) The longer the term of service, the less wastage we have of men in the pipeline overseas and back.

(*c*) A much bigger training establishment is needed for the shorter period of service; thus many trained men are unavailable for combat due to their duties as training forces.

2. A longer period of service is necessary due to the fact that it takes so long to train men in the basic military skills in our highly mechanized forces.

3. The monetary and personnel costs of training are so high that it is wasteful to train men for a period of service less than 27 months.

4. It is doubtful that we can maintain our Armed Forces at the necessary strength of 3.5 million by a 21-month period of service.

5. A saving of $709,000,000 in our defense budget would result if we had 27 months' service rather than 21 months due to the fact that a much larger training establishment is required to maintain a given strength for 21 months than in a 27-month period.

6. If we have a shorter period of service, we will have to have a larger total force in order to furnish training personnel and in order to keep our combat forces at the needed strength.

7. A 21-month period of service will not increase the reserves any more than will a 27-month period since in the long run all young men will participate in the program anyway.

8. A 21-month period of service limits the Armed Forces to training men for certain low technical jobs which require less training than others.

(*a*) We cannot wisely limit this high type of technical training only to the Regular forces since the Regular forces must be balanced. In addition to this, many of the Regular forces are not qualified for highly technical training and there are not enough of those who are qualified to meet the needs of a larger armed force.

(*b*) A 21-month period of service would result in the building of an unbalanced reserve of low-skilled individuals.

AGAINST 27 MONTHS

1. It is unfair to extend the term of service for reservists with prior service in World War II.

2. A student's education should not be interrupted for more than 2 years. A 27-month period of service will mean that 2½ to 3 years are lost.

## THE NECESSITY FOR AN INTERIM PROGRAM FOR 75,000 STUDENTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY AND RESEARCH

The committee believes it is necessary for purposes of assuring our continued industrial and technical superiority in the face of any contingency to provide that an ample number of young men be permitted to complete their studies of subjects essential to the national security and welfare.

Under the present law, any person pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning may have his induction postponed by his local board until the end of the current academic year or until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction. In addition, the President may provide for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.

This bill continues the basic policy contained in the present law, but provides an authority for deferment until the end of the academic year, instead of postponement, for students who receive their induction notices during the academic year. This applies to persons in the 18-to-19 age group as well as to those over 19. Under this bill, high-school students are deferred until they reach age 19, or graduate, or cease to pursue their course of instruction satisfactorily.

This bill, as stated, makes no change in the President's general authority to defer such categories of students as he deems the national interest dictates. It adds, however, a new provision which, until June 30, 1954, authorizes that 75,000 men annually may be removed from active training and service to permit them to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, or other fields. These men will be required to complete their basic military training before entering into their study or research program, except that, depending on the date of enactment of the bill into law, some change in this policy may be necessary for the first year. After completion of their studies, they would still have to discharge the obligation for completing their military service. This obligation would continue for a period of 10 years.

The 75,000 men would be selected upon the basis of competitive standards determined by a civilian commission of 5 persons, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. If necessary, this commission could allocate the fields of study or research for these 75,000 who were selected, and, in addition, would have the power to authorize the payment of the tuition and other school expenses of such of the 75,000 persons as the commission may deem appropriate. This will enable a man selected as one of the 75,000 to pursue his education even though he is unable to pay his expenses himself.

The committee feels it is important to emphasize that this group of 75,000 students annually would by no means constitute the full

male enrollment in the Nation's colleges and universities. Estimates made by the Office of Education indicate that with this program in operation there might be, for the 1951–52 school year, 25,000 veterans, 26,000 IV–F's, and 90,000 ROTC's enrolled as freshmen, in addition to the 75,000 selected students. This would mean a total first-year class of at least 216,000 males, exclusive of those deferred under existing authority, and not counting women students, or those young men who are below the induction age. Over-all, total male enrollment—for all 4 years of college—would be at least 845,000 for the 1951-52 school year. It is estimated that at no time during the period of this program's operation between now and 1954 would the enrollment of male freshmen (not including those under age 18) decline below the 191,000 mark, and total male enrollment in college would not decline below 719,500—a minimum very close to the 1939 prewar figure.

### SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST PROGRAM FOR 75,000 STUDENTS

The arguments listed below concern themselves with the educational issues which emerged during the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings.

Included are not only the contentions advanced by the witnesses who appeared, but also those presented by individuals and organizations who requested that their material be inserted in the record. There may be arguments other than those presented, but this study summarizes only those which appear in the record.

Not all arguments presented as opposing the Department of Defense proposals are directly in conflict with those proposals. Any time a variation of the proposals was presented, it was placed in the opposing column.

It will be noted that some witnesses are listed as both "for" and "against" the same measure. This is due to the fact that occasionally a witness would either point out arguments on the other side or would present evidence which could be interpreted as being a variation of the Department's proposals. All such arguments have been included for the purpose of securing a more balanced picture. Also, it should be carefully noted that not all of these extracts are in their full context. Every effort was made by the staff to present an accurate summary, and the committee hopes that no inaccuracies have crept in due to the need for condensing the wealth of material into the briefest possible space.

Not all of the material is in the nature of direct quotes. Frequently remarks from different parts of the record have been combined into one statement. Occasionally, in answer to a long question, a witness would say "Yes" or "No," or "I agree." In these instances the content of the question has been attributed to the witness. Care has been taken to see that no witness is quoted out of context to secure a meaning other than the one intended.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROPOSALS OF 75,000 EDUCATIONAL DEFERMENTS

### Testimony Favoring Proposals

#### A. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

*1. Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary, Department of Defense*

We recognize that there can be no long-range security for America in a program that denudes our industries and farms of skilled technicians or that interferes with our preeminence in science and general education. The proposed legislation contains specific safeguards intended to keep our colleges, laboratories, and industries healthy. . . .

*2. General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower*

(*a*) Senator Johnson. We have a proposal in this bill that provides that 75,000 of the boys taken in at 18 will have military training for 4 months and then on the basis of some test that has not been worked out as yet will be selected to pursue their studies in the sciences, medical schools, dental schools, engineering schools, and what not; and that figure was arrived at based upon recommendations made by a leading group of educators.

General Eisenhower. I think it is wise myself.

(*b*) That 75,000, as I understand it, is really nothing but a stopgap in the first 2 years. After the first 2 years there is no diminution of the men that can go to the universities.

(*c*) I would certainly like to see you producing an officer and technical class as you go along. It has to be done, and there has to be a proper marriage between the universities of the United States . . . and the armed services. . . .

(*d*) I would say that unless there was some way in which military training was going to go ahead for the length of time and on an intensive scale that made it real military training, I would take him out of uniform (when he returns to college) and require him to do his military service later. . . .

*3. General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff*

(*a*) . . . a certain number ought to be deferred for the time being, otherwise you are going to interfere very materially not only with our educational institutions . . . you are going to interfere with the gradual flow of scientists and specialists that you need. If you do not make some such provision, you will have a 2-year gap here. After that . . . of course, these people will start going to school again at age 20 or 21. . . .

(*b*) . . . if you would visit Camp Jackson . . . you would find that only a small proportion of those (facilities) could be furnished around a college and an armory.

(*c*) . . . I do not say there is not some use that the college facilities could be put to, particularly in training specialists . . . if you are going to exercise the control over the men which we think is necessary . . . you cannot have them scattered around in bunches of houses or dormitories.

*4. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service*

(*a*) I think the . . . 75,000 who are chosen out of each of the next 3-year groups plus, perhaps, a hundred thousand more . . . in the ROTC, will furnish a sizable base of people who will be engaged during this period in . . . college and postgraduate training. . . . The 75,000 was each year . . . after 3 years it will be 225,000.

(*b*) (I recommend) that the men chosen to be postponed for college be on the basis of general acceptance, to be determined competitively by appropriate tests, and their continued postponement be based on their performance as students. . . .

(*c*) It is impossible to institute a plan which would permit of deferments for the purpose of education unless there is assurance that the plan will be continued long enough for those receiving deferments also to meet their service obligations. otherwise a deferment becomes simply a means of evading service. . . .

(*d*) . . . who knows what we will need 10 years from now? So I have been converted to the belief that we should choose people on the basis of their competence rather than attempting to swerve young boys into courses that we at the moment think are highly necessary.

*5. Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations*

We concur in the principles and the details of the plan as it has been presented here.

*6. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army*

I am thoroughly in accord with the legislation which is under consideration before your committee and with the principles that are involved in that legislation.

*7. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force*

The Air Force strongly endorses and supports the program presented to you by the Department of Defense.

*8. Brig. Gen. H. C. Parks, United States Air Force*

We are accelerating our ROTC program and that will be reflected as part of this legislation . . . to give us approximately 11,300 graduates, ROTC graduates, available for new commissions. . . . That would utilize to a considerable extent the educational institutions.

*9. Hon. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense*

(*a*) If any man reaches the age of 18 and is in high school, he will remain there until he reaches his nineteenth birthday or finishes high school. If any man is in college at the time of his eighteenth birthday, he will be permitted to finish his college year.

(*b*) The Department of Defense has offered . . . a proposal for an expanded program of college training of young officers through the ROTC . . . improvement on present ROTC program, and an elaboration of subsidized program, known as the Holloway plan. . . . Students selected for the (Holloway) plan would have to serve an initial 4-month period of basic military training under universal program. Obligation of service would have to be fulfilled after graduation. . . . Upon completion of ROTC service, he owes 2 years, or 3 years if he is under a subsidized plan. . . . (In regard to whether we expect to give 4 months' training to ROTC men too)—it might be a waste of money to give 4 months' training to those men because during their period of college training in ROTC they will get far more than what they need or would get in those 4 months. . . .

(*c*) In the first 3 years of universal military service and training, the President would have authority to suspend temporarily active-service requirement of up to 75,000 students so they could complete college training, vocational training, and keep the educational pipeline from drying up. . . . (The Department recommends that 75,000 should be selected) on the basis that all the educators, scientists, and all the organizations working under Mr. Symington—the committees on the outside—told us that between sixty and seventy-five thousand would meet the needs for doctors, scientists, educators, and those of all other qualifications. . . . We took the maximum figure that the group of educators who felt must be given this training. . . . They said from 65,000 to 75,000, and that is why we put the maximum at 75,000.

(*d*) The 3-year limit on this provision is based on the belief colleges would be back on a stable footing after the first class of universal military service and training inductees completed service. . . . Every man 18 years old . . . will have to take 4 months' basic training.

(*e*) (This) maximum of 75,000 does not go into ROTC.

(*f*) Methods for selecting students to be deferred and for deciding courses of study that would be important to national interest should be left entirely in civilian hands under procedures to be drawn up by the President and approved by Congress.

(*g*) The only safeguard we ask for . . . is . . . that the proper share of men go into the land-grant colleges and into the smaller colleges.

(*h*) If their education is subsidized, which might have to be they owe additional time. . . . Men who can afford to go will get the number of years they require; men who cannot afford to go but who want to work their way through . . . may take 6 years instead of 4. (For) men who cannot work their way through and cannot afford it, we suggest some sort of national scholarship. . . .

(*i*) College training courses for military personnel on active duty . . . may involve as many as 50,000 men a year.

(*j*) There may be . . . 35,000 a year . . . in ROTC . . . and 75,000 (in the other group, plus) 50,000 in the service. (This gives a total of 160,000 per year.) . . . Plus those 18-year-olds who cannot be taken in even if you passed the law, the first time, plus those men who are in the schools now who would be continuing their deferment.

*10. Earl J. McGrath, Commissioner, Office of Education, Federal Security Agency*

(*a*) If we are facing an extended period of time in which substantially the whole number of physically fit college-age men will be eligible for induction, it is absolutely essential to the national interest that some device be worked out whereby we can assure a continuous flow of men in training for the occupations and professions without which the national strength and well-being are gravely impaired.

(*b*) . . . This general picture is one of difficulty, even of hardship, for many small colleges; but . . . drastic cuts in total enrollments for all colleges will not be the order of the day. . . . I am not making the argument here that these students should be retained in colleges to protect the colleges.

(*c*) At the undergraduate level, very careful consideration should be given before placing limitations on the student as to field of study. . . . A large proportion of undergraduate students do not have a specific field of interest at the age of entrance to college . . . as demonstrated by experience in the Second World War, we do not know which fields of study may emerge as critical as the war continues.

(*d*) . . . If the program were accelerated, you would put the 75,000 out each year for 3 years rather than 4, in which case you would have 225,000 in process at one time rather than 300,000.

*11. Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor*

(*a*) I agree with the provision that authorizes the President to enable 75,000 youngsters to carry on their schooling.

(*b*) I agree with retaining the present provisions of the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

(*c*) . . . Seventy-five thousand youngsters will be able to go on to college. Last September 86,000 men were admitted to college under the ROTC program. A continuation of both programs would result in the admission of about 150,000 yearly to college.

*12. Edward J. Overby, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Agriculture*

This Department concurs in the policy of the proposed program for universal military training and service.

*13. Dr. Charles A. Thomas, chairman, Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee, National Security Resources Board*

(*a*) The committee . . . believes at present that the number 75,000 is about right for the Reserve Specialist Training Corps, as a military matter.

(*b*) Senator CHAPMAN. Under this plan, Doctor, when these 75,000 students are carefully selected, it is true, is it not, that a much smaller proportion of them would fall by the wayside, going on through their college course, than is ordinarily the case with freshmen entering college?

(*c*) Dr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, that is what the educational members of my committee tell me. That is true.

### B. PROFESSIONAL, LABOR, AND FARM GROUPS

*14. Dr. M. H. Trytten, Director, Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council*

I am happy to see that the present bill recognized that these students should not be in military status.

*15. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations*

The CIO strongly endorses the principle that military requirements should not interfere with the flow of trained engineers, scientists, doctors, social scientists, and those trained in the humanities. . . .

### C. EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

*16. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

The plans which were submitted to you by the Department of Defense give, in my judgment, appropriate recognition to the continuing importance of education and to the role which the colleges can play.

*17. James P. Baxter III, president of Williams College and chairman of the committee on manpower of the Association of American Colleges*

(*a*) If this bill is adopted, there will be an opportunity to return to college after a man has had 2 years' training. Suppose he does not get in this group of 75,000 . . . suppose that he goes through with 2 years and 3 months, he will still have an opportunity to start in a lot of professional careers.

(*b*) . . . I feel strongly that educators should not urge you to defer students to complete their college work, unless those students are working on an accelerated program.

*18. Harold W. Dodds, president, Princeton University*

(*a*) . . . I do endorse heartily the proposals which have been submitted to you. . . . No other proposal that I have seen or been able to dream up myself provides the element of long-term durability which I think is necessary, with a minimum of possible violence to higher education and the lives of young men generally. . . .

(*b*) From the standpoint of the colleges, this would offer a larger freshman class than otherwise, which will be very advantageous to the colleges by helping to balance their enrollments between the upper and lower years of college. A further "phase" element is that the plan is not to call more than 450,000 18-year-olds during the first year. . . .

(*c*) . . . I am utterly opposed to the general deferment of young men in college who are not preparing in these special essential branches. To make college a haven of refuge for even the brightest students in these broader fields not immediately pointed to the defense effort would destroy their moral influence and capacities as future leaders of our democracy. To protect a young man from the necessity of national service just because he happens to be bright and scholarly inclined, as some have suggested, would be bad for him and destructive of his leadership possibilities.

*19. Detlev W. Bronk, president of Johns Hopkins University, president of the National Academy of Science, president-elect of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*

(*a*) . . . I am . . . in favor of the proposed program in the second instance, because it provides for furloughing or making possible the furloughing of 75,000 men, men for the ROTC, and 50,000 for in-service training. . . . There is a great need for trained men in the operation of the armed services at the present time.

(*b*) Whether they were in uniform or not in uniform, I cannot believe would make any particular difference to the universities, provided the universities had the opportunity to carry forward their educational program in the way in which they thought was most satisfactory.

*20. Ralph W. McDonald, National Education Association of the United States*

We strongly favor the provision suggested in section 6 (d) (1) that would authorize the selection of at least 75,000 young men annually for college study . . . The selected students should be free to enter accredited colleges and universities of their choice and pursue college programs of their choice in any of the recognized disciplines of American higher education.

*21. Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts Medical and Dental Schools and member of the American Council on Education.*

A plan should be developed by means of which a limited group of students, possibly 75,000 or more, should be referred back to colleges of their own choice, so far as possible, for full education, after completing their basic training of not more than 4 months in the Armed Forces. The testing and selection of this group should be done by competent, professionally trained civilians.

*22. William G. Saltonstall, principal, the Phillips Exeter Academy*

I favor the provisions in the bill for deferment of 75,000 men per year to engage in study or research in medicine, engineering, and the humanities.

*23. Leonard C. Smith, chancellor, Georgetown University*

. . . Members of the Armed Forces, upon application and after a proper test of their capabilities, should be permitted to enroll in a college of his choice to pursue his course of studies upon which he would receive college credits and degrees. The college can adopt an acceleration program which would permit graduation in approximately 2½ years.

*24. A. Gundlach, Berea College, Berea, Ky.*

. . . We, the general faculty of Berea College, urge the adoption of a plan for deferment of college students.

*25. F. G. Macomber, dean, School of Education, Miami University*

. . . immediately after reaching the age of 18 . . . men shall be inducted into the military, classified . . . tested for intellectual capacity, and then assigned, if qualified and requested, to the cooperative educational program. . . . Such men would be subject to a basic military training program of 3 months and conducted at a regular military camp or station during the first year following his eighteenth birthday.

*26. Association of American Universities*

(*a*) That from among those who have completed 1 year's service the Armed Forces may select candidates to pursue Reserve Officers Training Corps courses, on condition that they be obligated to serve an additional 2 years upon completion or termination of such courses.

(*b*) . . . An appropriate percentage of inductees shall be designated as eligible to suspend their military service to take specialized training for professions and trades essential to the military needs of the Nation.

*27. Association of American Colleges*

. . . We recommend that after basic training a substantial number of properly qualified young men be furloughed to colleges of their choice for further education in all areas of learning before completing their required military service. . . . Special consideration should be given to a Federal scholarship or loan program.

*28. Raymond F. McClain, president, Transylvania College*

Transylvania College supports resolution of the Association of American Colleges bearing on manpower situation.

*29. Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York*

. . . Applicants for post high school training and education might well be required to meet certain standards imposed by a national test, as well as the admission requirements of accredited institutions.

D. VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS

*30. Col. Edwin S. Bettelheim, Military Order of World Wars*

. . . We are in favor unanimously of this bill.

*31. Harold Russell, National Commander, AMVETS*

. . . There is a basic need for the 4 months training, and . . . afterward the men should be submitted for training in the arts and sciences.

*32. Bernard Weitzer, national legislative director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America*

We strongly support the provision for deferment of 75,000 persons annually to engage in study or research.

*33. Omar B. Ketchum, legislative director, Veterans of Foreign Wars*

. . . A reasonable number of carefully selected students in medicine and the sciences should be given deferments. . . . It is not anticipated that more than 75,000 to 80,000 young men would be deferred yearly on those grounds. . . .

E. OTHER GROUPS

*34. Dr. Vannevar Bush, Committee on the Present Danger*

(*a*) In the transition period, in order to keep a proper flow of scientific and technical men, I feel we have to compromise and send some men directly without camp training for that purpose. . . . I feel sure—I think 75,000 . . . covers it. I hope . . . it is less. . . .

(*b*) My personal opinion is we should not attempt to put these fellows in uniform or that we should give any Federal subsidy for their education.

*35. Dunlap C. Clark, United States Chamber of Commerce*

The President should be authorized to release from active service, after basic training, 75,000 inductees per year to permit them to study or conduct research in medicine, science, engineering, and allied fields, subject to later military

service. . . . College students in Reserve Officers Training Corps and similar units should be deferred if they agree to accept a commission upon completion of the course. . . .

*36. Gilbert F. White, Friends Committee on National Legislation*

Congress must specifically direct that institutions receiving such students be completely free of direct or indirect supervision by military authorities.

*37. Arthur L. Williston, Citizens Committee for Universal Military Training*

I am very definitely and unqualifiedly in favor of every feature of this bill. I think it is the most intelligent, comprehensive and valuable contribution that has been made to the people by Congress at any time. . . . No school or college that I know of claims to, even in two of its first years, offer training equal or comparable to the scientific foundation and training that the Army can furnish youth of special talent in 1 year, for example, in radar, aeronautics, . . . or a score of other branches.

### Testimony Opposing Proposals

Actually none of the witnesses were opposed to the basic idea of assuring a flow of students into educational institutions in the fields of science, engineering, medicine, and allied fields. The only differences being as to numbers and methods of accomplishing this.

#### A. PROFESSIONAL, LABOR, AND FARM GROUPS

*1. Clarence E. Davies, secretary, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, director of program of the Engineering Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council*

There is a present annual need of a minimum of 50,000 freshmen engineering students. . . . the provision in the bill by which a maximum of 75,000 persons to be selected annually for study or research in medicine, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields would appear to be inadequate.

*2. Paul H. Robbins, executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers*

(*a*) A proposal to restrict by law over a 3-year period the number of persons who can be released for study to 75,000 or for that matter, to any specific figure is of dubious wisdom.

(*b*) Fifty thousand of this year's engineering graduates have been absorbed into either Government or private employment . . . this number of graduates has proved far from sufficient for the country's needs.

(*c*) . . . the number of engineers needed in the next several years has been conservatively placed at a minimum of 30,000 graduates per year . . . nearly double this number will have to enter the freshman engineering classes to produce such a figure . . . nearly all the 75,000 students temporarily exempted under this bill would have to turn to engineering rather than to any other equally vital profession for the graduating classes 4 years hence to meet the conservatively estimated requirement of 30,000 engineers.

*3. Dr. M. R. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council*

I am uneasy about the upper limit of 75,000. It must be recognized that this number will not yield a graduating class 4 years later of 75,000, but a number somewhat smaller than this due to attrition of one kind or another. The eventual number of graduates may be as low as 50,000 . . . 75,000 must serve all needs, including the health fields, the healing arts, the sciences, and all other fields of training.

*4. Stockton Kimball, chairman of the Joint Committee on Medical Education in Time of National Emergency*

To supply the students needed by the medical schools alone will require that at least 10,000 to 12,000 men enter college each year. . . . We understand that last year 50,000 engineers were graduated and were immediately employed. Thus the 75,000 would barely take care of the Nation's needs in just these two areas.

*5. Dr. Harvey Stone, Johns Hopkins, member of the Council on Medical Education*

(*a*) . . . the provision of this obligatory 4-month period of basic training seems to me to have a good many objections to it. In the first place, how valuable is

that training going to be when the man becomes a commissioned officer 5 or 6 years later. Certainly any immediate benefit in the way of physical hardening is gone. . . . It is an expensive provision. . . . It costs about $120 to just outfit and equip a man with his uniform, etc. . . . You keep him for 4 months in this highly questionable training and you keep 75,000 of them, according to this bill, in that program—you are just wasting several million dollars quite unnecessarily.

(*b*) I think (that 75,000) is quite inadequate from all I can understand about it, and I believe that any specific number written in would be a mistake.

*6. Dr. Rudolph H. Friedrich, American Dental Association*

The Council on Dental Education of the Association estimates it is necessary to provide an annual reservoir of about 5,000 students from which to select the entering dental class. . . . All of the dental schools in the country can admit a freshman class of 3,200. From this number about 2,800 will be graduated. . . . If 5,000 or 6½ percent of the 75,000 proposed withdrawals will be required to fill the dental schools alone, considering the needs of all the other educational groups also, this number should be expanded or a more definite policy of deferment should be followed.

B. EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

*7. John Scott Everton, president, Kalamazoo College*

(*a*) I question seriously whether the allocation of such a meager number annually will adequately provide the trained manpower to meet the critical needs of this Nation including its international commitments in the years ahead . . . no Nation will remain strong that does not make adequate provision for leadership of all types—political, economic, religious, scientific, and in other fields of endeavor.

(*b*) Seventy-five thousand men is completely unrealistic and inadequate. . . . Distributed among the universities and colleges of the country, it would average out to less than 100 men in each of our institutions.

(*c*) Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, you think 75,000 ought to be a minimum and the more realistic figure would be 150,000?

Mr. EVERTON. That is correct.

(*d*) Is there much to be gained on insisting on a period of basic training before releasing them for their period of study in the colleges and universities?

*8. E. H. Hopkins, Vice President, Washington State College*

(*a*) . . . The deferment of 60,000 to 80,000 college students from military training and immediate duty would be seriously insufficient to meet present and future needs for trained specialists and leaders of whom there is a genuine shortage even at the present time. . . .

(*b*) . . . If the number of male college students were reduced to that number, the plan would, over the next few years, break the backs of a tremendously large number of our well-established and reputable colleges and universities. . . .

*9. Ralph W. McDonald, National Educational Association*

(*a*) . . . A 4-month period of basic training would be largely wasted upon a young man who would not enter into active military service until years afterward.

(*b*) Senator MORSE. Do you think I would be wrong, Mr. McDonald, if I said we could take judicial notice of the fact that a proposed 75,000 group would not begin to suffice in meeting those needs?

Mr. MCDONALD. Yes. Perfectly obvious.

*10. W. R. White, President, Baylor University*

(*a*) . . . a plan which will coordinate the resources of our colleges and universities and the needs of our military services with the least possible injury to our youth, educational institutions, and social order would be most desirable.

(*b*) As far as the 75,000, I would increase it . . . I think the figure you used a moment ago. Make that as a minimum and then set your maximum higher, one hundred twenty-five or one hundred fifty thousand.

*11. J. S. Nicholas, Director, Osborn Zoological Laboratory, Yale University*

(*a*) . . . Up to 75,000 students now in college may have service postponed to varying degrees but entirely at the discretion of the President. To take care of minimum military needs this is totally inadequate.

(*b*) . . .; the enrollment in engineering alone should be in the range of one hundred fifty to two hundred thousand men allowing only 20 percent increase for military needs. . . .

In addition to this, there must be provided manpower for the supply of chemists, physicists, mathematicians, geologists, biologists, and other specialists.

. . . . . .

(*c*) The dangerous minimum of 320,000 is needed for technical and specialized training alone.

*12. Charles E. Odegaard, Executive Director, American Council of Learned Societies*

I question only the wisdom of establishing by law a fixed ceiling of 75,000 men annually. . . . It would seem wiser to remove the ceiling, leaving the exact figure entirely to administrative determination, or providing if anything a minimum rather than a maximum.

## Summary of Arguments on Educational Deferments

### FAVORING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPOSALS

1. In view of our military needs, we cannot afford to defer more than 75,000 students each year.
2. In addition to the deferment of 75,000 freshmen each year, the ROTC programs will be accelerated so that as many as 90,000 each year will attend school under Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC programs. Also, as many as 50,000 men from the Armed Forces may be sent to school each year.
3. Students in high school and college will be permitted to finish their school year before they are inducted.
4. The total number of graduates from colleges and universities will not be drastically cut due to the fact that the 75,000 students will be selected by a highly selective test which will result in a much smaller proportion of young men being dismissed from college for scholastic reasons.
5. Men cannot be adequately trained at colleges since the necessary military facilities and supervision will be absent.
6. The 3-year limit on the program of deferment is justified by the fact that after 3 years the first group inducted will be returning to school.

### OPPOSED TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPOSALS

1. There is a need to defer far more than 75,000 men per year.

(*a*) Far more than 75,000 must enter as freshmen each year in order to secure 75,000 graduates 4 years later.

(*b*) 5,000 predental students, 4,000 pharmacy students, 10,000 premedical students, and 100,000 engineering students must enter college each year to secure the necessary graduating class to meet our national needs. This totals 119,000 entering students per year without taking into account the other necessary groups.

2. The proposed student deferment should be made permanent rather than for only 3 years.
3. The 4-month period of training to be given prior to education is wasteful in time and money since the training can be of little value to men who would not use such training for 3 or 4 years.
4. If no more than 75,000 are deferred yearly, a large number of our well-established and reputable colleges and universities will be broken.

## College Enrollments

Table I shows the estimated number of students that would be enrolled in each class in college in the years 1951 to 1954, inclusive, on the basis of no blanket deferments for any class and the inclusion of 75,000 trainees per year. For purposes of comparison, table II is enclosed. The second table is identical with table I, except that it adds estimates of the number of students that would be enrolled if all persons presently eligible to be drafted from this year's junior and sophomore classes were deferred, and one-half of those eligible for induction from this year's freshman class were to be deferred.

TABLE I.—*Tentative projection of number of full-time male undergraduates in each college class (freshman-senior), on the basis of no blanket deferments, 1951–54* [1]

[Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Research and Statistical Service, Feb. 7, 1951]

| Year | Component | Freshmen | Sophomores | Juniors | Seniors | Total full-time male undergraduates | 4-year male college graduates |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1950–51 | Veterans of World War II | 58,000 | 100,000 | 125,000 | 140,000 | | |
| | IV–F's | 25,000 | 15,000 | 10,000 | 15,000 | | |
| | ROTC | 65,000 | 52,000 | 44,000 | 40,000 | | |
| | Total | 148,000 | 167,000 | 179,000 | 195,000 | 689,000 | 187,400 |
| 1951–52 | Veterans of World War II | 25,000 | 46,400 | 88,000 | 119,000 | | |
| | IV–F's | 26,000 | 17,500 | 12,000 | 9,300 | | |
| | 75,000 selected | 75,000 | | | | | |
| | ROTC | 90,000 | 58,500 | 50,700 | 42,900 | | |
| | Total | 216,000 | 122,400 | 150,700 | 171,200 | 660,300 | 166,100 |
| 1952–53 | Veterans of World War II | | 20,000 | 40,800 | 83,600 | | |
| | IV–F's | 26,000 | 18,200 | 14,000 | 11,200 | | |
| | 75,000 selected | 75,000 | 67,500 | | | | |
| | ROTC | 90,000 | 81,000 | 57,000 | 49,400 | | |
| | Total | 191,000 | 186,700 | 111,800 | 144,200 | 633,700 | 140,100 |
| 1953–54 | Veterans of World War II | | | 17,600 | 38,800 | | |
| | IV–F's | 27,000 | 18,200 | 14,600 | 13,000 | | |
| | 75,000 selected | 75,000 | 67,500 | 65,800 | | | |
| | ROTC | 90,000 | 81,000 | 79,000 | 77,000 | | |
| | Total | 192,000 | 166,700 | 177,000 | 128,800 | 664,500 | 125,200 |

[1] The figures above do not include any estimate of the number of returning servicemen who may go to college after completion of their term of duty. Estimates for this group are very difficult to make; but it is not anticipated that this group will be of much numerical importance until the academic year 1954–55.

TABLE II.—*Tentative projection of number of full-time male undergraduates in each college class (freshman-senior), classified according to draft status, 1951–54* [1]

[Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Research and Statistical Service, Feb. 7, 1951]

| Year | Component | Freshmen | Sophomores | Juniors | Seniors | Total full-time male undergraduates | 4-year male college graduates |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1950–51 | Veterans of World War II | 58,000 | 100,000 | 125,000 | 140,000 | 689,000 | |
| | IV–F's | 25,000 | 15,000 | 10,000 | 15,000 | | |
| | ROTC | 65,000 | 52,000 | 44,000 | 40,000 | | |
| | Draft-eligible | 148,000 | 87,000 | 44,000 | 91,000 | 370,000 | |
| | Total | 296,000 | 254,000 | 223,000 | 286,000 | 1,059,000 | 274,700 |
| 1951–52 | Veterans of World War II | 25,000 | 46,400 | 88,000 | 119,000 | 660,300 | |
| | IV–F's | 26,000 | 17,500 | 12,000 | 9,300 | | |
| | 75,000 selected | 75,000 | | | | | |
| | ROTC | 90,000 | 58,500 | 50,700 | 42,900 | | |
| | Draft-eligible | | 74,000 | 69,600 | 40,900 | 184,500 | |
| | Total | 216,000 | 196,400 | 220,300 | 212,100 | 844,800 | 205,300 |
| 1952–53 | Veterans of World War II | | 20,000 | 40,800 | 83,600 | 633,700 | |
| | IV–F's | 26,000 | 18,200 | 14,000 | 11,200 | | |
| | 75,000 selected | 75,000 | 67,500 | | | | |
| | ROTC | 90,000 | 81,000 | 57,000 | 49,400 | | |
| | Draft-eligible | | | 59,200 | 64,700 | 123,900 | |
| | Total | 191,000 | 186,700 | 171,000 | 208,900 | 757,600 | 202,200 |
| 1953–54 | Veterans of World War II | | | 17,600 | 38,800 | 664,500 | |
| | IV–F's | 27,000 | 18,200 | 14,600 | 13,000 | | |
| | 75,000 selected | 75,000 | 67,500 | 65,800 | | | |
| | ROTC | 90,000 | 81,000 | 79,000 | 77,000 | | |
| | Draft-eligible | | | | 55,000 | 55,000 | |
| | Total | 192,000 | 166,700 | 177,000 | 183,800 | 719,500 | 178,000 |

[1] The figures above do not include any estimate of the number of returning srevicemen who may go to college after completion of their term of duty. Estimates for this group are very difficult to make; but it is not anticipated that this group will be of much numerical importance until the academic year 1954–55.

### EFFECT ON ROTC PROGRAMS

Under this bill, a person selected for enrollment or continuance in a college ROTC or similar program, and who agrees in writing to accept a commission, if tendered, to serve not less than 2 years on active duty, and to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of receipt of a commission (less period of active service), may be deferred from induction for training and service until after completion of the course of instruction, providing that he has completed a period of training equivalent to that given in basic training, and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned. In addition, the bill would affirmatively authorize establishment of officer candidate training programs so as to afford personnel who are not selected for one of the other available programs an opportunity for attaining commissioned status while on active duty.

The proposed bill would enlarge the present ROTC exemption to include Midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve, and Cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy, as well as students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges, the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense.

This bill does not in any way curtail or restrict the present ROTC programs. In fact, the Department of Defense anticipates that the annual entering class of ROTC students will be increased from the present total of about 70,000 to 90,000 by the school year 1951–52.

### INTEGRATION OF MILITARY TRAINING WITH THE NATION'S EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

It is the belief of the committee that the program, as outlined, represents the maximum proper integration of military training with the Nation's educational system. The committee does not feel that the Nation's institutions of higher learning should be transformed into military training camps. In an enforced marriage of military discipline and academic freedom, it is unlikely that the freedom of the classroom would long survive. Relying upon our colleges and universities to train the men now needed for our Nation's defense would be uneconomical, inefficient, and ultimately costly to the Nation's intellectual progress.

### THE NECESSITY FOR UNIVERSAL TRAINING AND SERVICE

The committee believes there is a clear necessity for a program of universal military training and service.

It is the committee's particular belief that the necessity for defending this Nation is not an obligation to be fulfilled by only a select few of the Nation's young men. The duty of bearing arms in defense of the Nation is a universal duty. Therefore, we believe that universality, not selectivity, should be the basis of the assignment for military duty.

The urgencies of the present moment are such that it is not feasible totally to adopt the principle of universality. Because we have not had a reservoir of men trained either for military duty or duty in civilian occupations which was considered adequate for maintaining our all-important productive superiority, a certain degree of selectivity has been necessary. For example, to safeguard the Nation against exhaustion of the supply of doctors, it has been necessary to provide broad authority for local boards to defer men now training to be doctors, so that they may complete their medical training.

In no instance, however, does the bill permit individuals or groups totally to escape the obligation for military service. Those men who enter the college training program, for example, must complete basic training before or during their college training. Upon completion of their college training, these men are still obligated to complete the full term of military service required of all young men inducted.

There is no sanction or opportunity for "draft dodging" in the provisions of this bill.

Eventually, as the needs of the moment are met, the committee feels that it should be the policy of the Nation to apply the requirement for military training service on a strictly universal, impartial basis of age. For this purpose, the bill provides that when the interest of national security permits, a program of universal military training and service should be instituted. This will assure us of a constant reservoir of trained men for our Reserve forces.

The penalty and jeopardy of peace-loving nations is that the potential aggressor always holds the advantage of the initiative. Thus,

the United States must mount its defenses on a basis that will find us equally strong whether the show-down comes this year or 20 years from now. The only way we can maintain a military posture of the kind that is required without a huge standing army and a ruinous drain on our economy is by revitalizing our National Guard and the Reserve components. Universal military training and service will assure a steady flow of trained young men into the National Guard and Reserve components and thus make possible the enduring strength we need, with minimum dissipation of our productive energies.

This will have the effect of preserving our civilian institutions by keeping our economy healthy, allowing greater orderliness in our planning of education, science, industry, and agriculture, while holding our professional Military Establishment to the smallest number consistent with our national security needs. It will have the further effect of permitting a rapid expansion of our active strength in a sudden emergency through the recall of trained reservists to military duty, rather than relying on inductions of large numbers of completely untrained men.

The knowledge that our defenses would be in a state of constant alert, and that the cost of the total program would be within our capacity to support, would be a major deterrent to further aggression on the part of our potential and present enemies. The removal of any basis for doubt of our intention to remain strong would be a potent spur toward peace in the world.

Because universal military training and service is democratic in concept and democratic in application, it is necessary that the fullest practicable measure of civilian interest and guidance be provided in the administration of the program. To this end, the bill provides, effective at such time as the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, finds that such order is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, that the President may issue an Executive order which will eliminate all periods of active service but will retain the requirement for initial basic military training. At, or somewhat prior to, that time, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission. The manner in which the Congress retains its control over the adjustment or shortening of the periods of training or service is discussed in section (m) of the section-by-section analysis.

This Commission, which will be composed of five persons to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, will consist of three civilians and two active or retired members of the Regular components of the Armed Forces. This will assure that the universal training program will be under predominantly civilian control and supervision.

The National Security Training Commission will, subject to the direction of the President, establish policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic military training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phase of such training). It will also, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies which will carry out such training, and all departments and agencies so designated are required to carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards prescribed by the Commission. Men who, at the time the universal training program goes into effect, have not attained

their nineteenth birthday, and are not members of the Armed Forces, shall be liable for basic military training for a period of not less than 4 months and not more than 6 months. The committee considered including details as to the term of service, salary, and other refinements relating to the Commissioners. However, due to the fact that the Commission probably will not be appointed for a number of years, due to the further fact that some of the members of the Commission may be retired military personnel subject to the dual compensation status, and due also to the fact that future salary scales are difficult to predict, the committee felt that these problems should be solved administratively, or by supplementary legislation.

The bill also provides for the establishment of different pay schedules for men inducted under the military-training program in the post-emergency period, as against those that would prevail now. Because all enlistees and all inductees are at the present time and will in the immediate future be sharing the same barracks, training assignments, and doing the same service, they should receive the same pay. Any discrimination in compensation would be impossible to justify under these circumstances.

However, when the program becomes purely one of training, with no obligation for active service, after the training, the bill provides that the monthly rate of pay for trainees may be cut to $30. This would mean substantial economies in the operating cost of the program for a nonemergency period. The dependents of trainees will receive the same benefits as the dependents of persons in the lowest enlisted pay grade.

The committee believes it is pertinent to observe that a planned, organized, orderly universal training and service program can provide infinitely superior protection for the character and welfare of our young men than conditions prevailing in periods of hurried mobilization. It is better to have our young men trained under a program dedicated and organized to the express purpose of considering their youth and welfare, than to throw them into the military service during periods of emergency when no well-planned consideration can properly be given to any demand other than that of transforming the men rapidly into qualified soldiers as rapidly as possible.

### THE NECESSITY FOR OBLIGATORY RESERVE SERVICE

The committee believes that it is necessary to require that service in the Reserves be obligatory for men who have completed their regular training and service.

To realize fully the benefits of universal military training and service, it is necessary to retain a commitment on the services of the young men who receive that training. Furthermore, it is wasteful to the national strength to maintain a Reserve force only at the whim and preference of individuals.

Essentially, the requirements of national strength are twofold: (1) A minimum armed force in being, and (2) a maximum Reserve force in a state of readiness. The larger and more effective our Reserve force, the smaller we can permit our standing force to become. It is in the interest of our national economy to assure a large and effective Reserve at all times.

Under this bill, persons inducted into the armed force for 26 months would be required to serve in the Reserve for a period of approximately

6 years after completion of their tour of active duty. This time requirement could be reduced by service in the National Guard or in other organized units of the Reserve components.

It will be noted that under the 1948 act if a member of the Reserve serves in an organized unit, he can reduce his Reserve service to 3 years. In the unorganized Reserve, he is obliged to serve 5 years. The present bill is so written as to permit the President to reduce the period of Reserve service based upon the degree of participation in the Reserve activities, thus accomplishing the objectives of the 1948 act, but allowing a much greater degree of flexibility in meeting the requirements of special programs.

The committee recognizes that our Reserve program since World War II has not been adequate or realistic. We have requested that the necessary corrective action be taken and have received assurances that a new program is being prepared by the Department of Defense and will be submitted in the near future.

### THE NECESSITY FOR MAINTAINING NATIONAL GUARD STRENGTH

The committee believes that it is necessary for the national security to maintain an adequate strength for the National Guard.

Section 1 (d) of the Selective Service Act of 1948 contained a congressional declaration to the effect that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line of defenses of this Nation be at all times maintained and assured. The Department of Defense favors retention of this declaration in the present law. The committee agrees that this national policy should be continued.

The act of 1948 contained two provisions which, in effect, permitted special deferments for National Guard groups. The first was a provision which exempted from training and service under the Selective Service Act persons who on June 24, 1948, were members of organized units of the Reserve components, including the National Guard and the Air National Guard. No change is made in this provision, except to change the date to February 1, 1951.

An additional provision in the 1948 act provided that in those cases in which the governor of any State determined, and issued a proclamation to such effect, that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of his State could not be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons not liable for induction under the Selective Service Act, individuals who had not yet reached the age of 18 years and 6 months could by enlisting or accepting appointments in the organized units of the National Guard or Air National Guard of that State be deferred from training or service under the Selective Service Act so long as they continued to serve satisfactorily as members of such unit. The Department of Defense recommended this provision apply only to those already in the guard, and not to those under 18½ who might come in after passage of the bill. The National Guard, however, earnestly urged that it was essential to its continued existence that it be permitted to accept men under 18½ years old until such time as the Secretary of Defense found that adequate numbers of trained personnel were available to enable the guard to maintain its authorized strength.

The committee feels that the best interests of the country, and of the National Guard as well, will be served by permitting the guard to maintain its authorized appropriated strength at all times. Accordingly this legislation allows the guard to accept men under 18½, who have not received induction orders, until the Secretary of Defense makes the finding that the guard's authorized appropriated strength can be maintained from the pool of available trained personnel.

## VII. Discussion of Other Provisions of the Bill

### CALL OF RESERVE AND RETIRED PERSONNEL TO ACTIVE DUTY

The Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended by Public Law 599, Eighty-first Congress, authorizes the President, until July 9, 1951, to order, with or without their consent, members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces, into the active military or naval service, for periods of not to exceed 21 months.

The Department of Defense recommended that this authority be extended to June 30, 1953, and be amended to provide for a longer period of service instead of the present 21-month period. In addition, it was recommended by the Department of Defense that the present authority to induct physicians, dentists, and allied specialists, which authority expires July 9, 1951, be extended to June 30, 1953. The committee approves these proposals as incorporated in the bill.

Military representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps unanimously testified that the 21-month period is inadequate for the needs of the service under present-day conditions. In calling Reserves and retired personnel to active duty, the period of service must be long enough to provide efficient use of such personnel. The committee believes that present exigencies require that this recommendation of the Department should be accepted.

### APPORTIONMENT OF VARIOUS PHYSICAL AND MENTAL PROFILES AMONG THE SERVICES

Under the present law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to prescribe standards for determining physical and mental fitness of persons inducted. However, a certain latitude is afforded the various services, in that the inductee must, in addition, be acceptable to that particular service. The bill is so worded as to place this responsibility more clearly in the hands of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Secretary of Defense has assured the committee that he intended to impose a firm requirement that each service receive a fair share of the various physical and mental profiles secured by enlistment as well as induction. This would insure a balanced distribution among the Army, Navy, and Air Force of men with the qualities needed for leadership and for maximum combat effectiveness. The committee has, in reliance upon such assurance, not inserted such requirements into the bill. We will, however, watch with interest the development and operation of these proposed directives.

### EXTENSION OF ENLISTMENTS

Public Law 624, Eighty-first Congress, provides that until July 9, 1951, the President is authorized to extend all enlistments in any component of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps for a period not to exceed 12 months. That law was approved July 27, 1950, as an emergency measure to prevent a reduction of our Armed Forces as a result of termination of enlistments at a time when an expansion of the Armed Forces was necessary.

Authority further to extend enlistments is as urgently needed today as it was when Public Law 624 was enacted. It is essential that the Armed Forces retain as many of its experienced personnel as is possible during this current emergency period of rebuilding the military forces. This action has the effect of adding an equivalent of 84,000 men to the manpower pool in fiscal 1953 and of 63,000 in fiscal 1954.

The bill provides that the authority of the President to extend enlistments under Public Law 624 be continued until June 30, 1953, together with the proviso that no person shall have his period of enlistment extended for more than 1 year. In the absence of a further deterioration of world conditions, it is considered fair and equitable that the enlistee not be subject to involuntary extension of his enlistment for more than 1 year.

### ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The bill contains a provision increasing to a maximum of 25,000 a year for a period of 5 years, the number of aliens who may be accepted for 5-year enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army. This is an amendment of Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress, which establishes a ceiling of 2,500 for alien enlistments or reenlistments.

Responsible congressional, civilian, and military witnesses testified that aliens of a type who would be of great value to our services are available, and are anxious to enlist. The screening processes required under the present law are most meticulous. Also, the enlistment term is 5 years. As a consequence, the committee agrees that every advantage should be taken of this pool of potential manpower.

To insure that this provision is not regarded as a substitute for our own responsibilities and efforts, this portion has been written as a separate title of the bill.

## VIII. Administration Recommendations

The administration recommendation submitted by the Department of Defense was revised by the committee in several respects. The most significant are the following:

Lower the registration age from 18 to 17—not adopted by the committee.

Permit the induction of 18-year-olds for service without first utilizing the 19–26 pool available to the local board concerned—not adopted by the committee.

Civilian control of the military training program—changed by the committee to conform to the concept of the Compton Commission.

Selection of the 75,000 students authorized for special study and research—clarified by the committee by providing that selection be made by a commission appointed as prescribed in the bill, and on a competitive basis.

The program for the rehabilitation of certain of those young men who are not now physically qualified to enter the Armed Forces was not adopted by the committee due to the fact that no adequate plan was presented by the Department of Defense or the Administration.

The letter of the Secretary of Defense to the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, dated January 17, 1951, is hereby made a part of this report.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, January 17, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*Chairman, Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee,*
*Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes.

This bill would establish a program of universal military service and training; it would lower the minimum age for induction into the armed services from 19 years to 18; it would extend the period of service for those inducted from 21 months to 27, and it would add 1 year to the enlistment period of all men whose original enlistments were scheduled to expire during fiscal years 1952 or 1953.

This is the principal proposal in the Department of Defense legislative program for 1951. The principles embodied in this legislation have the approval of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Director of Selective Service, and all the civilian agencies concerned with manpower problems. Its prompt enactment by the Congress is urged by the Secretary of Defense and the civilian and military heads of all the Armed Forces.

Purpose of the legislation:

In the judgment of the Department of Defense, this bill represents the best way to meet our immediate need for expanded fighting forces and, at the same time, provide an enduring base for our military strength. Any program that fails to accomplish both these objectives, at a cost we can support, will be inadequate to guarantee our own security or to contribute to the establishment of lasting peace.

We are confronted with a world situation of such gravity and such unpredictability that we must be prepared for effective action, whether the challenge comes with the speed of sound or is delayed for a lifetime. To continue to put our reliance on our forces in being without making provision for a dependable civilian reserve of trained military manpower would put a crushing burden on the productive economy that is the basis of our national strength.

What we need, and what this bill would provide, is the assurance that we would be able to build up our combat forces with all possible speed and that we would be able to maintain whatever strength might be needed for as long as might be necessary to insure world peace. Through the authorization of a permanent system of universal military service and training, we could achieve these ends with minimum cost in men and money and with the least necessary dislocaton of industry, agriculture, education, and family life.

The bill would make it the national obligation of all physically fit young men reaching the age of 18 to undergo military service and training and to follow that service with a specified term of duty in a Reserve component. The obligation to serve would be universal, but care would be taken in the first years of the program not to bring in 18-year-olds so rapidly that they could not make a useful contribution to our immediate military strength. As part of this orderly introduction of universal military service and training, effort would be made to confine initial calls to those closest to their nineteenth birthday. This would insure the greatest fairness in the way we put the plan into operation.

Under the bill, moreover, no youth under the age of 19 could be sent overseas with less than 4 months of training. This would virtually rule out, except in a dire emergency, the probability that any young man brought into service in the early years of this program would go into a combat area before he was 19. How-

ever, it is our strong fear that writing into the law a specific prohibition against sending men out of the United States before their nineteenth birthday would cripple the services in meeting a sudden, ruthless, and violent action by our possible enemy.

Experience in both World Wars has shown that men of 18 are among our bravest and best fighters; they have a strength and spirit that is both a support and an inspiration to their comrades-in-arms. But if they are to make their full contribution to our defense efforts, we must make certain that they receive adequate training and that they then be allowed to take their rightful place as a mainstay of our fighting forces, to the extent that the national interest requires.

In the present period of urgent need for enlarging our combat potential, those who were brought into the universal military service and training program would serve for a total period of 27 months, of which at least 4 would be devoted to training. As soon as the need abated, the President would have the right to cut down the service requirement and eventually to eliminate everything, except training. There would remain at all times an obligation that these young men reaching 18 devote from 4 to 6 months to training so they could be fitted into Reserve units and thus give us a durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of public alarm or complacency.

The suggestion that the term of service and training be longer than the present selective-service period of 21 months is based on the unanimous opinion of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps that 27 months is the shortest period of service that is consistent with national security in this period when so much of our effort and our personnel must be devoted to the training of men entering military duty for the first time.

It takes so long and requires such an outlay in both funds and training personnel to impart the basic military skills required in our highly mechanized military forces that the release of men in less than 27 months at this crucial stage of world history represents a major element of military weakness. The proposal that the total term of service be 27 months would apply not only to those coming in under universal military service and training, but also to those under selective service. Under the present 21-month term, men return to civilian life just at the point when their military usefulness becomes greatest. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, has estimated that we would gain nearly 50 percent in practical utility by the extra 6 months of service we recommend.

We recognize that 6 months is a long time in the lives of our young men. We make this recommendation for longer service only because we believe it is imperative to the attainment of the combat readiness we need in the tense months and years that lie ahead.

It is the recognition that our plans must be as dependable over the long haul as they are in the next year or two that makes the Department of Defense so emphatic in its belief that universal military service and training should be enacted without delay. We do not contend that there is no other way to meet the immediate manpower goals of the armed services, but we do insist that there is no other method that answers our immediate and our long-term needs with the same degree of certainty, the same economy, and the same regard for the total needs of our country, both civilian and military.

Since Washington first tried to win congressional approval for a program of universal training 150 years ago, our military effectiveness has been hampered and our survival as a Nation imperiled by the lack of trained reserves. Our desire for peace has caused us to throw aside our military strength before peace was secure, and the result has been to encourage aggression and war on the part of our potential enemies.

Universal military service and training represents the most effective, economical, and democratic answer to this problem. It avoids the necessity for maintaining over the years a large standing Army, Navy, and Air Force and thus contributes not only to a Military Establishment that is within our capacity to sustain but also keeps intact our American tradition of holding the professional military forces to the lowest level compatible with our security.

This is the time to give convincing proof both to those who hate us and those who look to us as a citadel of liberty that we have adopted a military posture that we can and will maintain for as long as it may be needed, on a basis that guarantees equality of sacrifice and that will not impose a ruinous financial drain on our productive energies.

We feel that the year between a young man's eighteenth and nineteenth birthdays is the proper year in which to begin fulfilling the obligation for service this bill would establish. This is the age that would entail the least upset in the life

of a young man and the smallest dislocation of education, industry, and family life.

At 18 most young men are finishing high school and not yet embarked on college or a life work. Few have married, and even fewer have children. They are at a transitional stage in their careers. We do not minimize the hardship it causes them or their families to have these young men enter military service, but this hardship is substantially less than that involved in calling in men after they have their roots more deeply fixed in jobs, higher education, and family or community affairs.

We would be operating too closely to the danger line if we had to satisfy our present military manpower ceiling of 3.5 million men with no changes in the present selective-service law, other than a 27-month period of service and a 1-year extension of enlistments. Any rise in casualties or any worsening of the military situation that forced an upward revision of our strength requirement would wipe out the safety margin and jeopardize attainment of the needed force.

It would, of course, be possible to call up husbands and fathers among the nonveteran group between the ages of 19 and 26, but the social damage of such a call would be incalculably greater than that involved in calling 18-year-olds, very few of whom have dependents. It would also be possible to ask congressional authorization to recall veterans, but no one could seriously argue that it was fair and democratic to recall those who have already given so much to the service of their country while these younger men remained immune from duty.

We feel that broadening the liability for service to take in 18-year-olds is not only necessary and just but, also, it will make it easier for us to build our military strength to the required levels with minimum disruption of the industrial, agricultural, scientific, and educational resources that play so substantial a part in our greatness as a Nation and a force for world betterment.

We recognize that there can be no long-range security for America in a program that denudes our industries and farms of skilled technicians or that interferes with our preeminence in science and general education. The proposed legislation contains specific safeguards intended to keep our colleges, laboratories, and industries healthy. Moreover, the calling up of 18-year-olds will considerably increase our ability to recommend deferments in the 19 to 26 group for men who possess skills that are essential to the promotion of high industrial and agricultural production or who are pursuing courses of study in fields of vital importance to both our civilian and military economy.

In recognition of the democratic principle that all military undertakings should have civilian understanding, interest, and support, provision is made for the appointment of a committee of distinguished citizens to advise the President on administration of the universal military service and training program and the welfare of men inducted under it. Similarly, all procedures for selecting students to be deferred and for supervising any program of national scholarships that might be set up to insure fullest equality of educational opportunity would be in the hands of civilian experts, rather than the military authorities.

We are mindful that the principle of equal obligation requires that every young man who can be effectively used in the Military Establishment participate in the program. Accordingly, we ask the Congress to consider the establishment in a civilian agency of a plan to assist in the rehabilitation of those who suffer from minor physical handicaps and who are desirous of making their contribution to the national welfare through induction into this program.

It is our conviction that this bill will give our country the maximum return in security for every dollar we invest in a military program that may have to be maintained at a high level for years to come.

We feel that it represents the practical way to put into effect an enduring program for the protection of our country and the defeat of aggression—a plan that is geared both to our immediate and long-term problems and that can be sustained with minimum strain on our human and industrial resources. Its adoption will be a major contribution to the strengthening of the country and the attainment of stability and peace in the world.

Respectfully submitted.

(Signed) GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

## Section IX. Section-by-Section Analysis

### SECTION 1

(a) *Changing the title of the present Selective Service Act*

This subsection changes the name of the Selective Service Act of 1948 to Universal Military Training and Service Act and revises the declarations of intent in the present Selective Service Act in order to be consistent with the purposes of the bill. In general, the act contemplates a training period of prescribed length followed by a period of service. Hence, the proposed legislation is a combination of universal training with universal service.

(b) This subsection is in the present law.

(c) This subsection is in the present law with only technical changes made.

(d) This subsection is in the present law.

(e) This subsection is in the present law.

(f) This subsection is included to establish the concept of universality contemplated by this bill.

(g) The importance of moral, religious, and spiritual values.

This subsection is new language. It is intended to reflect the intent of Congress that the realization and development of high moral, religious, and spiritual standards shall be maintained within the Armed Forces.

(b) *Repealing authorized statutory strengths of the military services*

Section 2 of the 1948 act provides for the following statutory strengths, which aggregate 2,005,882:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Army | 837, 000 plus | 110, 000 1-year enlistees |
| Navy | 666, 882 plus | 36, 000 1-year enlistees. |
| Air Force | 502, 000 plus | 15, 000 1-year enlistees. |
| Totals | 2, 005, 882 | 161, 000 |

These statutory ceilings were suspended until July 31, 1954, by Public Law 655 approved August 3, 1950. This suspension is not changed by this bill.

Although the proposed legislation would repeal section 2 of the 1948 act such action would not have the effect of permanently removing the strength ceilings of the Armed Forces, because these ceilings are prescribed in other statutes.

(c) *Lowering the induction age from 19 to 18*

The present Selective Service Act imposes an obligation for training and service on "every male citizen of the United States and every other male person residing in the United States" who is between ages 19 and 26. The proposed legislation would lower the induction age from 19 years to 18 years, thereby making the age group 18–26 liable for induction into the military service.

Elsewhere in the bill provision is made whereby registrants under age 19 shall not be inducted for service until those who are over age 19, and who are deemed by the local board to be available for induction, have been inducted.

(*d*) *Change of wording necessitated by repeal of section 2, and the authorizing of selection by age*

The present Selective Service Act authorizes the President to induct such numbers of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the personnel strength which were provided by section 2 of the act. Subsection (b) above proposes that section 2 of the act be repealed. If personnel strengths are repealed or temporarily suspended the change of wording herein recommended becomes necessary.

The proposed legislation would also specifically authorize selection and induction by age, which is essential for establishing universal military training and service.

(*e*) *Standards of physical and mental acceptability*

Under the existing law no person shall be inducted unless and until he is acceptable to the Armed Forces and his physical and mental fitness for such training has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The proposed legislation would clarify the present language of the Selective Service Act in order to assure uniformity in all standards of acceptability of *inductees* in all the Armed Forces. The present wording removes the implication that the three services could establish unilateral standards.

The need for correcting the present imbalance among the services insofar as the utilization of the different physical and mental profiles is concerned, and the congressional interest therein, is discussed in a later section of the bill.

(*f*) *Limitation as to place of assignment for individuals under age 19*

The existing law requires that individuals inducted into the Armed Forces shall be assigned to stations and units of such forces. The proposed legislation would add a safeguard that no trainee (a person who is inducted before age 19) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any installation which is located outside of the United States or to duty in a combat area during his initial period of basic training (first 4 to 6 months after induction) and that such persons be given full and adequate training.

The bill also provides that no "other member of the Armed Forces" who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the bill shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least 4 months of basic training.

It is not the intent of this provision to impose unreal or capricious restrictions on the assignment of personnel. The committee realizes that many specialists, such as physicians, dentists, railway operating personnel, repair crews, petroleum distributing units, and many other categories, do not require the same basic training as is so necessary for front-line combat troops. It would be unrealistic to insist that persons in categories such as these receive, for example, the same basic training as the individual infantryman or marine. Similarly, an adequately trained reservist who is placed on active duty should not necessarily be required to again undergo basic training, whereas a reservist who has had no previous training obviously should.

The intent of the provision is to insure that individuals whose assignment calls for actual combat with an enemy shall not be committed to action until they shall have had the basic training referred to herein.

(*g*) *Increasing the induction period*

Under the present Selective Service Act, induction is for a period of 21 consecutive months. The bill proposes to increase the induction period to 26 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged.

Provision is made elsewhere in the bill for the shortening, or the eliminating, of the period of service when such action is either directed by a concurrent resolution of the Congress or found by the President to be justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions.

(*h*) *Repeal of mandatory short-term Army enlistment*

The present Selective Service Act contains a number of provisions intended to insure a vigorous enlistment campaign. It was the intent of the Congress that by insisting upon a vigorous recruitment procedure the number of inductions could be materially reduced.

One of these provisions required that persons in the 19 to 26 age group should be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 21 months. This short-term enlistment did not apply to other military services, nor did it apply to persons under age 19 or over age 26.

The proposed legislation would repeal the provisions which require the Army to accept this short-term enlistment. Persons inductible under this bill may now apply for voluntary induction under section 4 (c) (4) of the act.

(*i*) *Periods of Reserve service*

Under the present Selective Service Act an individual who has served for less than 3 years is required to join a Reserve component and serve therein for a prescribed period of time.

The period of Reserve service required by the present law is: 3 years of service if in an organized unit; 5 years of service if not a member of an organized unit.

The proposed legislation prescribes new post-service Reserve obligation for all persons hereafter inducted, enlisted, or appointed prior to attaining 26 years of age. They are required to serve in a Reserve component for a period not to exceed 8 years (less periods of active military service).

The Secretary of a military department (and the Secretary of the Treasury) may prescribe transfer to an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program.

Persons previously transferred to a Reserve component are not covered by the new requirement but retain the obligation under which they were transferred.

Administrative flexibility is provided for equating or reducing this requirement, by regulation of the Secretary of Defense. Persons entering the service at age 26 or above are not subject to any post-service Reserve requirement. This subsection also provides authority for the release of persons on active duty who volunteer to join certain organized units of the Reserve prior to the terminal date of their period of active service in order to stimulate persons to voluntarily join the National Guard and other Reserve units which are critically short of qualified personnel.

*(j) Providing Presidential authority to reduce certain pay scales*

Under the present Selective Service Act, persons who are inducted "for training and service" receive the same pay, allowances, etc., as apply to other enlisted men of comparable grade and service.

The proposed bill provides the same pay and allowances as now exist for persons inducted into the Armed Forces but permits the President to reduce the basic pay of *trainees* to $30 for a period of not to exceed 6 months when the type or duration of training and service required hereunder is changed. During such period, however, the dependents of trainees would receive the same benefits as the dependents of persons in the lowest enlisted pay grade.

*(k) Repealing the 1-year enlistment program for 18-year-olds*

The present Selective Service Act contains a provision for the enlistment of persons between ages 18 and 19 for a period of 1 year. This 1-year period of service to be followed by 6 years of service in the Reserve components.

The actual operation of the program was of very brief duration. The proposed legislation would repeal those provisions of the 1948 act authorizing it.

The experience of the Armed Forces has revealed that the period of 1 year is insufficient to train enlistees *and* to obtain a useful amount of service from such an individual. It was also found that a program of 1-year enlistees diverted substantial numbers of personnel for training activities without providing any substantial input of trained personnel into active service for a sufficient period of time to fill the needs of the Armed Forces.

*(l) Extending the period of service for physicians, dentists, etc.*

This subsection extends the period of service for physicians, dentists, and allied specialists from 21 months in consonance with the period prescribed for inductees and reserves.

*(m) Authority to shorten the induction period*

A previous subsection of the proposed legislation lengthens the induction period from 21 months. An induction period is divided into two phases—for example, 4 months of "training," and the remaining months of "service."

(1) *Adjusting or shortening the periods of service or training.*—The proposed legislation would authorize the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, to increase the period of training to not to exceed 6 months; to decrease the remaining period of service, but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized; or to require only training without service. It provides further authority for changing or modifying the training given under the act. The President may vary his instructions with respect to different age groups, but otherwise such regulations must be uniform as to all services and as to the date of entry on active duty. This authority will permit coordination of the universal military training and service program with the needs of the Armed Forces generally.

The proposed legislation also provides that, effective at such time as the President eliminates periods of active service in the Armed Forces authorized under this title, individuals under age 19 may be inducted for not less than 4 months of training in a National Security Training Corps.

To insure that the Congress retains full authority to adjust or shorten periods of service or training, the bill also provides that such adjustment or shortening shall take place upon the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress declaring that such should be the case.

(2) *Creating a National Security Training Commission.*—This paragraph provides for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission, and specifies its general method of appointment and its general responsibility.

(*n*) *Selection by age*

(1) *Induction by age groups.*—This paragraph would amend the technical provisions relating to selection and induction to authorize selection and induction by age groups which is essential for the establishment of universal service and training.

The language in this paragraph is the same as that in the 1948 act, except that the final proviso is added at the end.

(2) *Requirement that all available persons in the 19–26 pool must be taken by the local board before 18-year-olds are inducted.*—This paragraph adds to the present language of subsection 5 (a) of the Selective Service Act of 1948 a new paragraph (2) which prohibits a local board from inducting an 18-year-old until all available persons in the 19–26 pool have been taken. The paragraph also provides that when it is necessary to take 18-year-olds to meet quotas, the older ones shall be selected first.

The prohibition against inducting 18-year-olds imposed by this paragraph ceases to operate when, at some future time, the President announces by Executive order that the required periods of active service can be eliminated, or the Congress should so declare by concurrent resolution.

The committee had originally intended to write into the bill certain legislative directives, in addition to the provisions of this paragraph, which would insure a greater utilization of the present pool of IV–F's and a more uniform utilization among the three services of the various physical and mental profiles.

It was felt by the committee that although those objectives could be accomplished administratively, the fact that they have not been so accomplished has resulted in considerable public concern, and public sentiment that the Congress should affirmatively write appropriate language into the pending bill to accomplish these reforms.

The committee has been informed by the Department of Defense that the Department of Defense is currently formulating instructions which not only will require a greater utilization of the pool of registrants now classified IV–F, but will place the three military services more nearly on a "share and share alike" basis insofar as the various mental and physical profiles are concerned, and for enlistments as well as for inductions.

The committee feels that the accomplishment of such objectives is of fundamental importance. To insure that reasonable and adequate progress toward carrying out the assurances made to the committee by the Department of Defense is made, the committee proposes to maintain a close surveillance in this field on a "watch-dog basis."

*(o) Clarifying the status of certain deferments for Reserve service; enlistments in the National Guard of persons below 18½ years of age*

(1) *Status of persons who enlist in organized units of the Reserve components subsequent to date of enactment of 1948 act.*—Individuals who became members of the Reserve components through voluntary enlistment subsequent to June 24, 1948, are not eligible for deferment under the authority of the present statute, inasmuch as they acquired their Reserve status subsequent to the date of enactment of the act. The Director of Selective Service is suspending administratively the processing of these individuals on the grounds that it would be illogical to induct them into another service. The amendment would clarify their position by placing them on a deferred status, the same as those who enlisted prior to the 1948 act.

(2) *National Guard enlistments.*—The present Selective Service Act authorizes a person who enlists in an organized unit of the National Guard prior to attaining age 18½ to be deferred from induction so long as he serves satisfactorily in such unit. The purpose of this provision of the 1948 act was to provide the National Guard with a source of personnel.

The operation of the 1948 act discloses that this provision has worked satisfactorily and has resulted in a total of perhaps 100,000 young men of this category entering the National Guard during the last 2½ years.

The proposed legislation establishes a method whereby the Secretary of Defense may terminate this enlistment program when he finds that trained men from other sources are available.

(3) *Technical amendment.*—This is a technical amendment made necessary by the two preceding paragraphs.

*(p) Merchant marine, midshipmen, and military college students*

The proposed legislation providing that Naval Reserve midshipmen attending merchant marine schools and students enrolled in military colleges which have ROTC programs and which are approved by the Secretary of Defense shall be exempt from registration and induction. These categories of students receive military training and upon graduation are commissioned in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

*(q) ROTC, college, and other programs*

(1) *Three-year program for 75,000 college students.*—This paragraph provides for the continuation of a flow of not to exceed 75,000 persons annually into educational institutions, this number to be in excess of the normal inflow provided by ROTC students, IV–F's, and draft-liable students.

It authorizes the President to relieve from active service upon completion of their initial period of training 75,000 persons enlisted or inducted into the Armed Forces for study or research in medicine, science, engineering, the humanities, or other fields determined to be of national interest. The proposed legislation requires that these individuals shall be selected by a Commission nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The appointment of this Commission is to be on a bipartisan basis; selection of individuals is to be accomplished on a competitive basis in accordance with rules and regulations established by the Commission. Further, it is the intent of

the committee that the selection processes shall be operated so as to give qualified young men from all parts of the Nation the same opportunity to compete for selection.

Within 10 years from the completion of their education or research, individuals so deferred may be reordered into active service for completion of their required period of service, unless they perform service in the national interest for an equivalent period.

This program would be under civilian control. Provision is made for the financial assistance of qualified students who need such assistance to take advantage of the program.

(2) *ROTC students.*—Persons selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, ROTC or similar programs may be deferred from induction. They must agree to accept a commission and serve 8 years after appointment (2 years on active duty or 3 years if subsidized). Such persons, however, would be required to have completed at least the equivalent of an initial period of basic training while enrolled in such programs.

(3) *Officer-candidate programs.*—The Secretary of each Military Department (and the Secretary of the Treasury) is authorized to establish officer-candidate programs. These programs are designed to give personnel not selected for one of the other comparable programs authorized under this section an opportunity for attaining commissioned status while on active duty.

The services are conducting officer-candidate programs currently, without the benefit of this specific legislative authority. The purpose of inserting this authority into the bill is to emphasize the intent of the Congress that programs of this sort, in addition to the college programs, are to be kept open.

(4) *Existing authority whereby the President may defer students is not disturbed by this legislation.*—This paragraph states that nothing in this subsection shall prejudice the President's deferment powers granted under subsection 6 (h) of the act. It is pursuant to such powers that all deferments of persons whose activity in any occupation or industry or in the fields of science, study, or research are currently being made. Comparable discretionary authority was contained in the 1940 act, which was in effect during World War II.

*(r) Liability for induction of nonveteran, nonfathers in the 19–26 group*

Subsection 6 (h) of the present Selective Service Act authorizes the President to provide for the deferment of persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable; also persons who have wives or children or wives and children with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes.

The proposed legislation amends subsection 6 (h) by removing the discretionary authority of the President to defer a married person who is a "nonveteran, nonfather."

Testimony presented to the committee indicates that there are a maximum of 290,000 nonveteran nonfathers who would be made available for induction by this change in the existing law. The committee is of the opinion that individuals in this category may very properly be required to fulfill their obligation for service, and that they should be called before the 18-year-olds.

(*s*) *Deferment of high-school and college students*

The present Selective Service Act authorizes the *postponement from induction* of a high-school student until he graduates or until he attains age 20. The proposed legislation would lower the maximum age from 20 to 19 and change the "postponement" provision to a "deferment" provision.

The present Selective Service Act also provides for a *postponement of induction* of any person pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college until the end of the academic year. This provision would provide for a deferment in lieu of a postponement.

The purpose of changing the postponement features to deferments is to remove any doubt that such persons may enlist during that period.

(*t*) *Provisions relating to certain conscientious objectors*

The Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 provided that persons found to be conscientiously opposed to noncombatant service should be assigned to work of national importance, under civilian direction. The 1948 act provided that they should be deferred.

This provision returns to the language used in the 1940 act, with the added requirement that assignment to such work of national importance shall be for the prescribed induction period—26 months.

(*u*) *Period of active duty for certain reservists*

Under the present Selective Service Act an individual who has had less than 90 days of previous active duty may be ordered into the active service for the normal induction period of 21 months.

The proposed legislation would repeal this obsolete provision in the present act.

(*v*) *Clarification of certain provisions relating to reemployment rights*

Section 9 of the 1948 act prescribes in considerable detail the reemployment rights which accrue to an individual who is enlisted or inducted into the military service. This section of the existing statute has worked very satisfactorily excepting with respect to cases which are discussed in this section of the proposed legislation.

(1) *Extending reemployment rights to persons who serve not more than 4 years.*—Under existing law reemployment rights are extended to persons who enlist for not more than 3 years. The proposed legislation would extend these rights to persons who serve for not more than 4 years. Thus it will be seen that the test is the length of time an individual serves and not the length of time for which he originally enlisted.

Under the proposed legislation an individual who enlists for 5 or 6 years but is released from service in 4 years or less would be entitled to reemployment rights; under the existing law he would not. Furthermore, under existing law an individual is entitled to reemployment rights only upon the expiration of his first enlistment after the date of enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1948. Under the proposed legislation it is immaterial how many times an individual may have enlisted after the date of enactment of that act so long as his total service does not exceed 4 years.

(2) *Clarification of what reemployment rights flow to an individual.*—Under existing law an employee of the Federal Government who is

called to active duty, but who may shortly thereafter be determined to be physically unfit and is thereupon relieved from active duty, is nevertheless entitled to reemployment benefits. These reemployment benefits in effect give him a superseniority in the Government service for a period of 1 year. The proposed legislation would deny reemployment benefits in these cases involving Federal Government employees who are determined to be physically unfit shortly after having been called to active duty.

(3) *Reinstatement rights for persons rejected for military service.*—This proposal gives for the first time reinstatement rights to those persons who leave private or Federal employment to enter the Armed Forces, but who are rejected by such forces. As written, the proposed legislation provides these reinstatement rights shall also be applicable to persons who leave private or Federal employment for the purpose of induction into, entering, determining their physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces. The proposed legislation provides for the reinstatement of such persons provided they make "prompt application" therefor.

(*w*) *Nonapplicability of certain laws*

The present Selective Service Act exempts uncompensated officials of the Selective Service System and individuals appointed to conduct hearings on certain appeals from certain laws applying to Government officials.

The proposed legislation would include members of the National Selective Service Appeal Board within such exemption.

(*x*) *Changes in definitions*

The proposed legislation would add to the present definition section in the Selective Service Act of 1948 definitions of the following terms:

active service and training
trainee
initial period of training
inductee.

(*y*) *Termination provisions*

(*a*) *Provisions in case of conflict with existing law.*—Section 17 (a) of the present Selective Service Act suspends all laws which are in conflict with the provisions of such act, to the extent of such conflict, for *the period in which the act shall be in force*. The proposed bill will remove the italicized portion from the present language.

As section 17 (b) of the present Selective Service Act now stands it enumerates the portions of the act which shall remain in force after the act itself shall have become inoperative *and prescribes the termination date*. Originally the termination date was to be the second anniversary of the date of enactment, which would have been June 24, 1950. This termination date was extended to July 9, 1951, by the Selective Service Extension Act of 1950. The proposed legislation omits this subsection of the present Selective Service Act, thereby making the act permanent legislation with no termination date.

(*b*) *Authority for appropriations.*—The authority for appropriation language contained in section 17 (c) of the present Selective Service Act is not changed by the proposed legislation except that a sentence has been added which provides that funds appropriated for the adminis-

trative expenses for the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission.

(z) *Extending present authority to order Reserve components to active Federal service*

The present Selective Service Act originally contained no authority whereby Reserve components could be ordered to active Federal service excepting the rather limited authority contained in section 7 of the original act referring to those reservists who had previously had less than 90 days of active service.

The Selective Service Extension Act of 1950 added to the original statute an additional section which authorized the ordering to 21 months active Federal service of the Reserve components effective until July 9, 1951.

The proposed legislation would extend the effective date of this authority from July 9, 1951, to July 1, 1953. It would also extend the mandatory period of service from 21 months to conform to previous changes recommended by the proposed legislation—26 months.

MISCELLANEOUS TERMINATION DATES

*Section 2. Extension of volunteer enlistments*

The act of July 27, 1950, authorizes the President to extend all enlistments for a period of 12 months; this authority expires on July 9, 1951. As a consequence, an enlistment expiring at any time prior to July 9, 1951, could be extended for a period of 12 months. Enlistments expiring after that date could not be extended.

Section 2 (a) of the proposed legislation would move the expiration date of this extension authority from July 9, 1951, to July 1, 1953. It would also provide that no enlistment which had been extended under the previous authority could again be extended for any additional period.

Section 2 (b) would extend Public Law 779 of the Eighty-first Congress which authorizes the induction of physicians, dentists, and specialists until July 1, 1953.

*Section 3. Strength limitations for female personnel*

Existing law fixes a percentage strength for women in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps by prescribing that not to exceed 2 percent of the authorized personnel total should be women.

Section 3 of the proposed legislation removes this percentage limitation.

*Section 4. Effect on persons now serving on active duty*

Section 5 of the proposed legislation provides that increases in period of service for any category shall apply to persons in such category who are serving on active duty on the date of enactment.

*Section 5. Separability*

This section is a routine separability clause.

*Section 6. Short title*

This section provides that the bill, if enacted, shall be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".

*Title II. Expanding the present authority for the enlistment of aliens*

Under existing law authority is given for the enlistment of a total of 2,500 aliens in the Armed Forces. The law is effective for 3 years. Under the terms of this bill, the law would be effective for 5 years and the authority would be enlarged so as to permit the enlistment of not to exceed 25,000 aliens per year. Since the statute would expire in 5 years, the maximum number so enlisted would be 125,000.

To insure that this program is not regarded as a substitute for the steps recommended by other sections of the bill, this provision appears as a distinctly separate provision.

## Changes in Existing Law

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows: Existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

The Selective Service Act of 1948:

### TITLE I

Section 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the [“Selective Service Act of 1948”.] *“Universal Military Training and Service Act”.*

(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the [armed forces and the reserve] *Armed Forces, including the Reserve* components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system [of selection] which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both [Ground and Air] *ground and air*, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both [Ground and Air] *ground and air*, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible *development and* utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

*(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.*

*(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command.*

[AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS]

[SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active-duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand plus one hundred ten thousand one-year enlistees; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two, plus thirty-six thousand one-year enlistees; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand plus fifteen thousand one-year enlistees. The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year.]

REGISTRATION

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

TRAINING AND SERVICE

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of [nineteen] *eighteen* and twenty-six, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of [nineteen] *eighteen* after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the armed forces of the United States. Any citizen of a foreign country, who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the armed forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (*including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups*) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain [the personnel strengths (other than one-year enlistee personnel strengths) of the respective armed forces authorized by section 2 of this title and such number of persons as in his judgment may be required for the United States Coast Guard] *adequate Armed Forces.*

No person shall be inducted *into the Armed Forces* for training and service under this title [unless and] until [he is acceptable to the Armed Forces for such training and service and] *his acceptability in all respects* (*including* his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury *with respect to the United States Coast Guard*).

No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provisions shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury to be essential to public and personal health.

The persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps or the United States Coast Guard, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the

Air Force of the United States. *Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Forces into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least four months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.*

No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) *of this section* shall serve [in the armed forces for a period of twenty-one consecutive months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury.] *on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-six consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.*

(c) [(1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.]

(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided,* That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of department concerned: *And provided further,* That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component.

(3) The passing requirement for the General Classification Test shall be fixed at seventy points.

(4) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the armed forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

(d) (1) Each person who hereafter *and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act* is inducted, enlisted, or appointed (except a person enlisted under subsection (g) of this section) and serves for a period of less than three years in one of the armed forces and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed force in which he serves, shall be transferred to a reserve component of such armed force, and until the expiration of a period of five years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter *and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act* be prescribed by law for such reserve component: *Provided,* That any such person who completes at least twenty-one months of service in the armed forces and who thereafter serves satisfactorily (1) on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least one year, which extension is hereby authorized, or (2) in an organized unit of any reserve component of any of the armed forces for a period of at least thirty-six consecutive months, shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such person, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces.

(2) Each person who hereafter *and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act* is enlisted under the provisions

of subsection (g) of this section and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed forces shall, upon discharge from such enlistment under honorable conditions, be transferred to a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of six years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall, so long as he is a member of such reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty, but except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress no such person shall be ordered to active duty, without his consent and except as hereinafter provided, for more than one month in any year. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can without undue hardship be filled by, any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program and to serve satisfactorily therein for a period of four years. Any such person who fails or refuses to perform such duty may be ordered to active duty, without his consent, for an additional period of not more than twelve consecutive months. Any such person who enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit and serves satisfactorily therein for a period of four years shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such person, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the transfer of such persons within and between reserve components of the armed forces and determining, for the purpose of the requirements of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the credit to be allowed any person so transferring for his previous service in one or more reserve components.

*(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force.*

(e) With respect to the persons inducted *into the Armed Forces* for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, *for training and service*, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other [enlisted men] *members of the uniformed services* of like grades and length of service of that component of the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* to which they are assigned, *except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate*

*of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950, plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.* Section 3 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: "Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148, ch. 166), as amended". The Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended, is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this title.

(f) Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted into the armed forces of the United States for training and service under this title, or to members of reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction or order to active duty, were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

[(g) Subject to the authorized one-year enlistee active duty personnel strengths established by section 2 of this title for the respective armed forces, the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of one year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of eighteen and nineteen.

(h) No person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (g) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.]

(i) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, except subsections 6 (j) and 6 (o), the President is authorized to require special registration of and, on the basis of requisitions submitted by the Department of Defense and approved by him, to make special calls for male persons qualified in needed—

(A) medical and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of fifty at the time of registration, and

(B) dental and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of fifty at the time of registration.

Persons called hereunder shall be liable for induction for not to exceed [twenty-one] *twenty-six* months of service in the Armed Forces. No such person who is a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces shall, so long as he remains a member thereof, be liable for registration or induction under this subsection, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the President under any other provision of law to call to active duty members and units of the reserve components. No person in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the fifty-first anniversary of the date of his birth.

(2) In registering and inducting persons pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President shall, to the extent that he considers practicable and desirable, register and induct in the following order of priority:

First. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the categories referred to in clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection, who have had less than ninety days of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

Second. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the above categories, who have had ninety days or more but less than twenty-one

months of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

Third. Those who did not have active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940.

Fourth. Those not included in the first and second priority who have had active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940. Inductions of persons in this priority shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President which may provide for the classification of such persons into groups according to the number of full months of such service which they have had and for the induction of the members of any such group after the induction of the members of any other such group having a lesser number of full months of such service.

In the selection of individuals from among the categories established by subsection (i) for induction, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment of any individual whose deferment is found to be equitable and in the national interest, taking into consideration the length of his previous service in the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service) of the United States, the extent of his participation in the Army specialized training program or similar program administered by the Navy, reasons of hardship or dependency, and the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

(3) It is the sense of the Congress that the President shall provide for the annual deferment from training and service under this title of numbers of optometry students and premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preoptometry, and predental students at least equal to the numbers of male optometry, premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preoptometry, and predental students in attendance at colleges and universities in the United States at the present levels, as determined by the Director.

(j) The President shall establish a National Advisory Committee which shall advise the Selective Service System and shall coordinate the work of such State and local volunteer advisory committees as may be established to cooperate with the National Advisory Committee, with respect to the selection of needed medical and dental and allied specialist categories of persons as referred to in subsection (i). The members of the National Advisory Committee shall be selected from among individuals who are outstanding in medicine, dentistry, and the sciences allied thereto, but except for the professions of medicine and dentistry, it shall not be mandatory that all such fields of endeavor be represented on the committee.

In the performance of their functions, the National Advisory Committee and the State and local volunteer advisory committees shall give appropriate consideration to the respective needs of the Armed Forces and of the civilian population for the services of medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel; and, in determining the medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel available to serve the needs of any community, such committees shall give appropriate consideration to the availability in such community of medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel who have attained the fifty-first anniversary of their birth.

*(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed six months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—*

*(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of four months but not in excess of six months which may be designated in such resolution;*

*(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted unaer this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-six months which may be designated in such resolution; or*

*(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,*

*the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than four months.*

*(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.*

SELECTION

SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.*

*(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—*

*(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and*

*(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction.*

(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for training and service under this title shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia, and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the sub-

divisions thereof, who are liable for such training and service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

DEFERMENT AND EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; *midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;* members of the reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4 (b).

(b) (1) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of twelve months or more, or between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, for a period in excess of ninety days, in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(2) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of ninety days or more but less than twelve months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, if—

(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in any organized unit of a reserve component of the armed force in which he served, provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities (including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled), or in a reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of such armed force in any case in which enlistment or commission in an organized unit of a reserve component of such armed force is not available to him; or

(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a reserve component of such armed force is not available to him or that he has voluntarily enlisted or accepted appointment in an organized unit of a reserve component of an armed force other than the armed force in which he served.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to be applicable to any person to whom paragraph (1) of this subsection is applicable.

(3) No person who after the date of enactment of this title is honorably discharged upon the completion of a period of three years or more of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(4) No person who is honorably discharged upon the completion of an enlistment pursuant to section 4 (c) or section 4 (g) shall be liable for induction for

training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(5) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, no credit shall be allowed for—

(A) periods of active-duty training performed as a member of a reserve component pursuant to an order or call to active duty solely for training purposes;

(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized-training program, the Army Air Force college-training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such academies; or

(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

(c) (1) Persons who, on [the effective date of this title,] *February 1, 1951,* were members of organized units of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, shall, so long as they continue to be such members and satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, be exempt from training and service by induction under the provisions of this title, but shall not be exempt from registration unless on active duty.

(2) (A) In any case in which the Governor of any State determines and issues a proclamation to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of his State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons referred to in subsection 6 (b) (2) or persons who are not liable for training and service under this title, any person who prior to attaining the age of eighteen years and six months, *prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,* enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such organized unit.

(B) Except as provided in subsection (b), *paragraph (1) of this subsection,* or clause (A) of this paragraph, no person who shall become a member of a reserve component after the effective date of this title shall thereby be exempt from registration or training and service by induction under the provisions of this title.

[(d) (1) Any person who, on the effective date of this title, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.

(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) on or after the effective date of this title, is selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or who, on or after the effective date of this title, is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, and (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.]

*(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active*

*training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.*

*(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission, and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.*

*(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.*

*(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.*

(e) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, or Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period

covered by the agreement but not to exceed four months, from induction for training and service under this title but shall not be exempt from registration.

(f) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States.

(g) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, as defined in this title, and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools, or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, shall be exempt from training and service (but not from registration) under this title.

(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (*other than wives alone*) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have [wives or] children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, [is ordered to report for induction under this title prior to his graduation from such school or institution,] shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, [have his induction under this title postponed] *be deferred* (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the [twentieth] *nineteenth* anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. [The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this paragraph beyond the date so determined.]

(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, [of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this title,] shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, [have his induction under this title postponed] *be deferred* (A) until the end of [such] *the* academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed

under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.

(j) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, [be deferred] *in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction.* Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this title, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, [he shall be deferred] *he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction.* If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

(k) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from training and service, under this title, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(l) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one shall be discharged from service in the armed forces of the United States while this title is in effect because such person entered such service without the consent of his parent or guardian.

(m) No person shall be relieved from training and service under this title by reason of conviction of a criminal offense, except where the offense of which he has been convicted may be punished by death, or by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made under subsection (h) of this section may, within five days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

(o) Where one or more sons or daughters of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurre dduring such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this title.

[ACTIVE DUTY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS]

[SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this title, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, without their consent and for a period not to exceed twenty-one

consecutive months each, members (other than those exempted or deferred from training and service under the provisions of section 6 (c)) of any or all reserve components of the armed forces of the United States who shall have had less than ninety days' continuous active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty. No member of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall be ordered into the active service of the armed forces of the United States under this section unless the governor of such State or Territory, or the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard in the case of a member of the District of Columbia National Guard, has consented to the ordering into active service of the armed forces of the United States of members of the National Guard of his State, Territory, or District, as the case may be, in accordance with such program or programs as may have been mutually agreed upon. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or abridge any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of reserve components of the armed forces into active service.]

BOUNTIES; SUBSTITUTES; PURCHASES OF RELEASE

SEC. 8. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for training and service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training and service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for training and service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such training and service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such training and service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training and service or liability therefor.

SEPARATION FROM SERVICE; REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

SEC. 9. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of training and service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of training and service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service, and upon the completion of his period of training and service under this title, each such person shall be given another physical examination and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such training and service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, and (2) makes application for reemployment within ninety days after he is relieved from such training and service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year—

(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall—

(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case;

(B) if such position was in the employ of a private employer, such person shall—

(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of such employer or his successor in interest, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case,

unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should—

(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case.

(c) (1) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of training and service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time such person was inducted into such forces, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within one year after such restoration.

(2) It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) should be so restored in such manner as to give him such status in his employment as he would have enjoyed if he had continued in such employment continuously from the time of his entering the armed forces until the time of his restoration to such employment.

(d) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) or subsection (c) (1), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party respondent to any such action.

(e) (1) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by any Territory or possession, or political subdivision thereof, or by the District of Columbia, shall be so restored by such agency or the successor to its functions, or by such Territory, possession, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia. In any case in which, upon appeal of any person who was employed immediately before entering the armed forces by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by the District of Columbia, the United States Civil Service Commission finds that—

(A) such agency is no longer in existence and its functions have not been transferred to any other agency; or

(B) for any reason it is not feasible for such person to be restored to employment by such agency or by the District of Columbia,

the Commission shall determine whether or not there is a position in any other agency in the executive branch of the Government or in the government of the District of Columbia for which such person is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position, such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists or by the government of the District of Columbia, as the case may be. The Commission is authorized and directed to issue regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this section insofar as they relate to persons entitled to be restored to positions in the executive branch of the Government or in the government of the District of Columbia, including persons entitled to be restored under the last sentence of paragraph (2) of this subsection. The agencies in the executive branch of the Government and the government of the District of Columbia shall comply with such rules and regulations and orders issued by the Commission pursuant to this subsection. The Commission is authorized and directed whenever it finds, upon appeal of the person concerned, that any agency in the executive branch of the Government or the government of the District of Columbia has failed or refuses to comply with the provisions of this section, to issue an order specifically requiring such agency or the government of the District of Columbia to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with such provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment, unemployment compensation, or readjustment allowances: *Provided*, That any such compensation ordered to be paid by the Commission shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the agency concerned or by the government of the District of Columbia out of appropriations currently available for salary and expenses of such agency or government, and such appropriations shall be available for such purpose. As used in this paragraph, the term "agency in the executive branch of the Government" means any department, independent establishment, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the United States Government.

(2) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the legislative branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces. In any case in which it is not possible for any such person to be restored to a position in the legislative branch of the Government and he is otherwise eligible to acquire a status for transfer to a position in the classified (competitive) civil service in accordance with section 2 (b) of the Act of November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1212), the United States Civil Service Commission shall, upon appeal of such person, determine whether or not there is a position in the executive branch of the Government for which he is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists.

(3) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the judicial branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces.

(f) In any case in which two or more persons who are entitled to be restored to a position under the provisions of this section or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits left the same position in order to enter the armed forces, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right to be restored thereto, without prejudice to the reemployment rights of the other person or persons to be restored.

(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to [the date of enactment of this title and while it is in effect,] *June 24, 1948*, enlists in the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* of the United States (other than in a [reserve] *Reserve* component) *and who serves* for not more than [three] *four* years (*plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law*) shall[, if such enlistment is his first enlistment in the armed forces subsequent to the date of enactment of this title,] be entitled upon [the expiration of his enlistment (including any extension thereof by law but not including any voluntary extension thereof) or upon his discharge] *release*

*rom service* under honorable conditions [prior to the expiration thereof,] to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

(2) Any person who, subsequent to [the effective date of this title and while it is in effect,] *June 24, 1948*, enters upon active duty (*other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness*), *whether or not voluntarily*, in the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than [three] *four* years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such [three] *four* years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

*(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated.*

(h) The Secretary of Labor, through the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, shall render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States or the Public Health Service. In rendering such aid, the Secretary shall use the then existing Federal and State agencies engaged in similar or related activities and shall utilize the assistance of volunteers.

(i) Any person inducted into the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than one day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election. No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, be required to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

(j) The Secretaries of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Treasury shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM; CONSTRUCTION; CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

SEC. 10. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

(3) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the Act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That, effective upon the termination of this title and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (A) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the

effective date of this title, (B) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for liquidating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (C) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

(b) The President is authorized—

(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title;

(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and for the District of Columbia, who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System; to employ such number of civilians, and to order to active duty with their consent and to assign to the Selective Service System such officers of the selective-service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments and such other officers of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States or other armed forces personnel (including personnel of the reserve components thereof), as may be necessary for the administration of the national and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System;

(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other civilian agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, classification, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this title, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this title. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political supdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the President determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation. Any such intercounty local board shall have within its area the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States. but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, or separate panels thereof each consisting of three or more members, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, have the power within the respective jurisdictions of such local boards to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local board shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training and service under this title, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records

or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from training and service, as provided for in this title by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

(4) to appoint, and to fix, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any reserve component thereof with his consent, or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this title (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 10 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the armed forces or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof, and the District of Columbia, and of private welfare organizations, in the execution of this title;

(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, with or without advertising or formal contract;

(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this title, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this title;

(8) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purpose, to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease pursuant to existing statutes, except that the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this title;

(9) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge such existing installations; to construct, install, and equip, and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of such buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances (including the necessary grading and removal, repair or remodeling of existing structures and installations), as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this title, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended;

(10) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this title, such personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof with their consent, and such civilian personnel, as may be necessary. For the purposes of this title, the provisions of section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress) with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees shall not be applicable to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this title, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

(d) In the administration of this title, gifts of supplies, equipment, and voluntary services may be accepted.

(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this title.

(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE

SEC. 11. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, funds available to carry out the provisions of this title shall also be available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization, of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this title, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

PENALTIES

SEC. 12. (a) Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this title, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said title, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant to this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise, with the administration of this title or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this title unless such person has been actually inducted for the training and service prescribed under this title or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this title. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

(b) Any person (1) who knowingly transfers or delivers to another, for the purpose of aiding or abetting the making of any false identification or representation, any registration certificate, alien's certificate of nonresidence, or any other certificate issued pursuant to or prescribed by the provisions of this title, or rules or regulations promulgated hereunder; or (2) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, has in his possession any such certificate not duly issued to him; or (3) who forges, alters, or in any manner changes any such certificate or any notation duly and validly inscribed thereon; or (4) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, photographs, prints, or in any manner makes or executes any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any such certificate, or any colorable imitation thereof; or (5) who has in his possession any certificate purporting to be a certificate issued pursuant to this title, or rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, which he knows to be falsely made, reproduced, forged, counterfeited, or altered; or (6) who knowingly violates or evades any of the provisions of this title or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto relating

to the issuance, transfer, or possession of such certificate, shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $10,000 or be imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of any certificate not duly issued to him, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to establish an intent to use such certificate for purposes of false identification or representation, unless the defendant explains such possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS

SEC. 13. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections *or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board.*

(b) All functions performed under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such Act.

(c) In computing the lump-sum payments made to Air Force reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 16, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 300a), and to reserve officers of the Navy or to their beneficiaries under section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1942, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 850k), no credit shall be allowed for any period of active service performed from the effective date of this title to the date on which this title shall cease to be effective. Each such lump-sum payment shall be prorated for a fractional part of a year of active service in the case of any reserve officer subject to the provisions of either such section, if such reserve officer performs continuous active service for one or more years (inclusive of such service performed during the period in which this title is effective) and such active service includes a fractional part of a year immediately prior to the effective date of this title, or immediately following the date on which this title shall cease to be effective, or both.

CIVIL RELIEF

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the Act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), and the provisions of section 4 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall be applicable to all persons in the armed forces of the United States, including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this title or the Public Health Service, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent Act of the Congress: *Provided*, That, with respect to persons inducted into the armed forces while this title is in effect, wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while such Act is in force, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

NOTICE OF TITLE; VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS

SEC. 15. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this title upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

(c) If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(d) Except as provided in section 4 (c) or section 4 (g), nothing contained in this title shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, except that no person shall be accepted for enlistment after he has received orders to report for induction and except that, whenever the Congress or the President has declared that the national interest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. When used in this title—

(a) The term "between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six" shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

(b) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "armed forces" shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard.

(d) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(e) The term "local board" shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

(f) The term "Director" shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

(g) (1) The term "duly ordained minister of religion" means a person who has been ordained, in accordance with the ceremonial, ritual, or discipline of a church, religious sect, or organization established on the basis of a community of faith and belief, doctrines and practices of a religious character, to preach and to teach the doctrines of such church, sect, or organization and to administer the rites and ceremonies thereof in public worship, and who as his regular and customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion and administers the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of such church, sect, or organization.

(2) The term "regular minister of religion" means one who as his customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, a religious sect, or organization of which he is a member, without having been formally ordained as a minister of religion, and who is recognized by such church, sect, or organization as a regular minister.

(3) The term "regular or duly ordained minister of religion" does not include a person who irregularly or incidentally preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, religious sect, or organization and does not include any person who may have been duly ordained a minister in accordance with the ceremonial, rite, or discipline of a church, religious sect, or organization, but who does not regularly, as a vocation, teach and preach the principles of religion and administer the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of his church, sect, or organization.

(h) The term "organized unit," when used with respect to a reserve component, shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof are required satisfactorily to participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(i) The term "reserve components of the armed forces" shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be deemed to include the federally recognized National Guard of the United States, the federally recognized Air National Guard of the United States, the Officers Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and shall include, in addition to the foregoing the Public Health Service Reserve when serving with the armed forces.

*(j) The terms "active training and service" shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; "trainee" shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anni-*

*versary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; "initial period of basic training" or "initial basic training" shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; "inductee" shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service.*

TERMINATION OF TITLE

SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title[,] all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby [suspended] *repealed* to the extent of such conflict. [for the period in which this title shall be in force.]

[(b) All of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 2, the second sentence of section 4 (a), section 4 (b), sections 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), 14, and 17 (b), shall become inoperative and cease to apply on July 9, 1951, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.]

*(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by Departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated Departments and agencies.*

[(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.]

UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

SEC. 18. (a) Whenever the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces of the United States, or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

(b) It shall be the duty of any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may prescribe, and (2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible.

(c) In case any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) refuses or fails—

(1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may have prescribed;

(2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible as determined by the President;

(3) to produce the kind or quality of articles or materials ordered; or

(4) to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as shall be negotiated between such person and the Government agency concerned; or in the event of failure to negotiate a price, to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as

he may subsequently be determined to be entitled to receive under subsection (d);

the President is authorized to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility of such person and to operate it, through any Government agency, for the production of such articles or materials as may be required by the Government.

(d) Fair and just compensation shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to render inapplicable to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession is taken pursuant to subsection (c) any State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, or employment standards of employees.

(f) Any person, or any officer of any person as defined in this section, who willfully fails or refuses to carry out any duty imposed upon him by subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years, or by a fine of not more than $50,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine.

(g) (1) As used in this section—

(A) The term "person" means any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or other form of business organization.

(B) The term "Government agency" means any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation in the Executive branch of the United States Government.

(2) For the purposes of this section, a plant, mine, or other facility shall be deemed capable of producing any articles or materials if it is then producing or furnishing such articles or materials or if the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it can be readily converted to the production or furnishing of such articles or materials.

(h) (1) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available, to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries having orders for steel products or steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each six-month period following the date of enactment of this Act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the Armed Forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 per centum.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 19. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 20. This title shall become effective immediately; except that unless the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares a national emergency after the date of enactment of this Act, no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this title within ninety days after the date of its enactment. The Secretary of the Army, for the Army and the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, for the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Secretary of the Treasury, for the Coast Guard, are hereby authorized and directed

to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strengths.

AUTHORITY TO ORDER RESERVE COMPONENTS TO ACTIVE FEDERAL SERVICE

SEC. 21. Until [July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended,] *July 1, 1953*, the President shall be authorized to order into the active military or naval service of the United States for a period of not to exceed [twenty-one] *twenty-six* consecutive months, with or without their consent, any or all members and units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces.

Act of July 27, 1950 (authorizing the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces):

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That until [July 9, 1951] *July 9, 1953*, the President shall be authorized to extend all enlistments in any component of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, and the United States Marine Corps, including the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, and in any component of the Air Force of the United States for a period of not to exceed twelve months: *Provided,* That all persons whose terms of enlistments are extended in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall continue during such extensions to be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the government of their respective service. *No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act.*

Act of September 9, 1950 (authorizing induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories):

SEC. 7. This Act, except for section 2 and section 5, shall terminate on [July 9, 1951] *July 1, 1953.*

Act of August 3, 1950 (suspending restrictions on personnel strength of the Armed Forces):

That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including *sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371)*, section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and section 2, title I, of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (Public Law 604, Eighty-first Congress), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

Act of June 30, 1950 (providing for enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army):

That, with the approval of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe, is authorized [until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed two thousand five hundred] *until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed twenty-five thousand* qualified unmarried male aliens (without dependents as defined in section 4 of the Act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 361), as amended), who are not less than eighteen years of age or more than thirty-five years of age; and, with the approval of the Secretary of State to accept reenlistment of any such alien upon the expiration of his original term of enlistment for such period or periods as the Secretary of the Army may determine: *Provided,* That persons enlisted under the provisions of this Act shall be integrated into established units with citizen soldiers and not segregated into separate organizations for aliens.

SEC. 3. So much of section 2 of the Act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads "; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until [June 30, 1953] *June 30, 1955*, with respect to enlistments made under section 1 of this Act.

O

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

[Report No. 117]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 8, 1951

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MALONE) (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

FEBRUARY 21 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951

Reported by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, with amendments

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

# A BILL

To provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* ~~That (a) the Congress declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy;~~

~~(b) the Congress further declares—~~

~~(1) that to provide the common defense for which the Constitution of the United States was ordained and~~

established, every male citizen of the United States and every other male person residing in the United States owes to our country an obligation to undergo training which will fit him to contribute to its protection in time of emergency;

(2) that adequate preparedness will prevent wars against this country and the needless sacrifice of human life; and

(3) that a citizenry trained for defense is the bulwark of democracy and the keystone of preparedness and can best be assured through youth training for national security.

TITLE I—UNIVERSAL TRAINING

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "National Security Training Act of 1951".

SEC. 102. There is hereby established the National Security Training Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall consist of five members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No member of the Regular services of the Armed Forces (active or retired) of the United States shall be eligible to serve on the Commission. Not more than three members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The President shall select the

Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. The Commission shall report directly to the President. The Commission shall cause a seal to be made of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

SEC. 103. The civilian member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum, and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,000 per annum. The military member shall receive the pay and allowances to which he is otherwise entitled by law. The civilian members shall serve for terms of three years.

SEC. 104. The Commission shall have an executive director who shall be the principal executive officer thereof. The executive director shall be appointed from civilian life by the Commission and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum. No member of the Commission shall be eligible to serve as executive director. The executive director shall perform such duties in connection with executing the functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. For this purpose any power, function, or duty of the Commission may, at the direction of the Commission, be exercised or performed by the executive director.

SEC. 105. Subject to the direction of the President, the Commission shall:

(a) Establish such policies and standards and issue such directives as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title and all agencies authorized to carry out any of the purposes of this title shall be governed thereby; and

(b) Provide for ascertaining the manner in which the authorized agencies carry out the functions assigned to them through a system of civilian inspection. No agency conducting training under the terms of this title shall deny to a person being trained the right of access to a member of such inspection system.

SEC. 106. The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such civilian personnel as are necessary for the performance of its functions. Civilian personnel required for the execution of this title may be employed notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the Act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946" (60 Stat. 216), with respect to the maximum limitation as to the number of civilian employees.

SEC. 107. The Commission may exercise any of its functions through such officials or agencies as it may designate.

SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby created within the Commission a National Security Training Advisory Board which shall consist of a civilian Chairman and not less than ten nor more than twenty-five other members appointed by the Chairman of the Commission, three of whom shall be members of the Armed Forces designated by the Secretary of Defense. The Chairman and other civilian members of the Board shall serve for such terms as the Commission shall prescribe and shall, while actually serving with the Board, receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Board pursuant to authorization of the Board, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their office. The members of the Armed Forces shall receive the pay and allowances to which they are otherwise entitled by law.

(b) The National Security Training Advisory Board shall advise the Commission, with particular attention to the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of universal training, and shall undertake such investigations and studies as requested by the Commission.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

SEC. 109. There is hereby created the National Security Training Corps of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"), to be composed of male persons who shall be inducted into it for training as hereinafter provided. Members of the corps shall be organized, administered, and trained by training agencies as provided herein, in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

SEC. 110. (a) An individual shall be considered to have been inducted into the corps and to have become a member thereof upon taking and subscribing to the following oath or affirmation:

"As a member of the National Security Training Corps, I, , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States of America and that I will obey the ords of the officers or other persons appointed over me according to law. So help me God."

(b) A member of the corps shall be subject to rules and regulations pertaining thereto: *Provided,* That he shall be subject to the Code of Conduct only while assigned to active training duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 111. (a) Service in the corps shall consist of

~~active training duty and inactive training duty. The first day of active training duty shall be the day of induction into the corps. Upon successful completion of basic training as prescribed herein, each member of the corps shall be furnished by the training agency with a certificate of completion of basic training. Such members shall be ordered to inactive training duty by the training agency as of that date and shall remain on inactive training duty while pursuing any alternative program provided by section 125 (c) except the alternative training provided by section 125 (c) (1).~~

~~(b) Upon successful completion of an alternative program, the member shall be discharged from the corps and shall be furnished in every case with a certificate of discharge issued by the training agency concerned.~~

~~(c) The Commission shall make provision for the types and conditions of discharges to be executed, which shall include: Honorable; general; undesirable; bad conduct; and dishonorable: *Provided,* That members of the corps assigned to military training shall be given a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge only as provided in the Code of Conduct: *Provided further,* That members of the corps not assigned to military training shall be given a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge in those cases where a district court of the United States, the Territories, possessions, or the District~~

of Columbia, or courts of the several States, have sentenced a member to imprisonment for one year or more.

SEC. 112. Upon discharge of a member from the corps, he shall not be subject to any further training or service under the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall in any way limit or prohibit the call to active service in the Armed Forces of any person who is a member of a Regular or Reserve component of the Armed Forces: *Provided, further.* That the execution of a bad-conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall forfeit any right to credit by the member for time served in training, but shall not prevent the member, upon the recommendation of the training agency concerned, from being reinducted for all or part of the training prescribed herein.

SEC. 113. Each member shall be paid, by the training agency to which he is assigned, a cash allowance during his active training duty at the rate of $30.00 per month; and under regulations prescribed by the training agency concerned, shall be furnished (1) necessary transportation, including transportation from his home to the place of induction and training and return, (2) quarters and subsistence or a monetary allowance in lieu thereof at a rate not to exceed the rate provided for enlisted members of the Armed Forces, (3) clothing and equipment, (4) hos-

pitalization, surgical, medical, and dental care, and other necessary services and supplies.

SEC. 114. (a) The head of the training agency concerned shall prescribe the uniform for members of the corps in training under his agency and the conditions under which it shall be worn, which uniform shall include distinctive insignia prescribed by the Commission and may include devices to denote grade or rank.

(b) Subject to regulations of the head of the training agency concerned, members may, upon termination of active training duty, be authorized to retain clothing and equipment. Members discharged otherwise than honorably, may be authorized to retain underclothing, toilet articles, and nondistinctive articles of outer clothing and may be furnished such civilian outer clothing as may be necessary.

SEC. 115. (a) Upon the application of a member of the corps in proper form or of any dependent of such member as hereinafter defined, a dependency allowance shall be paid, by the training agency to which he is assigned, to his dependents during the period of active training duty in the corps. The allowance shall be computed from the first day of the month in which an application is made and shall end on the last day of active training duty or on the last day of the month in which notice of termination of or cessation of

dependency is received by the disbursing officer making payment of the allowance, whichever date occurs first: *Provided,* That the total number of payments shall not exceed the total number of months actually served on active training duty in the corps by the member thereof. The dependency allowance shall be paid without regard to the pay status of the member while on active training duty: *Provided,* That if a member shall remain absent without leave for a period of thirty days, the allowance may be terminated by the head of the training agency concerned, or officer or person designated by him for that purpose.

(b) A dependent within the meaning of this section is:

(1) A lawful wife including a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable.

(2) A child including: (a) a child legally adopted in accordance with the laws of the State, Territory, or country in which the adoption took place; (b) a stepchild if in fact dependent on the member for his or her chief support, including a stepchild who after death of the natural parent or termination of marriage is in fact dependent on the member for his or her chief support; (c) an illegitimate child, but only if the member has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support or has been judicially decreed to be the putative

father of such child, or has acknowledged in writing under oath that he is the father of such child; (d) a child to whom the member stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than twelve months prior to the date of application on behalf of such child: *Provided,* That the dependency of such child such be considered to commence at the expiration of such twelve-month period.

(3) Parent including a father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the member or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than one year prior to the member's entry or active training duty stood in loco parentis to the member concerned: *Provided,* That such parent is dependent upon the member for his or her chief support.

(c) The dependency allowance shall be paid without a reduction or charge to the cash allowance of the member in the following amounts:

(1) for one dependent, $50 per month;

(2) for two or more dependents, $65 per month.

(d) The determination of all facts, including the fact of dependency, in the administration of this section shall be made by the local board with whom the member is registered, and shall not be subject to review in any court or by

any accounting officer of the Government. Such local board may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this section whenever it finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this section unless such erroneous payment or overpayment be determined to have been made as a result of gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States. No recovery shall be made from any person authorizing any erroneous payment under this section unless such payment or overpayment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

(c) The monthly dependency allowances payable under the provisions of this title shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom they are paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, garnishment, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatsoever.

(f) Whoever shall obtain or aid others to obtain or receive any dependency allowance or payment under this section, without being entitled thereto and with intent to

defraud, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year or both.

(g) Whoever in any claim for dependency allowance or in any document required by this section or by regulations made under this section makes any statement of a material fact, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

(h) Any person who has been entitled to payment of a dependency allowance under this section and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance with the intent to defraud, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

(i) No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any dependency allowance payable under this section. Any person violating or causing a violation of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

SEC. 116. Members of the corps shall, during active training duty, be entitled to the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. The terms "persons in military service" and "period of military service" in section 101 of the cited Act shall be deemed to include members of the corps on active training duty and periods of active training duty.

SEC. 117. In case of the death of a member of the corps during active training duty, the costs of recovery of the body, preparation for burial, including a suitable casket, transportation to the home of the deceased or to a cemetery designated by the deceased's nearest relative or proper authority, interment, transportation of baggage, payment of only the accrued or undisbursed cash allowance owing the trainee at the time of death, and accrued or undisbursed dependency allowance owing his dependents at the time of the trainee's death shall be paid by the training agency to which he was last assigned in the same manner as prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces: *Provided*, That members of the corps shall not, solely by reason of their membership therein, be eligible for burial in a national cemetery.

SEC. 118. (a) If any member of the corps shall suffer illness or injury in line of duty while on active training duty with the corps, or die as the result of such illness or injury,

he or his beneficiaries as the case may be shall be entitled to all the benefits, which are prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States who suffer disability or death while in the performance of duty, and the Secretary of Labor shall have jurisdiction in such cases after release of the member from active training duty with the corps, or in the event of his death, and shall perform the same duties with reference thereto as in the case of civil employees of the United States now within his jurisdiction: *Provided,* That employee's compensation shall not be paid concurrently with the cash allowance provided in section 113 of this Act.

(b) For the purpose of determining the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this section, the total compensation received by a member under this title in cash and in kind shall be deemed to be $150 per month.

(c) The periods of time within which notice of injury, claims for compensation, or any report or notice of inquiry, claims for compensation, or any report or notice must be made, as provided in the Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742), as amended, shall not begin to run in disability compensation cases until the termination of the member's active training duty in the corps.

(d) All determinations as to line of duty and review of these determinations shall be made by the head of the

training agency concerned under applicable regulations of that agency approved by the Commission for such action and shall be conclusive upon the Department of Labor whether made before or after the filing of a claim.

SEC. 119. A member of the corps shall be pecuniarily liable for the loss of and damage to property of the Government and for costs incident to his apprehension and return, including rewards paid, in case of unauthorized absence, and the amount of liability as determined by the training agency may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance not to exceed $15 in any one month: *Provided*, That the head of the training agency concerned or his designee may remit any such liability in whole or in part.

SEC. 120. (a) Members of the corps, while assigned to active training duty with the Armed Forces of the United States:

(1) shall be considered to be a member "of the military or naval forces of the United States" within the meaning of subsection (c) of section 402 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812);

(2) shall be considered to be "military personnel" within the meaning of section 1 of the Act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662), and section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372).

(b) Members of the corps assigned to active training

duty under the jurisdiction of departments or agencies of the United States other than the Armed Forces shall be considered to be employees of the Government within the meaning of subsection (b) of section 402 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812).

(c) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force and their designees are authorized to exercise with respect to claims of members of the corps, while on active training duty with their respective forces, for damages to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, the respective powers conferred upon the Secretary of War and his designees by the Act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 225), and the Secretary of the Navy or his designees by sections 2, 3, and 4 of the Act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662).

SEC. 121. Except as otherwise herein specifically provided, members of the corps shall not, solely by reason of their membership, be entitled to any rights, privileges, gratuities, or benefits provided by law or regulations for personnel or former personnel of the Armed Forces or civilian employees of the Government.

SEC. 122. Nothing contained in this title or any other Act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of com-

pensation by any person, firm, or corporation to members of the corps while on active or inactive training duty.

SEC. 123. (a) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this Act in the National Security Training Corps is being given, as the Commission may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of the National Security Training Corps and as the Commission shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of members of such corps, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person into any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Commission or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

(b) No person, corporation, partnership, or association

or agency shall knowingly sell, give, or in any way supply any intoxicating liquors to any member in the National Security Training Corps on active training duty. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than twelve months, or both.

SEC. 124. (a) The Commission shall formulate programs and designate Federal departments and agencies as training agencies to conduct such programs under its direction and control.

(b) Training agencies shall have direct responsibility for all training operations and may utilize the services of other agencies with or without reimbursement, including non-Federal agencies and institutions, in the conduct thereof.

(c) Military personnel of the Department of Defense may be detailed for duty with the National Security Training Corps, and when so detailed are authorized in addition to and in excess of the strengths otherwise prescribed for such establishment and section 1222 of the Revised Statutes shall not be applicable to any officer personnel so detailed.

SEC. 125. (a) The period of training provided for under this Act shall be for one year, or its equivalent in terms of a combination of basic training and training in one of the

alternative programs (options) prescribed in subsection (c) below.

(b) Basic training shall be for the initial period of four months beginning with the date of induction into corps, unless sooner terminated by enlistment in the Regular Establishment of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or at the discretion of the head of the training agency, provided that the period may be extended as follows:

(1) with the consent of the member, for the purpose of furnishing hospitalization, medical, and surgical care for injury or illness incurred in line of duty, or

(2) for the purpose of requiring a member to make good time lost to training for any cause.

(c) The alternative programs to be entered into upon completion of basic training will be as follows, and subject to quotas and standards of qualifications fixed by the head of the appropriate training agencies, with the approval of the Commission, the member may enter the alternative program of his choice:

(1) Additional active training duty with the corps for a period of eight continuous months;

(2) Voluntary enlistment and service in any of the Regular services, including the Coast Guard, for

such period as may be authorized by law or regulations for each service at the time of such enlistment;

(3) Enlistment and service in the National Guard or Air National Guard or Organized Naval Reserve or Organized Marine Corps Reserve for such period as may be authorized by law provided such term of enlistment is so fixed, otherwise by regulations for each service in effect at the time of such enlistment;

(4) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or the Enlisted Reserved component of the Air Force and assignment to an organized unit for which he is entitled to receive pay for attendance at drills or equivalent duty, for such period as may be authorized by law provided such term of enlistment is so fixed, otherwise by regulations for each service in effect at the time of such enlistment;

(5) Entrance into the service in either the Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academy;

(6) Enrollment and service in the Naval and Marine Corps officer procurement program as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057, ch. 962);

(7) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve or the Enlisted

~~Reserve component of the Air Force or Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, and entrance upon a college course, including Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps training and an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service if offered upon completion of the course;~~

~~(8) Enlistment and service in the United States Naval Reserve, and entrance into either the United States Merchant Marine Academy or a Navy accredited State Maritime Academy accompanied by an agreement on the part of the trainee to accept a commission in the Naval Reserve at the completion of the course, if offered;~~

~~(9) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve or Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the Commission may prescribe. and the pursuance of an approved course of technical or specialist training in such school, college, or university as may be approved by the head of the appropriate training agency, accompanied by an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service if offered upon completion of the course;~~

~~(10) Enlistment and service in the Volunteer Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Volunteer Naval Reserve or Volunteer Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve for a period of six years: *Provided,* That during the six-year period of enlistment such trainee shall be subject to a maximum of six months' active duty training, of which not more than one month will be required in any one year: *Provided further,* That this alternative of six years' enlistment in one of the Reserve components named in this option is open only to a trainee who is unable to select any of the preceding alternatives provided in subsections (3) through (9) because they are not available to him in his community, or if available, because their quotas are already filled, or he is otherwise ineligible for reasons over which he has no control;~~

~~(11) Such other alternative programs established by the Commission which the Commission shall determine to be of comparable importance to the national security and to constitute an equal obligation on the part of the member: *Provided,* That programs established under this subsection shall be available to those trained in the Armed Forces only within quotas estab-~~

lished by the Commission after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and to those who are not given military training.

SEC. 126. Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, any member serving in or selected for training in any of the alternative programs provided for above, who is unwilling to enter upon or fails to complete satisfactorily the period of training in the selected alternate program, may be recalled for an additional period of active training duty not to exceed four months.

SEC. 127. The Secretary of Defense or the Commission, as appropriate, shall prescribe a system of training credits to be applied in the event of transfer from one alternative program to another.

SEC. 128. The President is authorized to determine the location of such additional permanent or temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this title, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, ex-

change of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended.

REGISTRATION, SELECTION AND INDUCTION

SEC. 129. Subject to the policies, standards, and quotas of the Commission, the Selective Service System shall administer all matters in connection with the induction into the corps and the registration, examination, classification, allocation, delivery, and maintenance of records, of men registered under this title, together with such other duties as are assigned by this title.

SEC. 130. The local boards, established pursuant to the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Director of Selective Service and approved by the Commission shall have the same powers and duties within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to determination of dependency, inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from induction for or allocation for training under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards as such local boards have with respect to similar questions or claims arising under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 131. The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director of the Selective Service System in carrying out his functions under this title.

SEC. 132. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien residing in the United States who has declared his intention to become such citizen, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, who is between the ages of seventeen and eighteen and of every other such male citizen or person upon thereafter attaining the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places in such manner, and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided,* That persons in any category exempted from registration pursuant to the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, shall be exempt from registration hereunder.

SEC. 133. Every person registered under this title who is not subject to induction under any other provision of law and who is not otherwise exempted under the provisions of this title shall, until he attains the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, be liable for training: *Provided:*

(1) That every male person who is a citizen of the

United States and every male declarant alien, who enters the United States at a time subsequent to the period in which he would have been required to train had he not been absent from the United States, shall be liable for training, but no person shall be inducted for training before having attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth and after having attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth;

(2) That any registrant under this title who has attained the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth and has not attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth and who is not liable for induction under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, may volunteer for induction for training, except that a registrant who has not attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth must have the prior consent of his parents, or parent having custody of him, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis to him in order to so volunteer;

(3) That any registrant who, on the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth is successfully and satisfactorily pursuing a standard course of study, on a full-time basis in a high school or similar institution of learning shall, if he so requests, be entitled to have his induction or assignment under this title postponed

until his graduation therefrom, or until he ceases to pursue satisfactorily such course of study, or until he attains the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever occurs first, except that any such registrant whose induction or assignment has been so postponed shall be liable for training until he attains the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth;

(4) That under rules and regulations promulgated by the Director with the approval of the Commission, there are hereby authorized deferments from training under this title, for extreme hardship, physical or mental disability, or reasons vital to the national interest;

(5) That under policies established by the Director with the approval of the Commission, every registrant shall, prior to induction, be physically and mentally examined, and the local board shall classify the registrant: *Provided*, That no person shall be inducted for military training unless and until he is acceptable to the Armed Forces for training;

(6) That the President is authorized to postpone or exempt the induction of such groups or number of registrants as are necessary in order to limit inductions to the maximum number which can be trained by training agencies designated by the Commission;

(7) That no registrant under this title shall be

liable for training under this title who (a) is now serving or has heretofore served honorably for at least one year in any of the Armed Forces of the United States in active Federal service or of the Armed Forces of any nation allied with the United States at any time during World War II; or (b) shall hereafter enter into any of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty, and complete a minimum of one year honorable service therein; or (c) is enlisted and is serving, on the effective date of this title, in any one of the following Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States: (1) The federally recognized National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States; (2) the Organized Reserve of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: *Provided,* That in either case failure to complete such current enlistment shall render such person liable to induction and training until he attain the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth; or (d) on the effective date of this title is a cadet of the United States Military Academy, a midshipman of the United States Naval Academy, a cadet of the United States Coast Guard Academy, a midshipman of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or of a Navy accredited State Maritime Academy, a

member of the Senior Division Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval aviation college program, so long as he satisfactorily continues in and complete two years training therein: *Provided*, That until such time as the President determines that the program has reached full scale implementation, the Commission may conditionally exempt from induction or conditionally discharge from training any registrant or trainee who has been accepted for admittance to any of the academies or training programs enumerated, in order that such person may enter such academy or training program wherein he shall complete not less than two years of training in order to be relieved of liability for induction or further training hereunder. (b) No exception from registration, exemption, deferment, or postponement of induction for training under this title shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

SEC. 134. (a) Subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification and selection as may be established by the Secretary of Defense to insure a proper balance of trained manpower between the ground, air, and naval arms, each registrant eligible for military training shall be entitled to request and receive training in the service of his choice,

and shall be classified therein by his local board. Each registrant found not to be eligible for military training shall, subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification as may be established by the Commission, be enttiled to request and receive training in the nonmilitary training program of his choice, and shall be classified therein by the local board: *Provided*, That any such person claiming exemption from combatant training, because of religious training and belief as defined in section 6 (j) of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, when inducted or assigned under this title, be required to elect training in such other available training program of his choice as provided herein subject to such quotas and standards as may be established.

(b) Any person claiming exemption from combatant training shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal with the appeal board, the appeal board shall forthwith refer the matter to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the ob-

jections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that when the objector is inducted or assigned for training under this Act, he be required to elect training as provided in (a) above. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board, in making its decision. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training because of religious training and belief as herein defined is sustained, shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

SEC. 135. (a) Every person liable for training under this title, except those whose training shall have been deferred or postponed in accordance with provisions of this title, shall be called, inducted, and delivered by his local board for training with such training agency for which he has been classified by his local board at the time and place as directed by the director: *Provided*, That a volunteer for training under eighteen years of age may be delivered for training to which he has been assigned, at the training period next following the date upon which he was accepted as a volun-

teer, whether or not he has attained the age of eighteen years.

(b) The Commission, after consultation with heads of the training agencies concerned, will determine induction schedules and numbers to be inducted pursuant to such schedules.

SEC. 136. No person liable for training under this title shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training; no substitute as such shall be received or enrolled for training; and no person liable for training hereunder shall be permitted to escape such training or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of training by the payment of money or any valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training or liability therefor.

SEC. 137. (a) Each registrant exempted or deferred from training under this title, until he shall have attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, and each trainee for a period of six years after completion of the first six months of training or until discharged from the corps whichever period of time is greater, shall be required to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status, including his status in the training program and com-

pletion thereof, as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the director, and approved by the Commission.

(b) Each local board shall maintain a register of registrants, which shall contain a current record of the address, occupational, dependency, training and service status, and such other information as may be required for the periods specified in (a) above.

SEC. 138. Funds appropriated to the Selective Service System shall be available in the case of registrants who prior to their induction into the National Security Training Corps suffer illness, injury, or death while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this title, for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of (1) emergency medical care including hospitalization, and (2) recovery of body, preparation for burial, including suitable casket, transportation to the home of the deceased or to a cemetery designated by his nearest relative or proper authority, and interment, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

SEC. 139. Any person having and exercising any authority under this title, who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, enrollment, or muster; or any person who shall

knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certification as to his fitness or unfitness or liability or nonliability for training under the provisions of this title, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration, induction, or training or any of the requirements of this title; or any person who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration, induction, or training, or any of the requirements of this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way by force or violence with the administration of this title; or any person or persons who conspire to commit one or more of such offenses; or any person selected for training under this title who shall refuse to complete the training as prescribed under this title, shall upon conviction in the district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such case shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 140. (a) Nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 281 and 283), or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under au-

thority of this title and the regulations pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated member of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from training because of conscientious objections.

(b) All functions performed under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such Act.

SEC. 141. No individual who has been convicted of any crime not punishable by death, and no individual who has been committed to jail, corrective institution, or institution for juvenile delinquency, shall by reason of such conviction or commitment be relieved from liability for training under this title, but may be trained as directed by the Commission.

SEC. 142. Under rules and regulations promulgated by the heads of the appropriate training agencies, with the approval of the Commission, members of the corps while on active training duty may be granted leaves of absence without loss of cash allowances to which otherwise entitled: *Provided*, That no trainee shall be entitled to any payment in lieu of leave not granted to him prior to release from active training duty.

SEC. 143. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise

appropriated, such sums to the Commission as may be necessary to enable it to perform its said functions.

SEC. 144. The Commission shall report semiannually to the Congress all expenditures of appropriations in detail.

SEC. 145. If any provision of title I or II, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of said titles, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be effected thereby.

SEC. 146. The Secretary of Defense and the Commission shall submit recommendations to the President as to the time and rate of implementation of the training program established pursuant to the provisions of this Act. However, this training program shall only be implemented in whole or in part as to time and rate, as directed by the President. The recommendations shall take into consideration the intent of the Congress that operations under this Act shall not interfere with the immediate increasing of the components of the Armed Forces to their authorized strength.

## TITLE II

## CODE OF CONDUCT

SEC. 201. TITLE.—This title shall be known as the Code of Conduct (hereinafter referred to as the "code")

for the military training program of the National Security Training Corps.

SEC. 202. STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Any act or omission of a trainee, as herein defined, which tends to hinder or impede his training is hereby declared to be contrary to the purposes of title I and this title. The disciplinary punishment of trainees of the military training program as hereinafter provided shall be consistent with the maintenance of discipline.

SEC. 203. ALL TRAINEES SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS.—All trainees, as herein defined, shall, from the time of actual induction and while serving on active training duty, as herein defined, be subject to the provisions of this code.

SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.—The following words when used in this code shall be construed in the sense indicated in this section unless the context shows that a different sense is intended:

(a) The word "trainee" shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the National Security Training Corps and assigned to a component of the Armed Forces for training under the provisions of title I of this Act during the period of his active training duty.

(b) The words "active training duty" shall be deemed to mean that period of training commencing with the day of induction into the corps and consisting of the period of

basic military training in accordance with title I of this Act and ending with the completion or earlier termination of such basic training, and in addition the optional additional military training provided in section 125 (c) (1) of title I.

(c) The word "officer" shall be deemed to mean a commissioned officer.

(d) The words "civil authorities" shall be deemed to mean law-enforcement authorities of the United States and of the Territories and possessions, and authorities of the several States, including political subdivisions thereof, and of the District of Columbia.

(e) The words "commanding officer" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is empowered to exercise command of any detachment or company of trainees, or similar or higher units.

(f) The words "appointing authority" shall be deemed to mean (1) an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who commands a trainee regiment, or comparable unit; or (2) superior military training authority.

(g) The words "reviewing authority" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is next superior in the chain of command to the commanding

officer of the accused as defined in this title and who also is empowered to convene general courts martial.

(h) The words "staff judge advocate" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is a lawyer assigned to a reviewing authority to perform law duties.

(i) The words "superior military training authority" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or the Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, superior in the chain of command.

(j) The words "extra duty" shall be deemed to mean additional work or duty of any nature assigned to trainees as punishment.

(k) The term "military law" shall be construed to mean the laws governing the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps of the United States.

SEC. 205. MODE OF ENFORCING DISCIPLINE.—Violations of this code shall be punishable in the discretion of the commanding officer (a) by disciplinary punishment administered by the commanding officer of the accused, unless the accused shall request trial, or (b) by national security training courts. Trainees shall be likewise subject to prosecution in the courts of the United States and of the Territories and possessions and of the District of Columbia for crimes and

offenses against the United States, and in the courts of the several States for crimes and offenses against the States or any subdivision thereof.

SEC. 206. DISCIPLINARY PUNISHMENT BY UNIT COMMANDER.—A commanding officer of a trainee company or higher command may, for minor violations of this code, impose disciplinary punishments upon trainees of his command without the intervention of a national security training court unless the accused requests trial by that court. Punishment assessed by a commanding officer shall not constitute time lost to training within the meaning of section 278 hereof, and shall operate as a bar to subsequent trial for the same offense.

The disciplinary punishment authorized by this section may include admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not exceeding one week, extra duty for not exceeding one week, restriction to certain specified limits for not exceeding one week, but shall not include forfeiture of cash allowance or confinement under guard. A trainee punished under authority of this section who deems the punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense may appeal to the next superior military training authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged.

The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, or superior military training

authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment.

SEC. 207. NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURT.—A national security training court shall be composed of any number of officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training, of which three shall be a quorum, one of which three shall be a major or lieutenant commander or above. The senior member of the court shall be the president. One member of the court, if practicable, shall be a lawyer and shall act as a law member of the court. In the event no member of the court is a lawyer, the president thereof shall act as law member. Trials of trainees for violations of trainee discipline hereinafter set forth may be by a national security training court, which shall not include the accuser or the immediate commanding officer of the accused or the investigating officer or a witness for the prosecution or the defense.

SEC. 208. APPOINTING AUTHORITY.—A national security training court may be appointed by an appointing authority as herein defined.

SEC. 209. WHO MAY SERVE ON NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURTS.—All officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training shall be competent to serve on a national security training court. When appointing

such court, the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for such duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament. Officers having less than two years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the corps, be appointed as members of a court in excess of minority membership thereof.

SEC. 210. INFLUENCING THE COURT.—Any attempt on the part of any member of the Armed Forces to influence, by any unauthorized means, a national security training court or its members, or to admonish, censure, or reprimand the court or its members for any act or omission, is hereby prohibited and shall constitute an offense against military law.

SEC. 211. APPOINTMENT OF TRIAL COUNSEL AND DEFENSE COUNSEL.—For each national security training court the appointing authority shall appoint a trial counsel and defense counsel, who shall, if practicable, be lawyers: *Provided,* That if the trial counsel is a lawyer, the appointed defense counsel must also be a lawyer. No person who has acted as investigating officer or court member in any case shall act subsequently as trial counsel or, unless expressly requested by the accused, as defense counsel in the same case. No person who has acted for the prosecution

shall act subsequently in the same case for the defense, nor shall any person who has acted for the defense act subsequently in the same case for the prosecution.

The accused shall have the right to be represented in his defense by civilian counsel if provided by him, or by military counsel of his own selection if reasonably available, or by the duly appointed defense counsel.

SEC. 212. JURISDICTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURTS.—A national security training court shall have jurisdiction to try and punish any trainee for any offense made punishable by this code.

SEC. 213. ALLOWABLE PUNISHMENTS BY A NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COURT.—The punishments authorized by this code upon conviction of a trainee for any offense herein made punishable shall consist of any of the following punishments and no others: Admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not to exceed three months, extra duty for not to exceed three months, restriction to certain specified limits with or without extra duty, for not to exceed three months, and confinement with or without useful work for not to exceed three months, and forfeiture or withholding of one-half of the cash allowance per month, for not to exceed the period of confinement, when a trainee is confined pursuant to sentence of a national security training court, and where specifically authorized, bad conduct discharge

or dishonorable discharge: *Provided,* That admonition, reprimand, or bad conduct discharge, or dishonorable discharge may be included together with or in addition to any of the other punishments allowed under this section.

SEC. 214. ARREST.—A trainee charged with an offense may be placed under arrest or in confinement, as circumstances may require, but when charged with a minor offense only, a trainee shall not ordinarily be placed in confinement. Only a commanding officer or superior military training authority or an officer duly designated as his representative shall have power to place a trainee in, or release him from confinement. Any commissioned officer shall have authority to place a trainee in arrest. The arresting officer, the commanding officer of the trainee or superior military training authority shall have authority to release a trainee from arrest.

SEC. 215. PREFERRING CHARGES.—Any person subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this Act or military law may prefer charges, which shall be under oath that he has personal knowledge of or has investigated the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact to the best of his knowledge and belief. The charges shall be set forth upon a charge sheet and shall be in the form of a charge setting forth the alleged violation, together with a specification. In the event a trainee is placed under arrest or in

confinement, charges shall be filed within forty-eight hours of the time thereof. Otherwise a trainee shall be released from such arrest or confinement unless the commanding officer, acting upon the recommendation of an officer duly designated by the appointing authority to conduct a preliminary hearing or investigation, and who having conducted or begun to conduct such a hearing or investigation at which the trainee is present and informed of the grounds of his confinement recommends that the accused be not released, directs that the arrest or confinement be continued.

SEC. 216. ACTION BY COMMANDING OFFICER.—Charges will be filed with the trainee's immediate commanding officer, who will inquire into the facts and circumstances of the case and expeditiously dispose of the matter or without delay forward the charges together with the names of the witnesses and a statement of their prospective testimony with his written recommendations to the appointing authority.

SEC. 217. FORWARDING CHARGES; DELAYS; SERVICE OF CHARGES.—Unless the charges are disposed of without trial, the unit commanding officer shall, within forty-eight hours after accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the appointing authority. If the same be not practicable, he shall report to superior authority the

reason. ror delay. The unit commanding officer shall cause to be delivered to the accused a copy of the charges.

SEC. 218. ACTION BY APPOINTING AUTHORITY.—The appointing authority, in his discretion, may refer the charges for trial, order them dismissed, or make such other disposition of them as he sees fit; and no charge will be referred to a court for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed herein, that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under this code, and is supported by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

SEC. 219. INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES.—An investigation of charges shall include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. The accused shall be advised of the charges against him and of his right to be represented at such investigation by counsel. Upon his request, he shall be represented by civilian counsel if provided by him, or military counsel of his own selection if such counsel be reasonably available, or by counsel appointed by the appointing authority. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may

desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation, they shall be accompanied by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides, and a copy thereof shall be given to the accused.

SEC. 220. STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE.—Every reviewing authority shall have a staff judge advocate who shall advise the appointing or reviewing authority as to all matters prescribed by this code and shall perform such other duties as may be devolved upon him by law, regulation, or custom of the military, naval, or air services.

SEC. 221. ASSISTANT STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE.—Any assistant staff judge advocate shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by this code or by law, regulations, or the custom of the military, naval, or air services upon the staff judge advocates.

SEC. 222. ACTION BY TRIAL COUNSEL.—The trial counsel of the court to which the charges have been referred shall, within forty-eight hours after receipt thereof, cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had. A failure so to serve such charges shall be a ground for a continuance. The trial counsel shall as soon as practicable upon serving the charges upon the ac-

cused notify the defense counsel thereof. No trainee shall against his objection be brought to trial before a national security training court within a period of seventy-two hours subsequent to the service of charges upon him.

SEC. 223. TRIAL COUNSEL: PROSECUTION.—The trial counsel of a national security training court shall prosecute in the name of the United States.

SEC. 224. OATHS.—The trial counsel shall administer to the national security training court the following oath or affirmation: "You, , do swear (or affirm) that you will well and truly try and determine, according to the evidence, the matter now before you, and that you will duly administer justice, without partiality, favor, or affection, according to the provisions of the Code of Conduct of the National Security Training Corps, and if any doubt should arise, not explained by the said code, then according to your conscience and the best of your understanding. So help you God?" When the oath or affirmation has been administered to the members of the court, the president of the court shall administer to the trial counsel an oath or affirmation in the following form: "You, , do swear (or affirm) that you will faithfully and impartially perform the duties of a trial counsel?"

All persons who give evidence before the court shall be examined on oath or affirmation administered by the trial counsel in the following form: "You, ; swear (or affirm) that the evidence you give in this case shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God?"

In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration will be omitted.

SEC. 225. ARRAIGNMENT, PLEAS, AND MOTIONS.—The accused shall be arraigned, at which time the charges and specifications shall be read to him by the trial counsel. The accused may plead guilty or not guilty. If the accused makes any irregular pleading, or after a plea of guilty sets up matter inconsistent with the plea, or if it appears that he has entered the plea of guilty improvidently or through lack of understanding of its meaning and effect, or if he fails or refuses to plead, a plea of not guilty shall be entered in the record, and the court shall proceed as though he had pleaded not guilty. Prior to so pleading, or at any other time, the accused may make any pertinent motion which the court shall dispose of as justice may require.

SEC. 226. CHALLENGES.—Members of a national security training court may be challenged by the accused or trial counsel for cause stated to the court. A majority of the court shall decide the challenges by secret written ballot

but challenged members have no vote. Upon a tie vote the challenge shall be sustained. Each accused and the trial counsel shall be entitled to one peremptory challenge.

SEC. 227. OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN WITNESS AND OTHER EVIDENCE.—The trial counsel, defense counsel, and the national security training court shall have equal opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe. Process issued in national security training court cases to compel witnesses to appear and testify and to compel the production of other evidence shall be similar to that which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue and shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

SEC. 228. REFUSAL TO APPEAR OR TESTIFY.—(a) Every person not subject to this code who—

(1) has been duly subpenaed to appear as a witness before any national security training court, or before any military or civil officer designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before such court; and

(2) has been duly paid or tendered the fees and mileage of a witness at the rates allowed to witnesses attending the courts of the United States; and

(3) willfully neglects or refuses to appear, or

refuses to qualify as a witness or to testify or to produce any evidence which such person may have been legally subpenaed to produce;

shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the United States.

(b) Any person who commits an offense denounced by this article shall be tried on information in a United States district court or in a court of original criminal jurisdiction in any of the Territorial possessions of the United States, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such courts for such purpose. Upon conviction, such persons shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months, or both.

(c) It shall be the duty of the United States district attorney or the officer prosecuting for the Government in any such court of original criminal jurisdiction, upon the certification of the facts to him by the national security training court, to file an information against and prosecute any person violating this article.

(d) The fees and mileage of witnesses shall be advanced or paid out of the appropriations for the compensation of witnesses.

SEC. 229. COMPULSORY SELF-INCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.—No witness before a national security training court or before any officer, military or civil, designated to

take a deposition to be read in evidence before a national security training court or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue when such answer may tend to degrade him.

No statement obtained from any person in violation of this section or through use of coercion, unlawful influence, or unlawful inducement shall be received in evidence against him in a trial by a national security training court.

SEC. 230. DEPOSITIONS.—Depositions may be taken and used as evidence before national security training courts in the same manner as now or hereafter provided for courts-martial.

SEC. 231. FORMER JEOPARDY.—No trainee shall, without his consent, be tried a second time for the same offense, but no proceedings before a national security training court resulting in a conviction shall be considered a trial until the reviewing authority shall have taken final action upon the case. A proceeding which, subsequent to the introduction of evidence but prior to a finding, is dismissed or terminated by the appointing authority or on motion of the prosecution for failure of available evidence or witnesses without any fault of the accused shall be a trial in the sense of this section.

SEC. 232. LIMITATIONS AS TO TIME.—No person sub-

ject to this code shall be liable to be tried and punished by a national security training court for any offense committed more than one year before arraignment of such person: *Provided,* That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid period of limitation: *Provided further,* That this section shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 233. EVIDENCE.—Insofar as not otherwise prescribed in this code or by regulations promulgated under authority of titles I and II of this Act, the rules of evidence for courts-martial shall be applied to national security training courts.

SEC. 234. RULINGS ON LEGAL QUESTIONS.—The law member shall rule in open court upon all interlocutory questions other than challenges arising during the proceedings: *Provided,* That any such ruling made by the law member upon any interlocutory question other than for a finding of not guilty or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may at any time consult with the court in closed session before making a ruling, and may change any ruling

made at any time during the trial. Unless such ruling be final, if any member objects thereto, the court shall be cleared and closed and the question decided by a majority vote, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank. A tie vote on a motion for a finding of not guilty or on a motion relating to the question of the accused's sanity shall be a determination against the accused.

SEC. 235. INSTRUCTIONS.—Before a vote is taken on the findings, the law member shall, in the presence of the accused and counsel, instruct the court as to the elements of the offense and charge the court—

(1) that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond reasonable doubt;

(2) that in the case being considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in favor of the accused and he shall be acquitted;

(3) that if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no reasonable doubt; and

(4) that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt is upon the Government.

SEC. 236. FINDINGS.—After both sides have rested and

after any argument of counsel, the national security training court shall make its findings as to the guilt or innocence of the accused, which findings it shall announce in open court.

SEC. 237. FINDINGS OF GUILTY.—In the event the accused is found guilty, the national security training court shall receive evidence as to the age and service of the accused, together with any evidence of previous convictions by a national security training court or a district court of the United States, the Territories, or possessions or the District of Columbia in accordance with the provisions of section 250 of this code and any other pertinent data submitted by either side, for consideration by the national security training court in fixing the punishment.

SEC. 238. SENTENCE.—The national security training court shall thereupon sentence the accused. The sentence shall be announced in open court.

SEC. 239. VOTE ON FINDING AND SENTENCES.—The findings and sentence shall be determined on secret written ballot by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

SEC. 240. POLICY AS TO SENTENCE.—The national security training court shall adjudge a minimum sentence consistent with the maintenance of discipline and shall, if it believes such action consistent with the foregoing policy,

recommend to the reviewing authority that he suspend the execution of the sentence in whole or in part.

SEC. 241. BAD CONDUCT DISCHARGE OR DISHONORABLE DISCHARGE.—In the case of a trainee, as defined in this title, a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall be effected only pursuant to a sentence of a national security training court. The court upon proof of two previous convictions by courts deriving jurisdiction under the provisions of this code, or if otherwise satisfied from the evidence that the accused is incorrigible, or as an included punishment for any of the offenses denounced by sections 251 to 258, inclusive, of this code, shall have power to adjudge bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge from the National Security Training Corps, in addition to any other punishment authorized by this code. The bad conduct discharge shall be adjudged for an offense or offenses warranting separation under conditions other than honorable as included punishment, but not of nature to warrant dishonorable discharge. The dishonorable discharge shall be adjudged for an offense or offenses warranting dishonorable separation as included punishment. A bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge shall not be adjudged unless a complete record of the proceedings and testimony before the court has been made. A bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge adjudged in such cases shall be

effective only when ordered executed by the reviewing authority, after the record of trial has been held legally sufficient to support the sentence and approved by the Judge Advocate General of the service concerned. The holding of the Judge Advocate General shall be final and conclusive.

SEC. 242. EFFECT OF BAD CONDUCT DISCHARGE OR DISHONORABLE DISCHARGE.—The execution of a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall forfeit any right to credit by the trainee for time served in training, and shall not prevent the trainee, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as the case may be, in his discretion, being reinducted for all or part of the training prescribed by law.

SEC. 243. PREPARATION OF RECORD OF TRIAL.—The trial counsel shall prepare the record of trial, which shall include in narrative or other form the testimony of the witnesses. In such cases as he shall deem appropriate, the appointing authority may detail a reporter to record the proceedings of the trial. The trial counsel and the defense counsel shall agree upon the record and the statement of the testimony, and shall authenticate the record in certification of their agreement, and the record shall thereafter be authenticated by the president of the national security training court. In the event of disagreement, the testimony of the witnesses and any other part of the record in dispute

shall be stated by the national security training court, whose decision evidenced by the signature of its president shall be final.

SEC. 244. DISPOSITION OF RECORD OF TRIAL.—The record of trial shall be transmitted to the reviewing authority who shall forthwith refer it to his staff judge advocate for consideration and advice. After having been acted upon by the reviewing authority, the record of each trial by a national security training court shall be transmitted to such headquarters as may be prescribed by the head of the training agency concerned.

SEC. 245. APPROVAL BY REVIEWING AUTHORITY.—No sentence of a national security training court shall be carried into execution until it shall have been approved by the reviewing authority and in the case of a sentence involving a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge until the record of trial has been held legally sufficient and approved as provided in section 241. However, a sentence involving withholding of privileges, extra duty, restriction, or confinement shall run from the date of the announcement of the sentence by the national security training court. Neither an acquittal nor a finding of not guilty shall require approval by a reviewing authority and neither shall be disapproved.

SEC. 246. POWERS INCIDENT TO POWER TO APPROVE.—

The power to approve the sentence shall include the power to approve or disapprove a finding and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense and to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence and to order a rehearing: *Provided,* That no rehearing shall be ordered upon any charge or specification upon which the accused has theretofore been acquitted by the national security training court nor shall such court on rehearing have power to increase the sentence originally imposed. The power to approve a sentence shall include power to mitigate or remit the sentence or suspend, for a period not exceeding the period of training, the execution of a sentence or any part thereof but shall not include the power to increase the sentence. The reviewing authority, or his successor in command, or superior military training authority shall have power to vacate the suspension of any sentence, or any part thereof, and order it carried into execution.

SEC. 247. CONFINEMENT OF TRAINEES.—So far as practicable, trainees held in confinement shall not be confined with members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 248. SURRENDER OF TRAINEE TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES.—Any trainee who is accused of a a crime or offense punishable by the laws of the United States or the Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, or of the

several States or a subdivision thereof shall be surrendered, upon application duly made, to the civil authorities for trial: *Provided*, That any proceedings, trial, or period of punishment resulting therefrom shall not operate to relieve the trainee from any liability for further training in the corps.

SEC. 249. RETURN OF TRAINEES HELD BY CIVIL AUTHORITIES.—The commanding officer or superior military training authority, when advised that a trainee is held in custody by the civil authorities shall in appropriate cases make application for his return to training control; the trainee unless already tried by the civil court for the offenses with which he was charged by the civil authorities may be brought to trial before a national security training court, or the case shall otherwise be disposed of, in the discretion of the commanding officer or superior military training authority.

SEC. 250. JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—The several district courts of the United States, the Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the national security training courts of the crimes and offenses defined in sections 251 to 258, inclusive.

SEC. 251. DESERTION.—Any trainee in the military training program who deserts or attempts to desert the National Security Training Corps shall upon conviction there-

of be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for two years, or both.

SEC. 252. ADVISING OR AIDING DESERTION.—Any trainee or other person who advises or persuades or knowingly assists a trainee in the military training program to desert the National Security Training Corps, or who harbors a deserter, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for two years, or both.

SEC. 253. ESCAPE FROM CONFINEMENT.—Any trainee who, having been duly placed in confinement, escapes therefrom shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

SEC. 254. STRIKING OR ASSAULTING OFFICERS, OR OTHER PERSONS IN AUTHORITY.—Any trainee who strikes an officer, warrant officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person in authority over such trainee, or draws or lifts up any weapon or offers any violence against such person, being in the execution of his office, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for one year, or both.

SEC. 255. COLLECTIVE INSUBORDINATION.—Any trainee or other person subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this Act who attempts to create or who begins, incites, causes, instigates, encourages, or joins in any col-

lective insubordination tending to hinder or impede training under these titles shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for one year, or both. Collective insubordination within the meaning of titles I and II of this Act shall include any concerted action in the nature of a strike, including a sit-down or slow-down strike, or walk-out, picketing or boycott, which tends to hinder or impede training under the provisions of titles I and II of this Act.

SEC. 256. FAILURE TO SUPPRESS COLLECTIVE INSUBORDINATION.—Any trainee or other person, subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this Act, who, being present at any occurrence involving collective insubordination, does not use his utmost endeavor to suppress the same, or knowing or having reason to believe that such collective insubordination is to take place, does not without delay give information thereof to his commanding officer or other competent military authority, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

SEC. 257. PROPERTY LOSS, DAMAGE, OR WRONGFUL DISPOSITION.—Any trainee who willfully, or through neglect, suffers to be lost, spoiled, damaged, or wrongfully disposed of, any property furnished for or intended for use under the provisions of law providing for training in the

corps shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for six months, or both, and may be required to make good the loss or damage, in whole or in part, and when required to make good the loss or damage the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 258. WASTE OR UNLAWFUL DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.—Any trainee who sells or unlawfully disposes of or willfully or through neglect injures or loses any arms, ammunition, accouterments, equipment, clothing, or other property issued for use in accordance with provisions of titles I and II of this Act shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for six months, or both, and when required to make good the loss or damage, the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 259. ABSENCE WITHOUT LEAVE.—Any trainee who fails to report at the fixed time to the properly appointed place of duty, or goes from the same without proper leave or absents himself from his command, guard, quarters, station, camp, or ship without proper leave, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 260. DISRESPECT AND INSUBORDINATION.—Any

trainee who behaves with disrespect or in an insubordinate manner toward an officer, warrant officer, petty officer, non-commissioned officer, or other person having lawful authority over him, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 261. BREACH OF ARREST.—Any trainee who, having been lawfully placed under arrest, breaks his arrest before he is set at liberty by proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 262. RELEASE OR ESCAPE OF PRISONERS.—Any trainee who without proper authority releases a prisoner committed to his charge, or suffers a prisoner committed to his charge to escape, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 263. DRUNK OR DISORDERLY CONDUCT.—Any trainee who shall be found drunk or disorderly in quarters, station, ship, command, or under such circumstances as to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 264. OFFENSES OF SENTINELS.—Any trainee posted as a sentinel or watch who is found drunk or sleeping upon his post or leaves his post before he is regularly re-

lieved, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 265. DISOBEDIENCE OF LAWFUL ORDERS.—Any trainee who willfully disobeys or fails to obey any lawful command of his superior officer, warrant officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person having authority over him in accordance with law, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 266. ASSAULT.—Any trainee committing an assault shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 267. ASSAULT AND BATTERY.—Any trainee committing assault and battery shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 268. COMMITTING A NUISANCE.—Any trainee who shall commit a nuisance shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 269. CARRYING A CONCEALED WEAPON.—Any trainee who shall carry a concealed weapon without proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 270. DISCHARGING A FIREARM.—Any trainee who shall through carelessness or without proper authority discharge a firearm in camp, quarters, station, ship, or com-

mand shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 271. FALSE OFFICIAL STATEMENT.—Any trainee who shall make a false official statement or report shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 272. FALSE SWEARING.—Any trainee who shall swear falsely before a national security training court of any officer thereof or in any investigation, proceedings, or course of justice had under or arising out of this code, or who shall make a false oath to an affidavit, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 273. INDECENT EXPOSURE.—Any trainee who shall indecently expose his person shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 274. POSSESSION OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR.—Any trainee having in his possession intoxicating liquor in camp, quarters, station, ship, or command, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 275. WRONGFUL APPROPRIATION.—Any trainee who wrongfully takes, obtains, or withholds, by any means whatever, from the possession of the true owner or any other person any money or personal property of the value of $20 or less, with intent to deprive or defraud any person of the use and benefit thereof or to appropriate the same

to his own use or the use of any person other than the true owner shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 276. MISCELLANEOUS OFFENSES.—Though not mentioned in the preceding sections, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and trainee discipline, all conduct of a nature to hinder or impede training or to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, of which a trainee may be guilty shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 277. COMPLAINTS OF WRONGS.—Any trainee who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer or any other person having authority over him and who, on due application to his commanding officer, is refused redress may complain to the next higher military training authority who shall examine into the complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrongs complained of.

SEC. 278. MAKING GOOD TIME LOST.—Every trainee may be required to make good any time lost to training as a result of his own willful act of neglect, and this shall include time lost in desertion or absence without leave and time lost by a trainee due to restraint prior to trial resulting in conviction or restraint imposed as a result of a sentence by a national security training or civil court.

SEC. 279. PRESIDENT MAY PRESCRIBE RULES.—The

~~President may, by Executive order, which he may modify from time to time; and which shall be published in the Federal Register, prescribe the procedure including the rules of evidence and maximum limits of punishment, not exceeding the maximum limits of punishment authorized by this code, in cases before national security training courts: *Provided*, That nothing contrary or inconsistent with this code may be so prescribed.~~

~~SEC. 280. CERTAIN SECTIONS OF CODE TO BE READ AND EXPLAINED.— Sections 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 213, 214, 241, 242, and 250 through 278 of this code shall be read or explained to every trainee at the time of his induction or within six days thereafter and shall be read or explained once every three months to all trainees.~~

*TITLE I*

*SECTION 1. That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:*

*(a) Section 1 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'.*

*"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.*

*"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free*

*society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.*

*"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.*

*"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.*

*"(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest*

*possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.*

*"(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.*

*"(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command."*

*(b) Section 2 of such Act is repealed.*

*(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen".*

*(d) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate Armed Forces."*

*(e) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects (including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard)."*

*(f) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section*

*4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least four months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."*

*(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-six consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary*

*of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.*

*(h) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such Act is repealed.*

*(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:*

*"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and*

*shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."*

*(j) The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an*

*allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."*

*(k) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.*

*(l) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six".*

*(m) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:*

*"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed six months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—*

*"(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of four months but not in excess of six months which may be designated in such resolution;*

*"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-six months which may be designated in such resolution; or*

*"(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,*

*the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security*

*Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than four months.*

*"(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry*

*out the purposes of this Act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."*

*(n) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: Provided, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: Provided further, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any*

*local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: And provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.*

*"(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—*

*"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and*

*"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there*

*is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."*

*(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".*

*(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the following: "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".*

*(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".*

*(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".*

*(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows:*

*"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b)*

*of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.*

*"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer*

*candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period*

*of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.*

*"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.*

*"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."*

*(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting in clause (1) of the second sentence after*

*the word "persons", where it appears the second time, the following: "(other than wives alone)", and (2) by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof the words "wives or".*

*(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.*

*"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."*

*(t) Subsection (j) of section 6 of such Act is amended*

*(1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction", and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction".*

*(u) Section 7 of such Act is repealed.*

*(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.*

*"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948,*

*enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.*

*"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."*

*(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is*

*amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".*

*(x) Section 16 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:*

*"(j) the terms 'active training and service' shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."*

*(y) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.*

*"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the*

*provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by Departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated Departments and agencies."*

*(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-six".*

*SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is hereby amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."*

*(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828); is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".*

*SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408),*

*is hereby amended by inserting the words "sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371)," immediately following the word "including".*

*SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.*

*SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.*

*SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".*

## *TITLE II*

*SEC. 21. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out the words "until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed two thousand five hundred" and in-*

*serting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed twenty-five thousand".*

*(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955".*

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes."

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

[Report No. 117]

## A BILL

To provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MALONE

JANUARY 8, 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

FEBRUARY 21 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Reported with amendments

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2811

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 22, 1951

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of eighteen years and six months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps."

(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act."

(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training

Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided,* That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six in January 1945."

(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone) ; and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the six-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a

period of twenty-six consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided,* That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of department concerned: *And provided further,* That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component.

"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) of the subdivision of which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be

inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"(3) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of eighteen, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.

"(4) Any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"(5) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."

(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attain-

ing the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve

satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(i) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six".

(k) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under

this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-six months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under section 4 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the

day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial military training for a period of six months: *Provided,* That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of nineteen years during the period of such deferment.

"(3) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be entitled to all of the death (including burial expenses) and service-connected disability benefits now or hereafter authorized by law for members of the Armed Forces, and shall be subject to all of the duties, responsibilities, liabilities, and obligations now or hereafter imposed by law on members of the Armed Forces, not inconsistent with the provisions of this title. Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: *Provided, however,* That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the

Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"(4) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for duty at an installation located on land outside the United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.

"(5) There is hereby established the National Security Training Commission, which shall consist of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be regular or retired members of the Armed Forces, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission.

"Members of the Commission while actually serving with the Commission shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of

subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or regular places of business pursuant to such service.

"Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth are eliminated pursuant to this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial military training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish policies with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps."

(l) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense

that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard;".

(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the

platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be

added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of

any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided,* That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further,* That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section because of their activity as students shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the Natonal Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferrable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone) dependent upon them for support which renders their defer-

ment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status

of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."

(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who upon attaining the age of eighteen years and six months is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution shall, if he has not completed the academic year during which he attained the age of eighteen years and six months, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this

section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(s) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved

from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within sixty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(t) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(u) Section 10 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) the Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States,

information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."

(v) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense."

(w) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-six".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second

session) is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".

SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 5. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2811

## A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

FEBRUARY 22, 1951

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Feb. 27, 1951
For actions of Feb. 26, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 34

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....4,21
C.C.C.....2
Cotton.....27
Defense functions.....19
Electrification.....34
Expenditures.....31,32
Farm machinery.....5
Farm production....16,24,30
Fats and oils.....13
Flood control.....8
Forests and forestry.....25
Information.....12
Lands.....14
reclamation.....33
Military training.....6
Monopolies.....20
National defense.....10
Nomination.....12
Oleomargarine.....13
Organization, executive...
.....15,23
Peanuts.....1
Personnel.....18,31
Property management.....3
Research.....17,26
R.F.C.....23
Rent control.....7
Reports.....2
Selective service.....5,6
Soil conservation.....29
Taxation.....18
Transportation.....9,34
Weather.....28
Wildlife.....11,22,29

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported bill on peanut allotments and quotas. Sen. Lehman introduced (for himself and 14 others) and discussed measure to provide for investigation of oleo industry.

## HOUSE

1. PEANUTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2615, to amend the law regarding acreage allotments and marketing quotas on peanuts (H. Rept. 169)(p. 1602). For summary of bill see Digest 29.

2. REPORTS. Received the annual reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation (H. Doc. 64) and the General Accounting Office (pp. 1597, 1602). The CCC report was also received in the Senate (p. 1548).

3. PROPERTY TRANSFER. Received from the General Services Administration a proposed bill to repeal Sec. 407 of Public Law 910, 81st Congress, which prohibits the Defense Department from granting or transfering land or permanent buildings to civilian agencies of the Government; to Armed Services Committee (p. 1602).

4. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Taber criticized the 4-2 ratio on two appropriation subcommittees (pp. 1593-4).

5. SELECTIVE SERVICE; FARM MACHINERY. Rep. Ostertag, N. Y., urged provision of adequate manpower and machinery for food production (p. 1595).

## SENATE

6. MILITARY TRAINING; SELECTIVE SERVICE. S. 1, the proposed Universal Military Training and Service Act, was made the unfinished business (pp. 1577-80). The text of the bill is printed in the Record. The bill lowers the induction age from 19 to 18, limits the place of assignment for individuals under 19, increases the induction period from 21 to 26 months, provides that all available persons in the 19-26 pool must be taken before 18-year-olds are inducted, provides for clarification of status of men in reserve programs, provides for a program of universal military training, and generally leaves unchanged the authority for oc-

cupational deferments.

7. RENT CONTROL. The Banking and Currency Committee reported an original measure S. J. Res. 39, to continue until June 30 the authority for rent controls (no written report) (p. 1551).

8. FLOOD CONTROL. Received an Ind. Legislature resolution favoring flood control measures for the Maumee Valley, Ind. (p. 1549).
Received a Md. Legislature resolution favoring the employment of Allegany County (Md.) residents on flood control projects in the county (p. 1550).

9. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Hill commended the Secretary of Commerce for his appearance before the ICC in hearings on the general freight-rate investigation, and inserted correspondence on the subject (pp. 1576-7).

10. DEFENSE MOBILIZATION. Sen. Bricker discussed the need for an "over-all plan for a long-range program of defense mobilization," and claimed that the President has failed to produce such a plan (pp. 1582-4).

11. WILDLIFE. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 248, authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year (S. Rept. 129) (p. 1551).

12. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Ben Hibbs to be a member of the U. S. Advisory Commission on Information (p. 1584).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. OLEOMARGARINE. S. J. Res. 38, by Sen. Lehman (for himself and Sens. Wiley, Ferguson, Magnuson, Clements, Flanders, Johnson (Colo.), Tyre, Dworshak, Mundt, Humphrey, Aiken, Cordon, Young, and Gillette), authorizing and directing an investigation by FTC of the extent of concentration and monopolistic practices in the oleomargarine industry; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 1554). The text of the measure and a statement by Sen. Lehman are inserted in the record (pp. 1559-60).

14. LANDS. S. 952, by Sen. Watkins (for himself and Sen. Bennett), authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the Ogden (Utah) Chamber of Commerce; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 1553).

15. REORGANIZATION. H. R. 2879, by Rep. Keating, N. Y., H. R. 2880, by Rep. Boggs, Del., H. R. 2881, by Rep. Byrnes, Wis., H. R. 2882, by Rep. Cotton, N. H., H. R. 2883, by Rep. Davis, Wis., H. R. 2884, by Rep. Ford, Mich., H. R. 2885, by Rep. Jackson, Calif., H. R. 2886, by Rep. Lovre, S. Dak., H. R. 2887, by Rep. Norblad, Oreg., and H. R. 2888, by Rep. Potter, Mich., to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee (p. 1603). Remarks of Rep. Keating (pp. 1590-1; A1016).
H. J. Res. 172, by Rep. Shafer, Mich., to reconvene the Hoover Commission of Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government and make the Hoover Commission a permanent agency of the Congress; to Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee (p. 1603). Remarks of author (p. 1594).

16. FARM PRODUCTION. H. J. Res. 170, by Rep. Smith, Miss., providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to Armed Services Committee (p. 1603).

17. EXPERIMENTAL FARM. H. R. 2895, by Rep. Wickersham, Okla., authorizing an ap-

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: On page 91, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter no person shall be enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for an enlistment period in excess of thirty months. The period of enlistment of any person who, on or after June 27, 1950, has enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for a period in excess of thirty months is hereby reduced to thirty months.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 73, line 21, strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one".

On page 77, beginning with line 6, strike out all down to and including line 9.

On page 78, lines 8 and 9, strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one".

On page 91, beginning with line 8, strike out all down to and including line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended by striking out



★

'July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953,'."

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 73, line 21, strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one".

On page 77, lines 8 and 9, strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one".

On page 78, lines 8 and 9, strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one".

On page 91, line 13, strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one".

2-27-51——B

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: On page 91, beginning with line 8, strike out all down to and including line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. Until July 1, 1953, the President shall be authorized to order into the active military or naval service of the United States, with or without their consent, any or all members and units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces. The period of time for which any person who has served on active duty in any of the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of six

2-27-51——C

★

months or more prior to June 25, 1948, may be ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this section shall not exceed eighteen consecutive months and the period of time for which any other person may be ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this section shall not exceed twenty-six consecutive months."

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: On page 91, beginning with line 8, strike out all down to and including line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. Until July 1, 1953, the President shall be authorized to order into the active military or naval service of the United States, with or without their consent, any or all members and units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces. The period of time for which any person who has served on active duty in any

of the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of six months or more prior to the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act may be ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this section shall not exceed eighteen consecutive months and the period of time for which any other person may be ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this section shall not exceed twenty-six consecutive months."

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 72, line 5, strike out "word 'eighteen'" and insert in lieu thereof "words 'eighteen years and six months'".

On page 80, line 9, strike out "(1)".

On page 81, beginning with line 10, strike out all down to and including line 4 on page 82.

On page 82, beginning with line 8, strike out all down to and including line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended

by inserting after the words 'six months' the following: 'and prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength'."

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 83, line 8, strike out "seventy-five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundred and fifty thousand".

2-27-51——E

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

posed by the railroads. The Department of Commerce will actively participate in the case.

When I set up the Office of Transportation, putting into effect the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21, of 1950, this was one of the principal tasks the President and I had in mind for this Office. On July 24, 1950, in outlining the responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Transportation, I specifically directed that he initiate action before the transportation regulatory agencies when such action appeared to be appropriate in order to effectuate the over-all transportation policies of the Government.

We have been hampered by lack of the funds needed to get this work under way, but the Bureau of the Budget has recently authorized the staffing of this Office, and I look forward with confidence to the performance by General Fleming and his staff of the job you have in mind: To represent the general public interest in transportation matters.

I appreciate the sentiment expressed in the first paragraph of your letter. Your informed interest in legislation designed to establish a national transportation policy has been one of the heartening indications of support in the Congress for the task which has been assigned by the Congress and the President to this Department.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

---

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 29, 1951.*

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
*Secretary of Commerce,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As one who has long been interested in the transportation problems of the country, especially those of the South, I noted with much satisfaction the setting up in the Department of Commerce last year, under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21, of a Transportation Section, headed by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, for development of over-all transportation policy in the executive branch, and to represent the general public interest in transportation matters. I have sponsored legislation in Congress for a number of years to establish a national transportation policy.

May I inquire whether your Department will take an active part in the general freight-rate investigation just started by the Interstate Commerce Commission, Ex parte No. 175, of the 6-percent increase in freight rates proposed by the railroads? Such an increase, which would add over $400,000,000 to the country's annual freight bill, would obviously give an added impetus to inflation and might be the start of another series of price and wage increases, followed by additional freight-rate increases, such as we had in 1946–49.

I appreciate, of course, that the railroads must have adequate revenues and that they, like all the other basic industries, have recently experienced certain increased operating costs. However, I am advised that 1950 has been a year of relatively high railroad earnings and that a large increase in traffic may be expected in 1951 which may give them the greatest net revenues since the war peak of 1943–44.

Heretofore there has been no means of presenting to the Interstate Commerce Commission the facts about these matters from the standpoint of businessmen, farmers, and consumers. I am sure that your recently organized Transportation Section would be performing a great service by intervening in the present case, not to oppose any legitimate need of the railroads, but to see to it that the facts, from the standpoint of the users of transportation are adequately presented and the national interest fully protected.

With all good wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

---

Mr. HILL. Senators will recall that among its other provisions the plan provided for the appointment of an Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation to assist the Secretary with respect to transportation problems and the development of over-all transportation policy within the executive branch.

It is pleasing to see that the Secretary of Commerce, for the purpose of representing the interest of businessmen, farmers, and consumers, is intervening in the present rate case. This is one of the objectives sought in the transportation legislation which I sponsored in Congress for many years.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act.'

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessary exists.

"(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

"(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command."

(b) Section 2 of such act is repealed.

(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen."

(d) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate Armed Forces."

(e) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects (including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard)."

(f) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least 4 months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of 26 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury

with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.

(h) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such act is repealed.

(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of 8 years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainer of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(j) The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(k) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such act are repealed.

(l) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six".

(m) Section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed 6 months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of 4 months but not in excess of 6 months which may be designated in such resolution;

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 26 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than 4 months.

"(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

(n) Section 5 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as 90 days older, (ii) has not attained the age of 19, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "six

months" a comma and the following: "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed 75,000 persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest, and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than 10 years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulation prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer-candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057) as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such program to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed 1 year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer-candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended (1) by inserting in clause (1) of the second sentence after the word "persons", which it appears the second time, the following: "(other than wives alone)", and (2) by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof the words "wives or."

(5) Subsection (i) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Subsection (j) of section 6 of such act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction," and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction."

(u) Section 7 of such act is repealed.

(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board."

(x) Section 16 of such act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(j) the terms 'active training and service' shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of 4 months (or not to exceed 6 months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(y) Section 17 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated departments and agencies."

(z) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-six."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is hereby amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act.

(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828); is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953."

SEC. 3. The act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is hereby amended by inserting the words "sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371)," immediately following the word "including."

SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

TITLE II

SEC. 21. (a) The first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), is amended by striking out the words "until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than 5 years of not to exceed 2,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than 5 years of not to exceed 25,000."

(b) Section 3 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, is the bill now the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is that Senate bill 1 is now the unfinished business.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say that the bill will not be taken up for consideration until tomorrow. However, I desired to have it made the unfinished business, and that has been done.

## COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCES OF CERTAIN GERMAN PRISONERS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of regret that I feel forced to call to the attention of the Senate the recent action of Gen. Thomas T. Handy in commuting the death sentences of certain German prisoners who were convicted of murdering American prisoners during the Battle of the Bulge. In particular these murders included those at the Malmedy Crossroads.

The subject has been debated on the floor of the United States Senate on several occasions, and I do not intend at this time to raise the question of alleged abuses of these individuals during the investigations and trials which convicted them. This was answered completely and conclusively by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee which studied the matter thoroughly and found no evidence to support the charges of mistreatment.

However, it is because of the findings of this subcommittee, of which I was a member, that I feel it necessary to point out the seriousness of this decision on the part of General Handy, and its possible effect on the Armed Forces of the United States. Properly to evaluate this problem, a little of the background must be explained which has led to the theory of punishment of war criminals.

Throughout the history of wars between nations many persons have been able to escape punishment for crimes committed under the guise of war necessity by pleading the so-called doctrine of superior orders. However, while World War II gas going on, it was decided that those indiivduals who committed so-called war crimes would be subject to trial and this doctrine would no longer prevail.

Accordingly the stage was set for the conducting of large numbers of war crimes trials at Nuremberg and at the various lesser courts throughout Germany. The case to which I have particular reference is the so-called Malmedy case, which resulted in the conviction of 73 Germans accused of murdering American prisoners of war at various places during the Battle of the Bulge. The largest mass murder was the shooting of 142 unarmed American soldiers who had surrendered and were grouped in a field at the Malmedy crossroads. Forty-four of these accused were sentenced to death. Through normal review procedures of the Army this number was reduced to 12. Gen. Lucius Clay then made a personal study of these 12 cases and affirmed the death sentences for 6 of them and exercised clemency in the case of the other 6.

Some 18 months after the conviction of these accused a large number of affidavits, many of which were proven by the subcommittee to be false in whole or in part, were disseminated through various media throughout the United States. Organizations such as the National Council for the Prevention of War interested themselves, and the propaganda drums began to beat to save the lives of these six convicted Nazi murderers and to lay the groundwork for the ultimate freedom of all those who were convicted of these crimes. The motivations in back of these efforts were not clear. The subcommittee received certain competent evidence which led it to believe that one motivation was the desire of Communist groups to destroy the prestige of American Military Government in Germany. Whether this was a fact or not it is certain that the effect of these efforts was materially to disturb the German people and to lessen the standing of the American Military Government in Germany.

As a result of its studies the subcommittee was fully convinced that if any injustices had been done to the accused in these cases it had been more than rectified by subsequent reviews and General Clay's action.

When General Handy released his decision on these and other prisoners in Landsberg, he issued a press release, No. 5191, dated January 31, 1951. In this release he repeated the details of the crimes committed by these men and stated, among other things, that the commutation of the death sentences did not mean that there is any doubt whatsoever that they were guilty of the offenses charged.

Mr. President, I do not know what political considerations have influenced General Handy in his decision. This is as much a mystery to me as the great effort made by various individuals to influence this case in the past. I do know, however, that as a result of these efforts there are six guilty Germans who will not pay the death penalty and I suspect will be freed through the same type of pressure within a very short time—I do know that the practice of murdering prisoners of war is being continued by the enemies we are facing today—and certainly we all know that they should feel free to murder prisoners because we have so clearly shown that we will not punish them for doing it.

Mr. President, the other effect is simply this—by our actions we have repudiated the difficult, tedious, conscientious work that was carried out by our various military courts in Germany—we have repudiated the decisions of men like Gen. Lucius Clay, whose opinion in this case was as thorough, as complete, and as convincing as can be found in the history of such cases—and in essence we have laid the ground work for the repudiation of the theory of punishment of war crimes.

Mr. President, there is little else that needs to be said on this matter. I disagree so thoroughly and completely with the action of General Handy that I want the record to show that fact. I can only hope that some divine miracle will open our eyes to the fact that we must punish such criminals when we find them and that by prompt punishment we may cause potential murderers, operating under the guise of war conditions, to check their murdering hands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the news release by General Handy, with reference to his commutation of the sentences in question.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gen. Thomas T. Handy, commander in chief, European command, announced today his final action in the cases of the 13 war criminals under his jurisdiction who are now

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Feb. 28, 1951
For actions of Feb. 27, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 35

CONTENTS

Agricultural imports.....20
Agricultural investigations.....8
Appropriations.....9
Civil defense.....33
Claims.....17,24,26
Commerce.....11
Dairy industry.....29
Daylight saving time.....13
Defense contracts.....26
Education.....10
Electrification.....35
Farm production.....31
Farm program.....7
Fuels.....16
Government operations...21
Inflation.....4
Labor.....10,23
farm.....18,31
Lands, reclamation....6,34
Livestock and meat.....5
Military training.....1
Nomination.....2
Organization, executive.25
Personnel.....2
Postal rates.....12
Prices, control....4,14,22
support.....20
Purchasing.....15,26
Reports.....16
Selective service.....32
Small business.....15
Social security.....27
Soil conservation.....30
Taxation.....28
Trade, foreign.....3,24
Transportation.....35
Weed control.....19
Wildlife.....24

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated military training bill. Senate received nomination of Ramspeck to be a Civil Service Commissioner. House Rules Committee reported resolution to authorize Agriculture Committee to investigate agricultural mobilization. Rep. Cannon spoke in favor of "one-package" appropriation bill and discussed subcommittee ratios with Rep. Martin. Sen. Ellender introduced and discussed bill for importation of farm labor. Sen. Magnuson introduced bill to amend Sec. 22, re agricultural imports.

## SENATE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Began debate on S. 1, the military-training selective-service bill (pp. 1615-31, 1642-53).

2. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Robert Ramspeck to be a Civil Service Commissioner (p. 1654).

3. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Sen. Malone spoke against the reciprocal trade agreement program and in favor of S. 981, the "flexible import fee" bill (pp. 1631-42).

4. ECONOMIC STABILIZATION. Sen. Wiley said the administration should do more to fight inflation (p. 1615).

5. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. Received a resolution from the S. Dak. Legislature favoring continuation of the foot-and-mouth disease campaign (p. 1606).

6. RECLAMATION. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted various resolutions by the Nebraska Reclamation Association (pp. 1608-9).

7. FARMERS UNION. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted various resolutions by the Farmers Educational and Cooperative State Union of Nebraska (pp. 1609-10).

## HOUSE

8. AGRICULTURAL INVESTIGATIONS. The Rules Committee reported with amendment H. Res. 99, to authorize the Agriculture Committee to investigate all matters within its jurisdiction and agriculture in relation to defense mobilization (H. Rept. 179) (p. 1685).

9. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Cannon, Mo., spoke in favor of a "one-package" appropriation bill, discussing the matter with Rep. Taber, N. Y., and others, and discussed with Rep. Martin, Mass., the ratio of Democrats and Republicans on subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. Rep. Cannon inserted various newspaper articles and editorials favoring the omnibus appropriation bill. (pp. 1665-84).

10. EDUCATION; LABOR. The Rules Committee reported with amendment H. Res. 73, to authorize the Education and Labor Committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction (H. Rept. 178) (p. 1685).

11. COMMERCE. The Rules Committee reported with amendment H. Res. 51, to authorize the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction (H. Rept. 177) (p. 1685).

12. POSTAL RATES. Received the President's message recommending that postal rates be increased sufficiently to reduce the postal deficit; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (H. Doc. 65) (pp. 1660-1). The message was also received in the Senate (p. 1631).

13. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. The Judiciary Subcommittee of the D. C. Committee reported to the full committee without recommendation H. R. 2611, authorizing daylight saving time in D. C. (p. D129).

14. PRICE CONTROLS. Rep. Rogers, Mass., urged that prices be controlled and suggested that additional legislation be passed if the present law is not effective (p. 1659).

15. SMALL BUSINESS. Chairman Patman (Tex.) of the Small Business Committee announced the appointment of subcommittees to investigate the problems of small business in the national emergency, small business in Government procurement, specific problems of specific groups (pp. D130-1).

16. REPORT. Received from Interior Department a report on progress under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944 (p. 1684).

17. CLAIMS. Received from the Budget Bureau a proposed bill recommended by the Motor Carrier Claims Commission to amend the act creating the Motor Carrier Claims Commission; to Judiciary Committee (p. 1685).

BILLS INTRODUCED

18. FARM LABOR. S. 984, by Sen. Ellender, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 relating to recruiting agricultural workers from foreign countries; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (pp. 1610, 1612-3). Sen. Ellender discussed the purposes of the bill and inserted its text in the Record (pp. 1612-3).

H. R. 2955, by Rep. Yorty, Calif., relating to the stabilization of defense farm labor; to Agriculture Committee (p. 1686).

19. WEED CONTROL. S. 980, by Sen. Dworshak, to authorize appropriations for the eradication and control of halogeton on public lands; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 1610).

20. AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS. S. 983, by Sen. Magnuson (for himself and Sen. Morse), to amend section 22 of the Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs admin-

mane to the amendment which already has been adopted. I am simply asking that the substitute be printed. The Parliamentarian has advised me that if consent is given, the substitute can be printed and can be made available to the conferees, for their use.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## HIGH COST OF LIVING IN MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the high cost of living, particularly its impact upon the city of Milwaukee, Wis., and to have printed at the end of my statement a telegram from the mayor of Milwaukee.

There being no objection, the statement and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

On Sunday there was released a news story showing the cost of living in the city of Milwaukee as the highest of any city in the United States. The Bureau of Labor Statistics which had checked prices in 34 big cities last October found that in Wisconsin's largest city a modest but adequate annual budget for a family of four would require an income of $3,933. Washington, D. C., was second in that such a budget would require an income of $3,926. Included in the budget were costs of goods, rents, services, personal taxes, social-security deductions, occupational expenses, and life insurance.

In the city of Milwaukee there is a high cost of living committee appointed by Mayor Zeidler which has been working on this critical problem. Today I received a telegram from Mayor Zeidler expressing his deep concern over the inadequacy of the checks thus far against the continued rampant high cost of living. I believe that the mayor reflected the sentiments of the people of his great city. Certainly, the middle-income and low-income bracket people of the Nation have more and more been squeezed by the price spiral.

This has been due in considerable part to the fact that the administration unfortunately failed to use for a long, long time the powers which Congress gave it to control inflation. The administration has been critical of the price-control law which Congress wrote. But even if the law were as inadequate as the administration contends (and I for one very definitely disagree that it is so inadequate), even if that were the case, the administration has hardly demonstrated a driving will, intention, and organization to set the situation right. Instead, it has stumbled and fumbled in a way that makes every American wonder whether a single constructive lesson was learned from our World War II OPA-WPB experience.

Moreover, the administration has chosen to convey to the American public the impression that it could "have its cake and eat it too." It has given the impression to organized labor, for example, that wages could continue to rise without a resultant rise in prices. It has given the impression that strikes could occur as usual, ignoring the consequences of the loss of production in aggravating inflation.

It is obvious that speeches are not going to solve this problem, but that decisive action on the part of price and wage stabilization officers are necessary. Obviously, sacrifices on the part of every American will be necessary if this inflation problem is to be met head-on. And when I say every American, I mean business, labor, agriculture, and, yes, government appointive and elective officers as well.

There has been too much greed in too many quarters, and this greed has not been confined to any one single economic group. There has been too much of a tendency to pretend that only the other fellow must make sacrifices. Inflation, however, is not the sort of situation that George—the other fellow—can take care of. Just how much can be accomplished at this late stage in reversing the forces of inflation is open to serious doubt. Inflation tends to be irreversible in a period such as this. At least, however, we can secure sound, sensible administration so that inflation makes no further headway over and above its present peak.

---

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 26, 1951.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

I call your attention to the news story of Sunday, February 25, that the cost of living in Milwaukee is the highest in the United States as of October 1950. Since that month the forces of inflation in this locality have continued to operate so that undoubtedly the cost of living is higher. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics a modest budget for a family of four in Milwaukee is $3,933, meaning that an average earner should make $76 a week. I urge you to place into early effect necessary checks on this trend to protect large sections of middle- and low-income groups from great impoverishment.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
*Mayor of Milwaukee.*

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message frrom the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANKIN, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. ELLIOTT, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, and Mr. O'KONSKI were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2262) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the fortification of Dorchester Heights, Mass., and the evacuation of Boston, Mass., by the British, to be held in South Boston, Mass., on March 17, 1951, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further routine matters, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To Senate bill 1 the committee has reported an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which will be regarded as the text of the bill. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call on condition that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to yield under those conditions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this is a very important bill. Inasmuch as the announcement that we would not have a quorum call immediately upon convening was made only yesterday, now that routine morning business has been transacted, I deem it important to have a quorum call before the Senator from Texas begins his presentation. I ask the Senator from Texas not to yield for insertions in the RECORD after he begins his remarks. That is the only way we can proceed in an orderly manner. Senators who desire to transact routine business should be on the floor at 12 o'clock.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Anderson | Hill | Mundt |
| Bricker | Hoey | Murray |
| Butler, Md. | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Nebr. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Byrd | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Cain | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Carlson | Jenner | Pastore |
| Case | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Connally | Kem | Schoeppel |
| Cordon | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Dirksen | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Duff | Langer | Sparkman |
| Dworshak | Lehman | Stennis |
| Eastland | Lodge | Taft |
| Ecton | Long | Thye |
| Ellender | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Watkins |
| Flanders | McFarland | Welker |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Wherry |
| George | Magnuson | Wiley |
| Gillette | Malone | Williams |
| Hayden | Martin | Young |
| Hendrickson | Millikin | |
| Hennings | Monroney | |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today we have arrived at a moment in history when we must decide whether we shall indulge ourselves again in the temporary and false comfort of unpreparedness, or whether we shall take the realistic, hard-headed course of full preparedness.

A prepared nation can control its own destiny. An unprepared nation has its destiny controlled by aggressors.

From the lessons of history as I read them, the last remaining hope for peace in the world is for America to give evidence of its determination and its capacity to defend the peace.

Mr. President, in 1945 there were 1,820,000,000 people in the western sphere. Today there are only 725,000,000 people in this same sphere, a reduction of more than a billion people.

In 1945 there were 193,000,000 people in the Soviet sphere. Today there are 795,000,000 people under the iron heel of the Politburo, while 740,000,000 people claim neutrality.

While the number of free people in the world has been more than halved in only 5 years, the number of people behind the iron curtain has increased over four times as the Soviet Union blackjacked its way to further conquests.

The free are now outnumbered. The swift passage of time has balanced the manpower scales against us.

Too often, we have neglected to follow the teachings of the old proverb, "Do not put off until tomorrow what you can do today." Instead we have twisted it around and said, "Do not do today what you can put off until tomorrow, because then you may not have to do it."

But we have always had to do it.

We had better do today what should have been done in the many yesterdays.

Unpreparedness is an invitation to disaster.

The first essential of any preparedness program is now, as it has always been, the strength of our fighting forces under arms and in the Reserve.

Technology has not outmoded this fundamental. Conquests are made by men. Men must be had to defend against the aggressors. No nation is prepared until its male citizens are trained to fight.

The second essential of preparedness is the preservation of a constant state of readiness.

Throughout our history one thing about America has been certain. Our enemies have been able to rely upon our weakness while we have not been able to rely upon our strength.

Thus the two things that America must have now are men for the moment and reserves for the future.

The legislation now before the Senate is designed to meet these two compelling needs.

This bill does two things. It enables the military to raise an Armed Force of 3,500,000 men, and it assures that this Nation will at all times have an adequate reserve of trained, seasoned men ready on short notice to meet any challenge to our national security.

I realize that in this bill there are certain departures from the course we have been following during the past 2 years since the Selective Service Act was revived in 1948. This bill lowers the age of induction from 19, which was provided in 1948, to the age of 18. This bill extends the term of service and training from 21 months, which was deemed adequate in 1948, to 26 months, which the committee believes is more realistic for present conditions. This bill makes the further provision that a number of men may be permitted to begin studies of critical subjects in our colleges and universities.

These changes are not inconsistent with our experience and our practice during periods of emergency. The situation existing in the world today is considerably different and far more serious, Mr. President, than the situation which existed in March 1948 when the selective service legislation was brought before Congress for action.

The lowered induction age is entirely consistent with what this country has done in all periods of danger from the days of the colonial wars to the present. Eighteen-year-old men have served with distinction in all of the Nation's struggles. It is neither novel nor unique for the 18-year-old to contribute a portion of his time to the defense of his country.

Some, I realize, would prefer to exempt men of age 18 from service. This bill provides all the safeguards that we can afford for the 18-year-olds.

So long as there are available I–A's, useful IV–F's, nonveterans, nonfathers, 19 through 25, uncalled on the local board's rolls, the 18-year-old will not be required to enter military service.

To those who disapprove of making those between the ages of 18 and 19 eligible, I urge a consideration of what they are saying. They will be saying that when the supply of eligible men is exhausted in the 19 through 25 age bracket, the Congress of the United States will not permit the military to call anyone else. Mr. President, we would thus be denying an imperative need. Such a course is not a responsible one. I do not believe that the Senators will want to pursue it.

If we do not authorize the military to take the men between 18 and 19, the only recourse that we can follow in meeting the demands for military manpower would be to require that the veterans of World War II, many of whom were called into the service at age 18, serve again. That is the only group of men left from which sufficient numbers could be drawn to bolster our military strength.

Do you wish to say to the veterans of World War II that more is expected of them and their generation than is expected of the generation now between 18 and 19? I, for one, am unwilling to ask that they sacrifice more, under present conditions.

Taking the men between 18 and 19 will to a minimum degree disrupt their life or the life of the community. There is no logical, material difference between a man 18 to 19 and one 19 to 20, so far as concerns the point at which service eligibility now begins.

Will a large number of young men be thrown into combat before they attain the age of 19? Experience shows that it takes a minimum of 3 months for the Selective Service System to complete the induction process. Consequently, if the registration age is set at 18, a young man would be at least 18 years and 3 months old before he would be inducted. If we add to this the processing and travel from his home to his first station, a minimum—as the bill now provides—of 4 months of basic training, plus the normal furlough time, small unit and technical training and travel time in going overseas, the chances are remarkably small that substantial numbers of young men inducted for service will see combat before they have attained the age of 19 years.

Mr. President, this estimate does not take into consideration the fact that the bill provides that where it is necessary to induct men between the ages of 18 and 19, their selection shall be made in such a manner that the older individuals go first. Thus, those over 18 years and 9 months would normally be the first to be selected. If that group were to be exhausted, those in the age group 18 years and 6 months to 18 years and 9 months would be the next selected, and so on down the line by quarters, but always with the older men going first.

I would point out, Mr. President, that this bill protects those between the ages of 18 and 19 much more effectively than would a provision to set the induction age at, let us say, 18½. This bill specifically provides that the older men go before the younger; it requires that the supply of men between the ages of 19 and 25 be exhausted before a man between the ages of 18 and 19 can be touched. This is the sequence of security for those who fear for the welfare of young men between the ages of 18 and 19.

To those who may say that the age between 18 and 19 is too young, I would say that we have no desire whatsoever to induct those between 18 and 19 or any other group merely because of their age. The underlying need to take those between 18 and 19 is the same as that to take any man in any age group. Our manpower reserve is small. Our danger is great. Underlying all of the study on the matter of inducting 18- to 19-year-olds is the frightening realization that tomorrow or next week or next year we

may need all of the men we can find—all the men in all age groups—in order to ward off the brutal blows of the aggressor. In that eventuality, all available manpower will be needed immediately. Any delay, even for a few hours, on that grim day, in making men available to selective service, might prove extremely costly to free men everywhere.

The healthiest men, the men with the least responsibility to family or community, will go first. Other groups will go as they are needed, if they are needed.

I would remind the Senate that most of the men for our armed services will still be supplied by voluntary enlistments. Most of the men in our Navy and Air Force are today raised by that means, and will continue to be, in the future. This bill will primarily furnish men for the Army. I think I need not remind you, Mr. President, that few men are enlisting in the Army today. The reason is obvious. Little can be done to build our forces by enlistment which has not already been done. There, we are at a dead end. The program contained in this bill must be adopted if we are to build our Army to the strength which it needs in this hour of decision.

With this legislation, it is unlikely that Congress will have to pass any further legislation for manpower short of total mobilization. At that time only an amendment making veterans eligible and increasing the age of eligibility will be necessary.

Some argue that we should not induct men of 18 because some of our allies are not doing so. We had better be more concerned about and more watchful of our enemies at this critical hour than to be condemning the plans of our friends. Should we firmly and blindly resolve ourselves to remain weak because our allies may be weak? Or should we set a courageous example for free men everywhere to follow? If we refuse to expand our strength, we may well be the last generation of Americans to enjoy liberty. What has taken centuries to build could then crumble overnight, never to be revived.

Under this bill the men inducted into service will serve for 26 months, including time out for leave.

The present law is 21 months. Twenty-one months was adopted in 1948 when none of our troops were engaged in fighting. We of the committee do not believe that a 21-month period of service is now adequate.

More time in the service is imperative for the combat efficiency of our troops.

Subtract training time, 4 months; overseas transportation time, 2 to 3 months; leave, 1 to 2 months; plus additional time for specialist training, and barely 12 months of a man's time can be spent in effective service. With a 26-month term of service, it will be possible to receive the benefit of nearly 18 months of front-line service.

This is more economical in terms of money and in terms of manpower. The longer the term of service, the more men are free from the duty of running the pipeline of transportation and supply for men going overseas and returning.

The longer the term of service, the more specialized training can be given to our men, better equipping them not only for immediate service but for ultimate service in the Reserves.

The longer the term of service, the more men we train for cadre duty, in the event that we need such men to help us train a larger army in a hurry.

There is another important reason for this longer term of service. It is not a pleasant reason, but we must face it. Most of the men who are inducted through Selective Service will go into the Army. Our Air Force and our Navy are built upon 4-year enlistees and our Army is built upon 21-month inductees.

Of the 50,000 casualties suffered by United States forces in Korea, the great majority of them—as I remember, a number in excess of 38,000—have been suffered by the Army. The ranks of trained, seasoned, experienced officers and men of the Army have been seriously depleted. The men we have been losing were, by and large, the cream of the American Army.

Only by extending the length of service to 26 months can we make and keep the Army at its necessary strength and efficiency.

If we desire to have a more effective combat force, if we desire a more efficient use of military manpower through less waste in the pipeline abroad, if we desire more trained men, better trained in the technical mysteries of modern war, if we desire to build a technology-wise reserve for the future, we should extend the length of service.

The bill provides that, in order to safeguard the necessary flow of scientific and technically trained men into the economy, 75,000 students shall be selected on a nonpartisan, competitive basis for college study, after they have completed their basic military training.

These students would not escape service. Their liability for service would only be suspended while they equipped themselves with the training essential to the functioning of our economy. To guard against favoritism, these students would be selected by a civilian bipartisan board, nominated by the President, confirmed by the Senate.

It must be remembered that this would not be the only group entering college. There will be this year 65,000 ROTC students, 25,000 IV–F's, 58,000 veterans, and 148,000 draft-eligible men. Next year, there will be an increase to 90,000 in ROTC's. This—plus women and those men under the induction age—would mean well over 300,000 freshmen. It would be unnecessary—from the educational view—and unwise—from the security view—to subtract greater numbers from our fighting strength in this hour of peril.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator would permit, I should like to finish my statement and then I shall be delighted to attempt to answer any questions which may be asked.

We do not accept the idea that all colleges should be turned into military training camps. It would be most unwise to place our institutions of higher learning under the thumb of the military. There could be no more certain step toward a militaristic state than that. We want to safeguard academic freedom. We do not want to reduce our learned professors to drill-master status.

Involved as we now are in a struggle which could last a lifetime, we must adopt a course which will keep us strong 10 years from now—not just for today.

I do not believe it would be a responsible discharge of our duty if we now enacted legislation to increase America's strength and placed in that legislation a terminal date. We have no justification to say that as of a certain date the need for American strength will no longer exist. No man in this Chamber possesses the crystal ball with which to foretell the future.

To accomplish the goal of strengthening America for the future, this bill would require that each man trained for service would upon completion of his full tour of active duty remain in the Reserve for a maximum of 6 years. His service and his value to his country would not be lost, nor would his soldierly skills be allowed to disintegrate.

Beyond this, the bill provides that when the immediate need for rapid mobilization ceases, a program of universal training shall be instituted, thus allowing us to cut down our large and expensive standing Army, and to rely more on a seasoned, trained, ready, less expensive Reserve. This program shall be under predominantly civilian control. Such a program offering our young men 4 to 6 months of basic training, would assure a constant level of strength and competence in our Reserve forces.

Some wanted the program under all-military control. We concluded, however, that such a training program should be under civilian control.

Thus we have adopted the Compton Commission concept that the program shall be controlled by a board of three civilians, two military men, appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate.

The emphasis this bill places upon maintenance of an adequate Reserve is deliberate. America cannot afford to maintain at all times an excessively large, active-duty armed force, nor can this country indulge the repeated frenzy of mobilizing in great haste once or twice each generation.

An important aspect of national security is the strength of our National Guard. At present, all men enlisting in the guard are exempt from the draft. This bill would not change the status of those in the guard now—it would be wasteful to pull these men out of the guard, waste their training, and impair the effectiveness of their units.

This bill permits the guard to continue to accept men under 18½ years and to retain these men. This provision will continue until such time as the Secretary of Defense finds that there are enough trained men available from other sources to maintain the required strength of the guard.

This protects the Guard's strength—and by so doing it protects the national interest.

Very briefly, I have summarized the operations, the purposes, and the pattern of the bill.

This bill is the product of the collective judgment of the 13 members of the Senate's Armed Services Committee. The bill was reported to the Senate by a unanimous vote of the 13 members of the committee.

In preparing the bill, we have aimed at the target of as many men as we need as rapidly as we need them. Likewise, we have tried to safeguard the men and the Nation from excessive zeal on the part of the military.

Members of the Armed Services Committee certainly have made an effort to be prudent.

It is now our duty to decide, with the guidance of our conscience and our vision, what we will do.

I know full well that we face a grave responsibility as we deliberate here over legislation which will affect many homes, many young men, many families.

But I remind the Senate that the lack of adequate legislation on this subject will almost certainly affect all homes, all people, all families.

The American people look to us for the leadership they desire and deserve. They want us to lead them forward through the uncertain future.

Above all, I believe the American people want to be secure. They want to be prepared. If they are prepared, they will face the worst with calm courage and determination.

The free world today awaits the leadership of America. America awaits the leadership of you and me. America deserves that leadership.

Unfortunately it is not in our power, or in the power of any citizen, to choose that we prefer to retain our comforts rather than to defend our Nation.

That option now rests with the Soviet Union—not with us.

This legislation proposed today—this legislation which will bolster our manpower reserve—will be insurance against this option ever being exercised.

Mr. President, we cannot, we must not make the blunder of choosing a few months of self-indulgence now in return for eternal misery in the future.

We are here to do, not what we would like to do, but what we should do and what we must do. The interests of the Nation must prevail.

The facts before us are harsh. They are, nonetheless, real. We do not know how long this situation will continue.

We do know that within the continental United States today there is only one equipped, trained combat division of the United States Army standing ready to defend this land.

We do know that we will live in constant, haunting fear unless we take the courageous steps needed to protect our Nation.

Boldness and decision are required.

The American people will not be timid in following the leadership we set for them here today. Let us not be timid in exercising it.

This bill will give them the protection they expect—yes, the protection they demand. They will gladly do their duty as Americans if we will give them the chance.

Of some generations much is demanded in the way of sacrifice and service to their country. The generation which was born in the half-light of peace in the twenties and thirties will willingly meet that demand today in order that America may remain free in the years to come. Have no fear of that. That is the kind of people Americans are.

The shrewd and grasping masters of the Kremlin are no doubt watching our action here today with interest, hoping for the decision which we must not make, hoping that we will fail to act, as we must act.

But, more important, the American people await our action.

Shall we once more, by inaction, extend to our Nation an invitation to disaster?

Or shall we give the American people this bill which deepens our manpower pool by lowering the induction age?

Shall we give the American people this proposal which increases our combat effectiveness by increasing the term of service?

Shall we give the American people this legislation which will build our reserves for emergencies of the future?

Shall we, through this measure, contribute to national preparedness, bolster our national security, insure our freedoms, our institutions, and our very lives?

We shall, we must, with the guidance of God, here embark upon this course to redeem humanity. With the righteous strength, which centuries of freedom under God have given us, we cannot fail.

Mr. President, I shall now be delighted to yield to other Senators, and I yield first to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, first I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Texas on his excellent presentation of the pending legislation. I also wish to commend the committee for the fine work it has done. In my opinion, the pending bill is one of the most important that will come before Congress during the present session. I wish now to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas one or two questions, if I may, particularly for emphasis.

He stated that we had only one of two choices, namely, that we either had to call into the military service men below the age 19, or draft World War II veterans. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did any witness appear before the committee to advocate that it would be better to draft World War II veterans, who had served their country already in combat, than to take men who had not served their country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that I did not hear one single witness—and we heard more than 100 witnesses—recommend to the committee that we redraft World War II veterans, many of whom had served at age 18, rather than dip into the 18- and 19-year-old pool.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand the distinguished Senator, the committee did not really have any choice in the matter. They had to go below age 19 in order to get the manpower which would be needed for the armed services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator one or two more questions with reference to the pending legislation. What did the testimony show as to the chances of a boy who was properly trained of coming back from combat, as compared with one who was not properly trained?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The heads of the military services, testified that a man was a much better soldier and had a much better chance of protecting himself if he had had an opportunity to get adequate training. The Senator from Arizona will no doubt remember the very eloquent words of General Eisenhower, when he pointed out to the committee the absolute necessity of giving all men adequate training. He pointed out that the fields of Europe are now dotted with little white crosses, largely as a result of our failure to give our men adequate training.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, much has been said with regard to drafting men 18½ years old rather than men 18 years old. As a matter of fact, the pending bill really provides for the drafting of men of 18 years 11 months, and 18 years 10 months. In other words, it scales the age limits, which the other provision would not have done. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. I would say to the distinguished majority leader that all members of the Armed Services Committee, who have been maintaining a constant surveillance of the Defense Department, are aware of the great wastage of manpower which has occurred in the past and is occurring now. With that in mind, we hesitated to set an arbitrary age of 18 years 6 months, or 18 years 7 months, and say to the Defense Department, "You can take everybody over that age regardless of your needs."

Therefore, realizing that we had somewhat of a mandate from Congress in the 1948 act, in that Congress was willing to draft all men between 19 and 26 years of age, and realizing that there are still estimated to be available approximately 800,000 men between the ages of 19 and 26, the committee, in the bill which it has reported, says to the military authorities, in effect, "You must take every one of the 19- to 26-year-old men before you can touch anyone between the age of 18 and 19 years."

Pursuing that reasoning one step further, we realized that there are some 800,000 IV–F's in the country who are between the ages of 19 and 26. In that connection the committee says, "We want you to review every one of those 800,000 IV–F's, and you must induct all IV–F's who can be made eligible under a lower test of mental eligibility before you take a single man of 18 years 11 months, or 18 years 10 months, or 18 years 9 months. Realizing that some 570,000 college students were deferred for this year, and that June probably would be upon us soon after the passage of the pending bill, we said, "We want you to comb the 570,000 deferred students, from which group it is assumed you can get 200,000, and induct those

who can be inducted from that group before you touch any 18-year-old men."

Realizing that there are approximately 290,000 nonveteran, nonfathers between the ages of 19 and 26, who had been administratively deferred, the committee said, "You must take all of those men before you touch any 18-year-old. When, if, and after you have taken the 800,000 men between the ages of 19 and 26, the 200,000 college students, the 100,000 IV–F's, and the 300,000 nonveterans, nonfathers, making a total of approximately 1,400,000 men, you may, under this bill, take those who are 18 years, 9 months to 18 years, 12 months. When you have done that, you make take those who are 18 years, 6 months to 18 years, 9 months. After that you may take those who are 18 years, 3 months to 18 years, 6 months." However, under this bill no one is likely to be taken before he is 18 years and 3 months old, because a man registers when he is 18 years old, and it takes about 90 days to induct him after registration.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the Senator mind explaining the provision in regard to the completion of high-school courses by boys now in high school.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No boy who is now in high school pursuing a satisfactory course of study may be taken before he is 19 years of age.

Mr. McFARLAND. Unless he has completed high school.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No boy who is presently in high school.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, there is no prohibition in the bill against sending boys under 19 into active combat. I am correct, am I not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator indicate what the probability is of a boy under 19 actually engaging in active combat?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A great deal depends, I think, on when the combat would occur. My guess is not an educated guess. It is no better than that of any other Member of the Senate. However, I will say that the military authorities, beginning with General Marshall and going through the list of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have stated that they felt that under the bill as they recommended it, without the priorities which the committee put into it, they could not see any likelihood of sending boys under 19 into combat. However, they stated that if a restriction were put in the bill saying that no person may be shipped overseas or sent into a unit which is going into combat before he reaches the age of 19, they would be confronted with a very difficult situation. So, instead of placing that restriction in the bill, which the committee carefully considered for the first week of the hearing, the committee said, "How many men have you today?" They replied, "Roughly, two and one-half million." We asked, "What is the ceiling on the armed services?" They said, "Three and a half million."

Mr. ELLENDER. At that point——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Just a moment. The Senator asked a question. I want to tell him what we have done

Then we said, "So you need an additional 1,000,000 men?"

They said, "Correct"

We said, "You need a pipeline of 600,000. That makes 1,600,000." They replied, "That is correct."

So we took the groups which are untouched, which add up to 1,400,000, and we said, "Take those 1,400,000, and when you have taken all of them you can draw on the last quarter of the group between 18 and 19, and get 200,000"

Therefore we attempted, by setting up priorities, to accomplish the purpose which the Senator has in mind, to insure that no person shall be sent into combat until he reaches the age of 19

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the information I am trying to elicit from the Senator, so as to give assurance to fathers and mothers that if this bill is enacted, as presented, the probability of a boy under 19 being called into active combat duty is remote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator that the Secretary of Defense testified that it is unlikely that any person below 18 years and 6 months of age will be taken this year. The law requires that he be given 4 months' training, and 2 weeks' leave before going overseas. Two weeks are required for processing. That makes an additional month, or a total of 5 months. If a boy is taken at 18 years and 6 months, and has 4 months of training, 2 weeks of leave, and 2 weeks of processing, by that time he will be 18 years and 11 months of age. Then if he goes to the Pacific theater, which requires 2 months, he will be 19 years and 1 month of age before he arrives.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago the Senator gave us some figures as to the needed manpower for our Armed Forces. I should like to ask him for a little detail. As I understand, the goal set is 3,500,000 men by 1953.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Three million four hundred and sixty-two thousand men.

Mr. ELLENDER. Almost 3,500,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The statement is that the military authorities want to reach that goal as quickly as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the goal, at any rate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They estimate that they will not be able to do it by June 30, although they hope they can.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us the breakdown of that figure as it relates to all the services?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Roughly, 1,000,000 men for the Navy and Marines, 1,016,000 for the Air Force, and 1,400,000-plus for the Army.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has indicated, the manpower for the Navy and Air Forces is obtained on a more or less voluntary basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So long as we have a draft law.

Mr. ELLENDER. With respect to the Army, the figure which the Senator stated was 1,000,000 plus.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One million four hundred thousand.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator expect to obtain them? He stated a moment ago that 800,000 would be obtained from the category of men between 19 and 26. Am I correct in that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sorry; I got the first part of the Senator's question, and I was trying to give the answer to it. As I understand, the Senator wants to know how we are going to get the 1,400,000 for the Army.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator states that the number of men which will be needed for the Army under present plans is 1,400,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. About 700,000 of those are voluntary enlistments.

Mr. ELLENDER. From where would the Senator expect to obtain the others?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We estimate that we shall probably get 500,000 or 600,000 under the terms of this bill. We are to have an Armed Force of 3,500,000. The bill would draft only about 500,000 this fiscal year. We would get a couple of hundred thousand from the reserves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator be more specific? A moment ago he indicated that 800,000 would be obtained from the group between 19 and 26 that are not married. From married men between 19 and 26, with no children, he expects to obtain 200,000. Am I correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. From the category of nonveterans and nonfathers there is a potential total of 290,000. The Senator gives that as an estimate of those who are available.

I want to be specific. The Senator from Louisiana wants me to be specific, but it is very difficult for the Senator from Texas to determine how many husbands now childless will show up with a child before they are drafted. We are starting now with an estimate of 290,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. That, of course, will have to be taken into consideration at the proper time. What I should like to find out is simply this: When will it become necessary to make the first call for boys under 19? In other words, I would like to find out where the men will be obtained before we dip down into the group of 18 years and 9 months of age. I believe that if the Senator can give sufficient detail on that point to support his view, it will tend to give assurance to fathers and mothers that they need not fear that a boy under 19 will be called for active combat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to be specific for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana. I also desire to be frank. It is difficult for the Senator from Texas, the Armed Services Committee, or the Secretary of Defense to answer that question as specifically as the Senator would like.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us an estimate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is difficult to be as specific as the Senator from Louisiana wants us to be. The first thing to determine is how large the call is. That will depend to some extent upon the facilities which are available to take care of the men. The military authorities are asking the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee for authority to expand those facilities. The speed with which the men will be called will depend upon whether we give them such authority, and the speed with which they can expand the facilities. We know that approximately 1,400,000 men would be made eligible under the terms of the bill, before we touch the 18-year-olds. As to how quickly we can get the facilities ready to take care of the 1,400,000, the Senator's guess is as good as mine. The Assistant Secretary of Defense wandered into that field of speculation by saying that she was reasonably confident that not a single boy under 19 would be drafted before July of this year, and that during the entire fiscal year 1952 no one under 18 years and 6 months would be called. That is assuming that we are not in total mobilization.

Mr. ELLENDER. I must have misunderstood the Senator from Texas. I understood him to say that the number of men needed for the Army is 1,400,000. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. The Senator from Texas said 1,400,000 would have to be called before 18-year-olds could be taken.

Mr. ELLENDER. Out of the three and one-half million men who will be taken for duty, what is the total number who will be in the Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not have that figure. We will have about 1,400,000 in the Army.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many are in the Army now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A little more than 1,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. A little more than 1,000,000. So it is necessary to call about 400,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It would be necessary to call only that number if those now in the service were frozen there for the remainder of their lives. But the Senator understands that the service of men in the Army is constantly ending?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; but in the meantime more men become eligible for duty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I follow the Senator's question. What he is not taking into consideration is that more than 800,000 men will leave the service during the coming year. They have served their time. They must be replaced.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I understand. But as men complete their term of service more men become eligible, as I have previously stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It must be remembered that it will be necessary to add a million men to the two and one-half million in order to get three and one-half million. In order to obtain this million by enlistments and induction, it is necessary to have a pipeline of 600,000. So we start out with a potential of 1,600,000. Of that 1,600,000, 1,400,000 are in the 19- to 26-age group. So, assuming 1,000,000 to be a mathematical certainty, there will be 1,400,000 in the priority groups and 200,000 from the 18-year-old groups. Does the Senator follow me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Judging from what the Senator has just said, the only class of boys under 19 who would be called would be those reaching 18 years and 9 months; I mean the probabilities are that that is what it will be relegated to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think it would be a safer statement to say 18 years and 7 months or 18 years and 8 months.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that if it requires as many as 90 days for induction, and, under the bill, a minimum of 4 months of actual training, then we can conclude that no boy could be assigned to combat service until he has reached the age of 19 or more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. And if he should be sent to the Pacific area there would be 2 months travel time added. The Senator has made some valuable contributions to the debate. He ought to add 2 months travel time if the soldier goes to the Pacific.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would make him 2 months older.

As I understand, the bill provides for universal military training. Will the Senator from Texas be specific and tell us exactly how we would go about establishing universal military training, and when it can be expected?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas cannot guess when the international situation will permit us to reduce the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will he indicate the conditions under which universal military training may come into being?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the bill we provide for a 26-month period of time of service, but we also provide that when international conditions permit, the President may reduce the term of service from 26 months to 18 months, to 12 months, or not below from 4 to 6 months. When international conditions permit, and we have an adequate reserve; when we have a small standing army, it is contemplated that the President will reduce the term of service from 26 months to from 4 to 6 months, cutting 20 months off the time of service, but never having it below 4 months. The bill provides that if the President does not do that, and if the Congress feels that the international conditions are such that the term of service should be reduced, and still have a basic training program of from 4 to 6 months, Congress itself could act so as not to require a man to give more than from 4 to 6 months of service. The subcommittee did not include such a provision, but the full committee, after making several improvements to the bill, wrote in an amendment providing that Congress could, by concurrent resolution, any time it saw fit, reduce the term of service.

The Senator asked the question when this will be done. In connection with the adoption of universal military training, the bill provides that whenever international conditions, as determined by the President, permit a reduction in the term of service, he can take such action or whenever the Congress decides that we should make such reduction, it can do so by concurrent resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. But suppose the time should come when the President could act, that is, if the international situation should improve, as I understand from reading the report of the committee it states that the President could establish universal military training by merely issuing an Executive order eliminating all periods of service with the exception of providing for a minimum of 4 months and a maximum of 6 months for 18-year-olds. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not recall that the report says that is the only way it can be done. It can be done either by Executive order of the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress. If the President reduces the period of service he can put UMT in operation by Executive order, or Congress can put it into effect by concurrent resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am speaking solely of universal military training. I am not talking about shortening the terms of service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The change can be made in two ways—either by Executive order of the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. I understand that. Assuming that the President should issue such an order, or that Congress should act, what then would be the procedure? Would boys of 18 years be inducted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the bill, as reported, is passed, yes; they would be inducted to serve from 4 to 6 months. They would be inducted to serve for not less than 4 and not more than 6 months. They would be paid $30 a month. They would serve under rules, regulations, policies, and standards promulgated by a Universal Military Service Training Commission with a membership of five persons, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, consisting of three civilians and two active or retired members of the Regular components of the Armed Forces.

Mr. ELLENDER. At what age would boys be required to report for universal military training?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At 18.

Mr. ELLENDER. From 18 to what age?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Every boy, when he became 18, would have to go into service and serve from 4 to 6 months.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose he is in high school and has not completed his high-school course. Would he have to report for universal military training?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If his local board did not defer him. This is quite far off, and the standards and procedures will have to be prescribed by the Commission which the Senate will have to confirm when it is appointed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the rules and regulations and the procedures under which boys are going into the service, that is, under universal military training, will be worked out and prescribed by the Commission which is to be created under the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator, as usual, is correct. If the Senator will turn to page 54 of the report, he will find the following:

> The National Security Training Commission will, subject to the direction of the President, establish policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic military training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phase of such training). It will also, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies which will carry out such training, and all departments and agencies so designated are required to carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards prescribed by the Commission.

Mr. ELLENDER. One more question, Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield, and then I shall be through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield further to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any way by which the Congress could prevent the President from issuing the executive order, other than by simply repealing the act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator mean whether there is any method by which the Congress could prevent the President from stopping inductions?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I mean to ask whether there is any means by which the Congress could prevent the President from issuing an executive order setting up universal military training, except by repealing the act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; not as I interpret this measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if the President were to exercise his authority by means of issuing an Executive order on the subject, the Congress would have no power to prevent it, except by repeal of the act as a whole. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If I understand the Senator's question——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am trying to establish whether by voting for this measure we shall be voting to establish universal military training. When we vote for this measure, are we voting to establish universal military training?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the bill sets forth the procedure which must be adhered to in order to make universal military training come into being. The Senator has said that in order to prevent the President from exercising his right to establish universal military training, it would be necessary for the Congress to repeal the act as a whole. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct; but I wish to make clear to the Senator that this bill, as it is reported, contemplates that we shall adopt a universal military training program of from 4 months' to 6 months' service, to be handled under the commission designated in the bill. When and if and after international conditions permit, if the President does not choose to reduce the term of service. Congress can do so if it chooses. Of course, if neither of them acts, the situation is not altered.

However, the committee realizes that we want to set up the machinery, adopt the principle, and pass the bill which will provide the standing reserves the Nation needs. We realize that we cannot go on with a standing army of three and one-half million men. We must give training to the men inducted, for a reserve force is no good unless it is composed of trained men. The cheapest way to do so is by means of the universal military training program.

In this connection, we shall have on the commission some of the most competent men in the Nation; and in principle we have approved the recommendations of the American Legion in regard to this program.

We could pass a bill adopting a universal military training program and at the same time provide that the act shall expire in 4 or 5 years. We thought about that and gave consideration to it; but the likelihood is that we would then march up the hill and march down again. In other words, we would pass such a bill, and then would repeal the program before it ever went into being.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand all that. I simply wish to make it plain that by voting for this bill, we shall actually be establishing universal military training—which I favor.

I repeat that it is to be established by means of Executive order when the conditions warrant it; and the only way by which the President can be prevented from exercising the right given him by this bill is by having the Congress repeal the act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am glad to yield, first to the Senator from Massachusetts, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is there not an additional way by which the Congress can always prevent the President from establishing universal military training, namely, by not appropriating the funds required for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; and I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and other Senators realize that the program would not be very effective without the necessary appropriations.

I think it is made clear in the bill and in the report that this measure authorizes a universal military training program to be conducted under the Commission to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that the advice from the Department of Defense is that under this bill no 18-year-old boy will be drafted, in all probability, before the 1st of July 1951; and that no boy under 18 years and 6 months of age will be drafted before July 1, 1952. Is that what the Senator said? Is that based upon——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me ask the Senator to wait a moment, please, so that I may answer the question he already has asked me.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I intended to say that no boy between the age 18 and the age of 19—if that is what the Senator means by "an 18-year-old boy"—will be drafted between now and July 1 of this year.

Mr. TAFT. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And on the basis of the present ceiling, the present facilities, and the present plans, it is not anticipated that those below the group of 18 years and 6 months of age will be reached before the next fiscal year.

Mr. TAFT. Is that based upon the assumption that by the 1st of July 1952 we will have an armed force of 3,450,000 men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Three million four hundred and sixty-two thousand men.

Mr. TAFT. Has Congress ever decided that we should have an armed force of 3,450,000 men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Congress decided last August that there should be no ceiling.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, Congress lifted the ceiling. However, is not the decision to be made by the Appropriations Committee this year whether the size of the Armed Forces shall be 3,250,000 men or 3,500,000, or whatever figure may be decided upon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to argue this matter with the Senator, but I should like to answer his question.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We did have ceilings on the number of personnel of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as the Senator from Ohio knows. However, last August Congress, by a very large vote in both Houses, passed a measure suspending those ceilings until 1954, and in effect saying that we wish to remove the ceilings because we do not think it is in the best interests of the Nation that we operate under them. Congress directed the military authorities to proceed with plans concerning manpower which may be approved by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Has not the Senator from Texas just pointed out to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that Congress retains control over this mili-

tary training program because of the power of Congress to control appropriations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is not one line in this bill which seeks to deprive the Appropriations Committees of the authority they now have.

Mr. TAFT. But the point I wish to make is that no Congress has ever decided, as I understand the matter, that we should have 3,450,000 men in the Armed Forces. Should not we begin with the establishment of the size of the Armed Forces that is necessary before we draft 18-year-old boys to make up those forces?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Congress decided what the ceiling should be. However, thereafter Congress in its wisdom decided—with the support of the Senator from Ohio, I believe—that we should not retain that ceiling. So Congress suspended the ceiling and said, in effect, "The sky is the limit, subject only to the best judgment of the President and the best judgment of the appropriate committees of Congress."

Mr. TAFT. But that decision has never been made, has it? Up to the present time no Congress has ever decided that we should have Armed Forces of 3,450,000 men, has it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; and neither has any Congress decided that we should have an armed force of 1,100,000 men.

On the other hand, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said that it is in the best interests of the Nation to establish as soon as possible an armed force of 3,462,000 men; and the Congress has decided to suspend the ceiling until 1954.

If at the time that suspension of the ceiling was made, Senators wished to substitute a ceiling which would apply, they should have offered such an amendment to the bill, and in that connection should have provided that the ceiling would not be suspended.

However, as recently as last August the Congress passed a bill suspending the ceiling, and saying, in effect, that the only control over the drafting of men into the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force shall be the control afforded by the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. TAFT. But the Appropriations Committees have never exercised that authority up to this time, have they?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no doubt that at this very hour the Senate Appropriations Committee is meeting in its room downstairs and is exercising its judgment and authority. I do not serve on that committee, and I shall not undertake to say what it will do. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who now is in the Chamber, can answer questions about what the Appropriations Committee has done in the way of providing appropriations to build up the Armed Forces to a strength of 3,462,000 men.

I was cheered yesterday by the statement of the Senator from Ohio. Bearing in mind his views regarding a large Armed Force, which he has held for the past several years, and remembering his eloquent statements prior to World War II regarding the lack of danger and the great waste which was involved in adding to our forces, I was heartened when he said he was not in a position to say that 3,500,000 men were too many; and no one at this time contemplates going beyond 3,462,000. I understand the figure is about 3,300,000 for the current fiscal year.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the latest decision by the Appropriations Committee, made less than 3 months ago, favored an Armed Force of 2,750,000 men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot testify as to what was the decision of a committee of which I am not a member. I may say to the Senator that I am unaware of it, but the Senator's colleague the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is present, and I shall be happy to yield to him to confirm the Senator's impression.

Mr. TAFT. I may ask my colleague from Massachusetts whether it is not a fact that 3 months ago the Appropriations Committee, in the second supplemental appropriation bill for last year recommended appropriations for approximately 2,750,000 men in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot specificially answer the question in that form. I do not remember the exact number. The Appropriations Committee gave the armed services all the money it wanted, for the men available. What the Senator from Ohio asks is: Why did we select and justify the figure of 3,325,000 men now and 3,462,000 after July 1? My answer to that, or my understanding of it is, that General Marshall told us that that was the thought-out, considered estimate of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for providing a ground force by which the Air Force could strike quickly, if trouble came, to provide sufficient ground troops to hold the strategic areas, and to provide a sufficient Navy to keep the oceans clear and to transfer men and equipment to those areas. The Joint Chiefs of Staff considered that such a number would constitute a well-rounded force able to strike quickly and to retalitate quickly, and upon which to build for the future, if it should become necessary. Is that not the idea of the Senator from Texas as to the basis for the figures in the pending manpower bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; I may say I am in general agreement with that statement by the Senator from Massachusetts. As I recall, during the first week of the 7 weeks of hearings, we considered the general subject of manpower. At that time there was a ceiling of 3,260,000 men. After we had proceeded for a matter of a week or 10 days, the Defense Department suggested to us a ceiling of 3,462,000. It was indicated that they planned to reach that ceiling as quickly as possible, and that they hoped to reach it by July 1 of this year. It was later testified that they did not think they could get more than 3,325,000 men by the first of the next fiscal year, based on the present number of enlistments and the facilities now available. To reach the 3,462,000 figure involved almost doubling the Air Force. The instructions to the Air Force were to provide 94 groups as quickly as possible, though the Air Force is unable to say that it can double its personnel by July 1. But, as I understand, under the program evolved and legislation adopted by the Congress suspending the ceiling until 1954, and in the light of developments connected with the Korean incident, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the approval of the Commander in Chief, have set the ceiling at 3,462,000, which they desire to reach as quickly as possible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to point out that I am not saying that 3,400,000 men, or 3,000,000, or any other figure suggested may be the proper one. The Senator heard me speak yesterday afternoon and is aware of the fact that I expressed the hope that we could hold the number to 3,000,000 men. But what I am pointing out is that Congress has never yet decided upon the matter. We are basing this proposed draft law on a number of troops which has never yet been decided upon by Congress. I merely suggest that we are going about the job backward, that we should first decide how large an army we are to have before we undertake to determine how many men it will be necessary to draft in order to obtain it. That is the way it impresses me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is unaware of any witness who appeared before the committee—and more than 100 witnesses appeared—who expressed the thought, the hope, or the desire, that we keep our Armed Forces below the figure of 3,462,000 which was set. The Senator from Texas thinks he ought to add to his reply to the statement of the Senator from Ohio, that the Congress decided last August that we would not be governed or controlled by a legislative ceiling.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with that. I think it has to be determined from time to time. I have no objection to that. My only point is, I think Congress ought to determine it. Merely because the Chiefs of Staff say, "We would like to have this number of men," the Congress ought not, before it has reached any decision as to the number, put its stamp of approval on that number today, and base all legislation for a period of 6 months on something which the Appropriations Committee will not decide until June. It seems to me to be a rather unsound procedure.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. If it is not going to be necessary to draft, and if we are not going to draft, even under the figure of 3,450,000 men, any boy under 18 years of age, 6 months before July 1, 1952, why should

we draft them at all? Why should we not leave them out of the picture? Why not make 18½ years the age at which boys may be drafted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the commitee felt that it wanted to operate on a day-to-day or month-to-month basis, and if the committee had been willing to proceed helter-skelter, taking a bite here and a bite there, that would have been the proper procedure. The committee attempted—and its action was unanimous, I may say to the Senator—to provide appropriate machinery and priorities. I think it would have been unanimous even had the Senator been there, for, had the Senator possessed the information presented by the 100 witnesses, I feel confident he would have joined in the course which the committee unanimously followed. We attempted to provide the machinery and the priorities not merely for a 6-month program or for a 1-year program, but one which would operate through the years.

Under the bill as reported, the only thing it would be necessary to do, in the event of all-out war, would be to add to the bill a small amendment providing that veterans now exempt under it shall not continue to be exempted—that their exemption shall no longer be in effect—and to increase the age limit. The bill provides machinery for a long-range program. After the colleges of the country, the representatives of the various professions, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the agricultural groups, the labor groups, and the farm groups all got together and agreed on the principles, there was set down in the bill a long-range program for most efficiently utilizing the Nation's manpower resources. We do not say that we shall take 18-year-olds, but set forth the priorities, specify those who should come first, and thus go down the list. Whether men in certain categories are taken will depend upon the circumstances in the future. I do not think this will come to pass, but I can understand how, under the Senator's philosophy—not being particularly excited——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When I finish my statement, I shall yield.

Mr. TAFT. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under certain phases of the situation which the Senator thinks may exist further down the road, after a few months, about which he may not be particularly concerned from the standpoint of safety, it is possible that under this bill we would not even take 19- or 20-year-olds for a period longer than 6 months. The Senator from Texas, believes the danger to be such that, we ought to have the machinery ready, in order that every person in this country may know where he fits into the program. If he is in the age group from 19 to 26, he ought to know that he is going to be called before his younger brother is called, and he ought to know that, if he gets married, he is still going to be called. He ought further to know that if he is a IV–F, his classification is going to be reviewed; and he ought to know that if he is qualified for combat, and is occupying a chair-corps job, the Preparedness Subcommittee is surveying all those matters in order to determine how many such jobs may be held by people with limited duty qualifications.

That takes care of 1,400,000, and after we get through with them, we say, "If you make your plans so that if you come in the first quarter, aged 18¾ to 19, you can be called first." Then they can make their plans. The reserves who are now being called up can find out what their situation is, and they will not be given only two weeks notice in which to leave a home on which they have a mortgage, and leave perhaps a wife and four or five children.

This is a program regarding which all the groups concerned with manpower—labor, veterans, the United States Chamber of Commerce, all of them—said, "Do not do this overnight, so that you will be coming in every 2 or 3 months offering amendments and changing the law here and there."

If we have total mobilization we will know the groups we will have to call on. So let us set up the program, and let the conditions and needs determine when the men will be called.

Some think we should take every one at 18½ years whether he is needed or not; that when a boy finishes high school he should sit on the street and twiddle his thumbs until he becomes 18½ years of age, we will take him regardless of whether we need him or not. We feel that our bill does not make a boy 18½ years old eligible for induction as quickly as the arbitrary 18½-year provision would make him, because we require the authorities to show that they must have the men.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand from the newspapers that the Committee on Armed Services in the House has adopted the 18½-year figure, and as I read the newspapers yesterday, General Bradley reluctantly agreed to that, on the theory, apparently, that we did not need those under 18 years and 6 months old. So it is not merely my opinion I am stating. I am asking the Senator for justification of the position taken by the committee on the 18-year figure. I think I understand the argument in favor of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to answer the Senator on the two points he has mentioned. In the first place, he would be on safer ground if he would read the hearings instead of the newspapers, and get General Bradley's views from the hearings. I am told that General Bradley's statement before the House committee was not that he favored the age limit of 18½ years instead of 18, but that he very strongly feels that the Senate committee provision should be accepted instead of the House provision.

Of course, I have to rely on the newspapers for some of my information, and it is my information that the House Committee did not adopt any definite provision at all. A bill has been introduced in the House, by one member of the House, providing for the 18½-year figure. That is a correct statement.

Mr. TAFT. My understanding is that the bill was introduced at the request of the majority of the committee. I may be mistaken as to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the committee has not taken any action in regard to the matter, and has not heard from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It heard from General Bradley yesterday, and his statements as quoted in the newspapers are in direct conflict with his testimony before the Committee. I am informed by Mr. Lovett and others that General Bradley is asking for an opportunity to appear again befor the committee, and to reiterate the statement he made before our committee, namely, that he thinks we should make available the 18-year-olds when, as, and if needed.

Mr. TAFT. Is there not some reason for limiting the pool of possible draftees to the actual requirements? If the Army feels that this pool is 600,000 larger than it needs, as it apparently will be on the first of January, are we not likely to be met a year from now with a 4,000,000-man request, committing ourselves 6 months in advance of action by the Committee on Appropriations, as we now seem to be committed to 3,400,000? Should we not hold the pool down to the actual requirements as the military officials state them, even if we accept their figures as to present requirements?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The answer to the Senator's question is that the committee did not think so, as the Senator will see if he will read the report of the hearings. The pool varies greatly. The need changes constantly. We have attempted to provide machinery which will meet the demands over a period of time. If the Senator is concerned only with seeing no further than his nose, and providing machinery from now until the end of the fiscal year, 4 or 5 months, we can do that.

Mr. TAFT. Not the end of this fiscal year, but the end of the next fiscal year. That is what the Senator said. He said we did not need a boy under 18 years and 6 months old. If so, why draft him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, the Senator from Texas did not say that in the next 18 months we would not need any. The Senator from Texas said that the Department had testified that with the present ceiling, and under present conditions, their present estimates are correct. The Senator from Texas did not say what we needed or did not need; he rather questioned some of the Department's estimates, as he certainly questions the estimates of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask two or three questions, and help me out with reference to the extension of the induction period?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know that I can help the Senator, but I shall be glad to try to do so.

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall welcome any help. The present law provides for a

21-month induction period, with the provision that the President, up until July 9 next, can extend the period for 1 year. Is that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator talking about enlistments?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; I am talking about the draftees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No.

Mr. GILLETTE. What is the fact?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, a draftee's time expires in 21 months. If the bill as reported shall be enacted, the period will be extended to 26 months.

Mr. GILLETTE. If the bill is enacted, it will extend the period automatically to 26 months, will it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. As to those now in the service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; those who are inducted. As to those who enlist, we passed a law which authorized the extension of their enlistments for 1 year. There is a difference between a man who is inducted and one who enlists. There is a group of enlistments expiring this year. We passed a law which allowed the Department to extend the time of those enlistments 1 year. The pending bill provides that for the next 2 years, as enlistments expire, they shall be treated as we treated the group last year, allow the Department to extend the enlistments for 12 months. The bill extends the induction period to 26 months from 21 months.

Mr. GILLETTE. It also extends the right of the President to extend the enlistment period from 1 year to 2 years, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. Let us assume that one man's term ran out last year, and that mine runs out this year. We passed a law last year which allowed the Department to keep the men in the service another year. The pending bill provides that all shall be treated alike.

Mr. GILLETTE. Why has the committee recommended extending the induction period from 21 months to 26 months? Why does the committee propose that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Presently the Air Force is made up of men who have 4-year terms, the Navy is made up of men with 4-year enlistments. The Army is made up largely of men with 21-month terms. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, each member of the Joint Chiefs, the Director of Selective Service, and the Secretary of Defense, all very strongly felt that the minimum of service, taking into consideration the leave conditions, the transportation conditions, and the training conditions which we imposed, should be 30 months. But when they got together to work out the program, as General Hershey, of the Selective Service, put it, "I voted for 27 months, because it was the nearest time to 30 months." The heads of the various military services all would prefer 30 months, but after talking to some of the members of the Staff and some of the Senators on the committee, it was made abundantly clear that it was unlikely that the Congress would embrace a 30-month recommendation in the report. So the officials came to us with a recommendation of 27 months.

I should say to the Senator that there are members on our committee who voted to report a 26-month bill, who feel that 26 months is too long a period, and who probably will offer amendments providing for 24 months. The reason why the committee finally adopted the 26 months figure was that out of the 26 months there are 4 months for training, 2 months or more for leave, 2 months to cover shipping to assignment areas overseas, and 2 months to cover shipping back in the case of the Pacific area. Finally, if we should adopt a 21-month period and then subtract these periods, there would be a period of actual service of less than 12 months.

The Air Force said they would need men for 4 years. The Navy said they would need them for 4 years. The Army said, "The other services did not suffer the casualties we have suffered. So please give us a minimum of 27 months." It costs the Federal Government three-quarters of a billion dollars more for a 21-month period of service than for a 27-month period of service. We considered the 27-month period, and many Senators, among them the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Senators, said that a period of 27 months would mean that a man would lose not only 2 years out of his schooling, but 2 years and 3 months. We worked out a plan on the basis of a 26-month period of service which would permit a man in the service to accumulate his leave, as it is possible for a civilian employee of the Government to accumulate his leave. If he chose to take only weekend passes, and not use his leave, he could get out of the service in 24 months. That was the basis of the compromise which was finally reached.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I hope the Senator will pardon me, but as I understood his explanation, the reason the compromise was adopted was because some of those connected with the military services thought the period ought to be 30 months, some thought it ought to be 29 months, and some members of the committee thought it ought to be much less. If I understood the Senator correctly, the compromise was based on what the leaders in the armed services wanted, rather than reached as a resonable compromise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I would not say that. It would be a fair statement to say that the Joint Chiefs of Staff wanted 27 months. It is a fair statement to say that the committee, after hearing witnesses for 7 weeks, concluded that it would be a wiser course to follow to provide a 26 months' term, and permit leave to be accumulated.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield further to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Texas has said very cogently that in a 26-month term a certain number of months would be employed in basic training, and a certain number of months would be taken up by leave. Therefore there would be left a much smaller number of months. Is it not a fact that Pvt. John Doe is in the service for 21 months regardless of where he is assigned or allocated? Is it not a fact that he is serving for 21 months?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. If the bill is passed he would serve 26 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Twenty-one months is 21 months, and 26 months is 26 months.

Mr. GILLETTE. Twenty-six months is 26 months. We agree on that point.

Mr. LONG and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana. He has been on his feet a long time. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LONG. First, I wish to commend the Senator for his very excellent presentation of the bill, and for the very hard and diligent work of the subcommittee, which the junior Senator from Louisiana had occasion to observe. I notice that the record of the hearings on the bill extend to 1,241 pages, which shows that there was an enormous amount of study made of the subject. Do I understand the Senator correctly to say that every member of the Committee on Armed Services has agreed to the bill as reported?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should say that all 13 members of the Committee on Armed Services voted to report the bill.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered several amendments in committee. He disagreed with the conclusions of the committee as to the term of service, as to the 75,000 college students, as to the 18-year-olds, as to the reserve, and possibly as to one or two other points. He was present when the subcommittee made its report to the full committee. The full committee was not present. He offered his amendments in committee and they were voted on. They were defeated in committee. However, the Senator from Oregon very graciously joined us in reporting the bill, with the full understanding that by so doing he did not waive any of his rights. He made it abundantly clear that he intended to offer some of his amendments on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that the other 12 members of the full Committee on Armed Services are together in supporting the pending bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With the exception of the term of service. The

Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] preferred a 21-month term of service. As I remember, the vote was either 12 to 1 or 11 to 2.

Mr. LONG. I should like to know from the Senator, if he has the information before him, how long in the opinion of the military authorities it takes to train a man for the Army. In other words, is there any particular period of time after which it may be said a man is completely trained and knows as much as he should know as a front-line combat man?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is very difficult for the Senator from Texas to answer that question. In a modern army it depends a great deal on the type of duty to which a man is assigned. All military authorities admit that a minimum of 4 months is required for basic training. If a man specializes in any particular field, additional months have to be added to the 4 months' basic training period. It depends largely on a man's job in the armed services.

Mr. LONG. Could it be assumed that when a man is in the service for 1 year he is fully trained for whatever mission the armed services may have in mind using him for in a war?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It would depend on what branch of the service was involved. If he were to be assigned to the infantry, probably 4 months of basic training would be sufficient. If he were to be a tank driver, it would take 10 months to train him. However, not only the 18-year-olds, but every man who is inducted, regardless of the type of service to which he is assigned, gets a minimum of 4 months of basic training. That provision is intended to cure one of the serious errors of the past, and to make certain that men are not sent into combat who are in the service for only 2 or 3 months.

Mr. LONG. It would be reasonable to assume, would it not, that if 4 months is a sufficient length of time in which to train a man to go into combat, certainly at least 90 percent of those who are taken into the armed services would be fully trained by the time they were in the service for 1 year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should think so.

Mr. LONG. If the danger which our country presently faces should decrease during the next year or two, and the world situation should improve, particularly if our friends and allies in Western Europe should raise larger standing armies than they have at the present time, would the Senator feel that at that time it would be wise to reduce the term of service to less than 27 months, so that a man who was inducted into the armed services would not feel that he should be called upon to give such a large portion of his life to the service of his country, particularly when there was no war imminent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. Such authority is already vested in the President. However, the committee was not satisfied with that, and provided that if at any time Congress determines that the term of service should be reduced, it may be reduced by concurrent resolution, which does not require approval by the President.

Mr. LONG. If Congress should feel that the sacrifices being made by men should be reduced from a period of 27 months' service, it could, by concurrent resolution, and without approval by the President, reduce the period of service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Recurring to the colloquy between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Ohio with respect to a ceiling, does the Senator from Texas, speaking for the Committee on Armed Services, mean to say that the Committee on Armed Services feels that a decision as to the ceiling should be left to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas did not say that either for himself or for the committee. The Senator from Texas said that the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from South Dakota, who was then Representative from South Dakota, properly voted to suspend all ceilings until 1954. By so doing they in effect allowed those ceilings to be fixed subject only to the restructions of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CASE. The then Representative from South Dakota—to use the words of the Senator from Texas—was a Member of the House at the time that decision was made. However, my memory is that at that time the argument was made that with the prospective recess or adjournment of the Congress it would not be possible to have a flexible situation which could be met without removing the arbitrary ceiling. The argument was made at the time that the Congress still would have the authority, when it made appropriations, to determine the number of persons in the armed services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to know that the arguments which were made finally persuaded the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. They were persuasive to the extent that, if Congress was to be in recess, the country should not be hamstrung by an arbitrary ceiling. However, that was on the basis that the decision could be made by the Appropriations Committees. However, today the discussion centers about a long-term policy; and apparently it is now proposed that the authority which rested in the hands of the Appropriations Committees should be regarded as a settled policy, the argument tending to the conclusion that hereafter the decisions as to the size of the Armed Forces should be left to the recommendations of the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas prefers to let the record determine what he has said, without having the Senator from South Dakota give his interpretation of it.

The Senator from Texas does not say that we should not have any ceilings. The Senator from Texas says that the Congress, without a vote against it, suspended the ceilings until a given date, and that given date is 1954. In 1954 we shall revert to the ceiling which is now in the law. However, the law has been suspended by a subsequent act. We shall revert to a ceiling of approximately 2,000,000. We shall take a look at the situation then, or at any time previous to that, if the Senator wishes to propose a ceiling. Without a single vote being cast against it, only 5 or 6 months ago the Congress declared its judgment. I do not undertake to say why the Congress arrived at that conclusion, but I think it was felt by everyone that in view of conditions in the world we should not be limited to an armed force of 2,000,000. If there is any question about our Armed Force being too large at 3,462,000, little testimony to that effect was offered by any of the 100 witnesses who appeared before the committee. Many thought it was too small.

The Senator from Texas sent a copy of the report to all Members of the Senate with the request that they read it. Copies of the hearings are available. However, until the time the bill reached the floor of the Senate there was no suggestion that the ceiling should be reduced.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator from Texas has made a fair statement; but it serves to bring out the point which I think the Senator from Ohio was trying to make, and that is that at this time, confronted by the demand for changing the draft age, Congress should face a determination of what would be an appropriate ceiling or authorized strength for the armed services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas understood the Senator from Ohio. He also understands the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to seek a little information. As I understand, the bill limits the amount of time which a boy is required to give to the service to 26 months. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is exclusive of his Reserve service.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that. My next question is, What is the minimum length of time for which a young man can enlist in the services? Is it 2 years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At the present time it is 3 years. The Senator has raised an important point. I am glad he has brought it up. Let us asume that we pass the pending bill. We make liable for induction those from 18 through 25. If a boy is 18 years of age and has just finished high school, the priority for induction reaches him. The day he becomes 18 he becomes eligible for induction under the terms of the bill, although he may never be taken. However, under the terms of the bill he may present himself voluntarily for induction and be taken, and serve only 26 months. However, if he enlists, the period of service is 3 years.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the law provide that at the termination of his period of enlistment the President may require him to remain in the armed services for an additional period not to exceed 12 months?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is a provision for a 12-month extension in the case of enlistments expiring this year and next year, the same as for those expiring last year. I should say to the Senator that the 3-year term of enlistment applies to the Army. The term of enlistment for the Air Force and the Navy is 4 years.

Mr. AIKEN. But a man can be required to stay in the service for an additional period of 12 months if the President so decides.

The question which I rose to ask is what prompted the committee to conclude that a volunteer should be required to serve for a longer time than a drafted man should serve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Enlistments were expiring. We are not talking about those who enlist from now on. We are talking about those whose terms are expiring. The Senator is aware of the condition in which we found ourselves after June of last year in Korea. Certain enlistments were expiring that year; certain others the next year; and still others the following year. So we first granted authority to extend the enlistments which expire this year. Being still short of manpower, and particularly short of trained manpower, and particularly short of Army manpower, we felt that it was only fair to authorize treating Joe and John the same way Jim was treated. We do not extend Jim's enlistment again. It can be extended only for a period of 12 months. Jim's enlistment was extended last year. We treat Joe and John the same way.

Mr. AIKEN. Then is it the purpose of the committee to require those who may at present be in the service as volunteers to remain in the service until such time as the inductees—at whatever age is decided upon—have built the service up to the required number?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If their enlistments expire after July 1, 1953, they cannot be extended.

Mr. AIKEN. Then after 1953 there will be equal treatment for all of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Up until then, the draftee is required to put in 26 months, whereas the volunteer may be required to put in the length of time for which he volunteers, plus 12 months if the President decides that is necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are two fields which I wish to explore briefly, if I may, with the indulgence of the Senator from Texas.

The first relates to the National Guard, and the right of the National Guard to continue to enlist young men of less than 18 years and 6 months of age, so long as there has been no proclamation to the effect that no such enlistments are needed to keep the National Guard up to its full strength.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the bill proposes to insert certain words in the text of section 6 (c) (2) (A) of the act of 1948, as amended. I am reading from page 82 of the committee report. The words sought to be inserted are as follows:

> Prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction.

In those words there appears nothing whatever that limits the proposed action and the continuation of the enlistment of young men less than 18 years and 6 months of age to each State separately. To the contrary, from the reading of those words it might appear that the addition of these words would allow the National Guard to be treated as a national organization and this action to be taken nationally as applying to all States. The Senator from Florida has noted, however, that these proposed new words, when inserted in the appropriate place in the law as it now exists, will be inserted in a section which begins with a recital which makes it clear, at least to the Senator from Florida, that this determination is to be made State by State, and not for the National Guard as a whole. For instance, I quote the opening words from section 6 (c) (2) (a) of the law as it now exists. Those opening words are:

> In any case in which the Governor of any State determines and issues a proclamation—

And so forth. The purpose of my question is this. Is the Senator from Florida correct in his understanding that this determination shall be made by the Federal authorities not for the National Guard as a whole, but State by State, and that the enlistments may continue in each State, until such proclamation is made, upon the basis of the State law, and by the bringing in of the young men of an age up to 18½ years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas says that is his understanding of it; that it will be worked out on an individual State basis jointly by the Governor of the State and the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. HOLLAND. And there is no thought in this new wording to bunch together all the National Guard units of all the States, and to get away from the proposition that each State will have its own National Guard, set up under its own law, and will continue enlistments in that Guard up to the time of full strength with young men up to 18 years 6 months of age?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The next question to which I wish to address my inquiry deals with the use of aliens in the Regular Army, with particular reference to the 25,000 in number of these aliens who, as the Senator from Florida understands, will be permitted to be enlisted for terms of 5 years, after very careful screening, to become members of the Army of the United States. My question is this: Is there any departure from the careful screening allowed under present law but now applicable only to 2,500 of these aliens?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is no departure. We simply struck out the "2,500" and inserted in lieu thereof "25,000," otherwise retaining the same language. The Senator will find that dealt with on page 95 of the committee report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the present provision with respect to screening of 2,500 is continued with reference to the screening of the 25,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. The report says on that point that the screening processes required under the present law shall be continued. That merely amends the present law by striking out 2,500 and inserting 25,000 per year. We do not know whether we will receive that many. That is the maximum number that can be taken in. In view of General Eisenhower's testimony we felt we should attempt to have this number enlisted, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida thinks he understands the next point about which he wishes to ask the Senator from Texas, but he wants the matter to be in the RECORD. Is it the intention of the committee, in increasing the number to 25,000, to continue the requirement, not only that these men shall be carefully screened, but that they shall be so well screened that they will be eligible for citizenship and entitled to claim the right to admission to citizenship after 5 years' service as prescribed under present law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct, if he means by that that they shall be eligible for citizenship. Certainly those administering the screening processes and the procedures prescribed should bear in mind that these persons will be eligible for citizenship. That is something that should be borne in mind in the screening process.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then it is farthest from the thought of the committee, if the Senator from Florida may so suggest, to set up a force of mercenaries, but rather it is the thought of the committee to screen out able-bodied aliens to fight for freedom, in as large a force as 25,000, who are perfectly willing to fight in our Army and for a period of 5 years, in order to be eligible for citizenship in the United States of America?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As usual, the Senator puts it better than the chairman of the subcommittee can.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Texas, in his answers to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] relative to the National Guard, has, I believe, answered the question I am about to ask. It is a matter with which I am greatly concerned. As I read the bill—I have not had time to read all the hearings—and as I understood the Senator from Texas in his answer to the Senator from Florida, the National Guard and air arm of the States have been fully protected in this measure? Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know whether the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Kansas will agree

on what is full protection, but we can agree that the provisions of the present law which permit 18- and 18½-year-old boys to go into the guard and not be subjected to selective service are continued. We do not repeal that provision. We continue it. We do provide language which was acceptable to the Secretary of Defense, which says that when and if he finds that within a State there is available adequate trained personnel to meet the required strength of the guard, then the 18- to 18½-year-old exemption shall not apply. That seems to be a very good solution of the problem, because I understand that the Department of the Defense is now attempting to make available to the guard certain trained men that will supplement their ranks. We did not take away from the guard the protection it now has of getting some of the 18- and 18½-year-old men, but we did provide that when the Secretary of Defense says "there is an adequate trained personnel available to you to meet your strength requirement," the Guard may no longer take the 18- and 18½-year-old boys.

As I understand, the guard does not care about the 18- and 18½-year-old boys. They would rather secure trained men. If the guard could secure veterans with less than 12 months' service, or men who have been discharged from the service, in sufficient numbers to keep up their strength, I think it would really be better for them. I think their position was very sound on that point.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in hearty accord with the last statement made by the Senator. As one who has served as Governor of the State, I realize fully the difficulty we have in my State, which I think is found in other States, in keeping the National Guard up to strength. It is rather important that we maintain full strength for the National Guard, for it is one of our components under the National Defense Act of 1916.

I would not want the proposed legislation to contain anything which would prevent or deter in any way keeping the National Guard at full strength. With the assurance the Senator from Texas has now given me, I feel confident that that is what the committee had in mind when it reported the bill.

However, I ask the Senator if he will be so kind as to permit me to ask him another question respecting another component part of our military organization which, I believe, has not been mentioned this afternoon. I refer to the Reserve. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who has not been disappointed, at least, by the way the Reserve program has been handled by the military authorities. In fact, I think it has been so poorly handled as to be disgraceful. But regardless of that, we are faced with the situation of dealing with Reserve. Did the committee consider that problem, or did it not take action upon it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The committee not only considered it, but notified the Department of Defense and notified the Senate, on page 56 of the report, in the following words:

> The committee recognizes that our Reserve program since World War II has not been adequate or realistic. We have requested that the necessary corrective action be taken and have received assurances that a new program is being prepared by the Department of Defense and will be submitted in the near future.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the very able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], has announced that the Armed Services Committee will go into the whole question very thoroughly; and we hope that in a matter of weeks we shall be giving consideration to that question.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Texas for that encouraging statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? Let me say to the Senator that a number of other Senators who recognize the benefits which will come from their hearing the address which is to be made by him, have asked that they be notified when he will begin his remarks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well; I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield for that purpose?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support the pending bill, the Universal Military Training and Service Act. No one has a greater dislike for compulsory military service than do I. No one hates war or has cause to hate war more than I. But, like every other American citizen, I want my family and my children to lead their lives here in the United States with security. To have that security, I know we must have peace in the world. Today our security and the peace of the world depend upon our strrength here in the United States. We have become the strongest nation in the world. As such we have responsibilities. To live up to those responsibilities and to maintain that strength our young men today are asked to learn the basic training that is the foundation of a good soldier, airman, or sailor. That basic training will help us to be strong. Service in the Armed Forces today will help us to maintain our strength and our responsibilities as a world power. Let us hope in the days ahead that the length of the service required of our young man will, with better world conditions, be shortened and take less of his life at an important point in his career. But let us pray, at the same time, that the giving of this service by him to his country now will make him a better man physically and mentally. At the same time, let us hope it will enable him more wisely and helpfully to serve his country as a patriotic citizen. Those are the basic reasons, it seems to me, that we must pass as early as possible this bill that we are now debating.

As a member of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee which drafted S. 1, I attended substantially all of the 37 sessions which that subcommittee held, and I heard practically all of the testimony of about 100 key witnesses who appeared either for or against the bill as now drafted.

In addition to this, I was a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Eightieth Congress which reported the Selective Service Act of 1948. I was also a member of the conference committee which perfected the final version of the 1948 act. The pending bill seeks to amend that act, which was continued by legislation last year to July 9, 1951.

I believe that the bill now before us represents a good, adequate, practical solution to our immediate military manpower problems. The bill provides for the raising and maintaining of an armed force of approximately 3,500,000 men. It also provides for a long-term program of universal military training.

This bill will permit the inducting of men from 18 through 25 years of age.

The bill makes it clear that the local board may not dip into the age group below 19 years until all its available registrants over age 19 have been taken.

The maximum period of induction is 26 months. Following this, the individual is transferred to the Reserve for the remainder of the 8-year period of liability for military service.

It continues the present law which permits men to enlist in the National Guard prior to becoming 18 years and 6 months.

I should like briefly to discuss more in detail two of the bill's most important provisions—the Reserve program and 26 months' period for active service.

The events which followed Pearl Harbor and more recently the crisis in Korea clearly show the imperative need for a positive continuing Reserve program. Our recent frantic efforts to find trained replacements for our troops in Korea, our present plight in which our forces stationed here at home are filled with men who are only now completing their basic training are glaring evidences of the inadequate status of our reserve of trained manpower.

In this country we depend upon our reserves for the building up of our armed services in time of stress. We are opposed to the principle and practice of a large professional army. Our reserves consist of our National Guard and of the organized and inactive reserve forces of our armed services. Both groups are now manned by veterans of World War II and by men who are too young to be veterans of World War II. The veterans are becoming older and thereby obtaining greater responsibilities as civilians and as heads of families. The non-vet-

erans have never received a sound basic military training. The basic fact remains therefore that we have not today adequate trained reserves because we have no program for training men before they join the reserve components.

A reserve consisting of untrained men is of no value. Actually it is harmful. Its impressive appearance on paper gives an illusion of strength which is not there.

Under our present hit-and-miss system, completely untrained men join the reserve components. Actually our committee was told that they comprise approximately 50 percent of the present reserve. The other half are veterans of the last war. Under the present limitations of funds and facilities, it is not possible—or at least it has not been done—to give these untrained members of the reserve any realistic instruction.

The consequences of this loosely integrated system were made painfully clear last September. At that time it became necessary to recall numerous individuals for immediate active duty to meet the Korean crisis. The astonishing fact developed that the only trained reserves are veterans of the last war. Unless some system is shortly developed which will fit continually into the reserve component large numbers of trained men, the only trained reserves available to meet some future Korea will be the veterans of this Korea. This is particularly true of that portion of the reserve which is not in organized units. The large pool which must be called to duty as individuals to provide the men needed to fill new units or to replace losses.

Let me give you two examples which have been called to my personal attention. The first case was a veteran of four combat drops in an airborne division of World War II. He had several medals for courage in action. He had been wounded. When he was called suddenly back into the service because of Korea, he had a responsible civilian position through which he supported a wife and three daughters. His wife was at the moment that he was called on very short notice bedridden with a serious illness. I requested the Army to give that man a greater deferment of time and they cooperated.

The other case I would like to mention briefly was a veteran of World War II who is now 37 years of age with a wife and 2 children. He was called back into the service and was in active combat in Korea, when I last heard from him.

A letter just received from Korea is typical of those I am constantly receiving:

KOREA, *February 18, 1951.*

DEAR SIR: In my confused mind I have several questions that maybe you could help me answer. I'm a veteran of World War II and was recalled to active duty with the Enlisted Reserve Corps in September. I had 15 days to report for duty leaving a pregnant wife and a job I had just gotten after almost 2 years waiting for an opening. We received about 14 days training and were then transported to Korea in the fastest shuffle of men I've ever witnessed. My second night in Korea was spent digging a foxhole on the lines. Regardless of the aforementioned, I'd now like to know why a man who has been wounded, suffered frostbitten feet, should be subject to front line duty again. I know of cases where men have been wounded four times, have come back to risk their lives again. Every day we see pictures of healthy American youths trying to beat duty in the Army by enlisting in some safer branch of service. Why if they can enlist in one branch, can't these 18-year-olds be drafted just as well? I started my military service at 18 years of age and so did a great many other World War II veterans. True, it's young, but who else can carry on the fight? This is more than just "police action" over here and we're getting pretty tired of carrying the whole load. Let's get some more help over here so we can end this mess and get home to our wives, families, and jobs. Enclosed is one of the articles I refer to.

Stationery is short so I can only spare one sheet. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted.

Certainly these are cases typical of many that every Senator can cite. These are types of men who should not be called except in extreme emergencies. Young nonveterans should be trained sufficiently to do the work that these men are now required to perform. This bill calls for every physically and mentally sound man between 18 and 26 years of age, except for a comparatively few deferments, to give 2 active years and 6 more in the Reserves to the service of his country.

We believe that the Reserve program contemplated by this bill is a sound one. We believe that it will make it possible to formulate in detail a system for maintaining our Reserve units in a state of readiness which heretofore has been impossible.

But such a program cannot be worked out until some legislation has been enacted upon which the Department of Defense can build an adequate Reserve program. With that thought in mind, the committee has requested in writing of the Secretary of Defense to submit to the committee within 60 days after the date of enactment of this bill the detailed plans of a Reserve system which will be put into effect at the earliest possible date in all of the military services.

The pending bill does not in any way abrogate Reserve agreements which have already been made with individuals. It does contemplate, however, a more realistic Reserve program for the future.

Each person who subsequent to the date of enactment of this bill is either inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to attaining the age of 26, shall be obligated to serve either on active training and service or in a Reserve component for a period of 8 years. This is provided on page 74, line 12, of the bill. Each person released from active training and service is transferred to a Reserve component. This is not optional with the individual. It is mandatory.

But the individual who serves in an organized unit may shorten the total period of Reserve obligation. The 3-year-5-year formula prescribed in the 1948 act is not carried forward in this bill. The committee felt that the formula was unduly restrictive and did not meet the needs of the different services. After all, the degree of activity which an individual in an organized unit is called upon to undertake varies in the various services and in accordance with the availability of facilities and funds. We therefore felt that the adoption of such a rigid formula as contained in the 1948 act was unwise.

So long as we maintain an active duty force of 3,500,000 men, the long-term annual turn-over rate will absorb practically all of each year's pool of physically fit men, if the estimates of the Defense Department and the Selective Service experts are correct. But we are all naturally hopeful that we shall be able ultimately and before too long to reduce the size of the active-duty force.

When this time comes—and we all certainly pray for its early development—it will then be possible to shorten the induction period and to permit inductees to be transferred from the active forces to the Reserve without serving the full induction period of 26 months. This procedure will guarantee to the Reserve a flow of trained men to supplement the young men now serving in Korea and those who will have been discharged and transferred to the Reserves.

Our ultimate goal, of course, when the security of our country can be more clearly foreseen than it can at the present moment, will be to eliminate entirely the period of active service and to require of the individual inductee nothing more than the prescribed period of initial basic training, which may vary from 4 to 6 months. That is the goal toward which we desire to work. Either the Congress or the President can work toward that goal when they believe that the emergency is sufficiently lessened to permit it.

When this phase of the program begins to operate, we will have achieved the goal of providing annually for our Reserve components a flow of trained men. We will no longer have, as we have now and have had in the past, a Reserve in which the only trained men were the veterans of the last war.

Our pool of young Reserves will consist of boys who have had a sound course of basic military training—a course of training which can be given in peacetime rather than hurriedly devised to meet the crisis of an emergency. It will then no longer be necessary, we hope, for us to draft completely untrained young men into our military services. We can simply call up successively the trained reservists who graduated during recent years.

Mr. President, this is the important contribution which the pending bill makes to our Reserve program. It becomes of the greatest lasting significance.

When we do get our Reserve program on an even, practical basis, there are bad practices, or questionable practices, which must be gradually eliminated. For example, at the outset of the Korean crisis, reservists were hurriedly called to active duty without regard to their civilian employment or status, or the number of their dependents. The armed services kept no catalog of reservists. A man who had served 3 years in combat during World War II, who had a wife and several children, who owned a small business, was just as apt to be called as was the youngster who had served only a year or two after VJ-day. I have cited several instances

that have come to my personal attention. Such inequities must be corrected, and corrected as soon as possible. A system of releasing as rapidly as we can from active service those men who served long periods in the last war, or who have family commitments which render their military service a distinct hardship, must be devised. We must prevent the recurrence of such injustices.

Counterwise, the status of the reservist who has not been ordered to duty and who has never had any active military service must be quickly reexamined. In the long run, the question comes down to this: Should the young man who is now a member of a National Guard organization or of a unit of the Organized Reserves, who has never had any active service, continue to be deferred? Should not such a man, as soon as he is sufficiently trained, be required to serve on active duty and replace those World War II veterans and other veterans who have their tour in active combat in Korea?

These are questions which must be met and solved in a systematic manner as we tackle the job of putting our Reserve system in order.

The committee has requested in writing that the Secretary of Defense furnish it at the earliest practical time the plans whereby some of these objectives are to be attained. Such a plan should be formulated at once. It does not need to wait necessarily for the passage of this bill. I hope the Department of Defense will prepare such a program at the earliest possible moment, because there are too many of our veterans now in Korea with many responsibilities at home who should be replaced with younger men, who in many instances are now sufficiently trained.

In commenting upon these factors, I simply wish to point out that our present Reserve system—or should it be called our lack of system—is full of inequities and mistakes. They must be removed or corrected. We are all alert to the problem from the many injustices that have been called to our attention. We are all insistent that it be solved.

But changes cannot be made overnight. We must take one step at a time. The first step is to provide a system of feeding into our Reserve components adequate numbers of men on a continuing basis, rather than to rely upon the vagaries of enlistment of completely untrained youngsters.

Mr. President, another point that I would like to discuss briefly is the length of the induction period. In the 1948 act it is 21 months. This bill lengthens that active service to 26 months.

In discussing this question, we must be careful to avoid generalities. Many people feel that the period of induction is something which applies to all members of our military services of 3,500,000 men. Actually that is far from true. The Selective Service System is now inducting men only for the Army. The Navy and Air Force, which make up about 2,000,000 of the 3,500,000 men, are able to secure all of their personnel either by voluntary enlistment, reenlistment, or by the recalling of reservists. The enlistment period in those services is 4 years. With the present favorable rates of reenlistments, the average period of enlisted service for personnel in the Navy and Air Force is in the neighborhood of 5 or 6 years.

The Army, on the other hand, must secure a very substantial portion of its personnel through induction. Although the Army had conducted for many years a very productive enlistment campaign, its needs are so much larger that it has found it impossible to sustain itself without the aid of Selective Service.

At the end of October 1950, the number of men in the Army as a result of voluntary enlistment exceeded the number in either the Navy or Air Force by over 150,000 individuals. However, the build-up of the Army, plus the rigors of the very difficult campaign in Korea, have brought about a situation in which the Army will ultimately secure the bulk of its enlisted strength through Selective Service. Initially, this number will not be as large as is generally supposed. I am told that it will be in the neighborhood of 600,000 men by the end of the current fiscal year in June. How large it will be next year or in 1953 is impossible to estimate.

The point, however, is simply this: The period of induction at the moment is of primary significance to only one service—the Army.

The Army is currently bearing the brunt of a very difficult military campaign which is being conducted many thousands of miles from the United States. The efficiency of the units conducting this campaign will be adversely affected to a very marked degree by the large turn-over which will begin to take effect as the period of service of the 21-month inductees begins to terminate. This was one of the basic reasons that influenced the committee to recommend that the induction period of 21 months be increased.

This bill would extend the power of the President until June 1953 to give one extension of 1 year to the enlistment period of a man now in service. This will help, but it is not enough.

As it was pointed out when the Selective Service Act of 1948 was debated, an induction period of 21 months for training purposes is adequate. As a matter of fact, this shorter period permits more men to be trained, and is thereby of great advantage to the Reserve components of the Army. It really has no effect on the Reserve components of the other services for the reasons I have already stated.

Under a 26-month induction period, the committee figures that each man will have 4 months of basic training. Under our present laws, he will be entitled to 2 months and 5 days of leave, exclusive of week-end passes. Because of the long distances he must travel to points where he is needed in Europe, in Japan, or in Korea, 2 months will be taken in travel to get him to his post and to return him for discharge. Thus, there will be approximately 18 months of useful service as a trained man to the Army. The committee therefore recommends the longer induction period primarily for military reasons to meet the demands in Korea and of sending men to other countries where they are needed as replacements. We do not feel that this longer period of induction should be retained indefinitely. We feel that it should be reduced whenever the military situation confronting the Army makes such action possible. Provision whereby this reduction in the 26-month period of induction can be shortened and ultimately eliminated is specifically set out in the terms of the bill on page 77, line 12, and following:

Mr. President, I have tried in this talk to elaborate somewhat on the problem of the Reserves and on the reasons that convinced the committee upon reaching a 26-month period of induction for active service.

I believe this is a sound bill. I believe it meets the needs of today and provides for the needs of tomorrow. This bill of and by itself is not the answer to all of our problems for national security, by any means. On the other hand, Mr. President, I sincerely believe that without the provisions of this bill other measures and the huge appropriations that we are expected to make in this session of Congress for national defense will be inconclusive. It is useless for us to build tanks, planes and ships unless there are patriotic men, well trained and qualified, in sufficient numbers, constantly rotating so that there is fairness to all, to man those tanks, planes, and ships. This bill provides those men as fairly and as equitably as possible. I take the great responsibility of saying this only after the most thoughtful and careful consideration, now stretching over a period of several years. I say this because, as I cited at the beginning of this talk, we are taking a step that will go into practically every family in the country, that will affect the future of our mothers and fathers, and their sons. But this step is necessary if we are to build up the security of these same boys and undertake our responsibilities as a world power for greater peace in the world that will immediately affect the lives of the mothers and fathers and sweethearts of these boys.

This bill provides a method by which we in the United States can meet the immediate needs of our Armed Forces and maintain an adequate reserve force, as opposed to a large professional army, which we have never had nor ever want to have except in times of great emergency. I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts. The pending bill does not provide any immediate relief to the men in the reserves who have been called back to active service?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would agree with the distinguished Senator from Kansas that it does not apply any imme-

diate solution. It is an effort to build up a gradual solution.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is a long-term proposition, is it not? The pending bill intends to cover a series of circumstances and conditions on a long range basis, does it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It would do two things, as I see it. First, it would build up and maintain a sufficient force, in the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide the strength which the Nation is required to have as a world power. Secondly, it is an effort to build up over a period of years a reserve of young men with basic training, who can fit into the reserves. In that way we would not be in the position in which we were when Korea broke, or when Pearl Harbor broke.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If the Senator will yield, I should like to make an observation. I have received hundreds of letters concerning the handling of the Reserve components. They are being called out after having given months and years of service in World War II. Much dissatisfaction and discouragement has developed. Unless some compulsory filling up of the reserve gaps is provided, we shall probably suffer for years, and will not be able to fill the reserve forces through voluntary means. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree, particularly as regards the Army.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. I was interested in the Senator's statement that the bill will provide a constantly rotating force to man the ships, the guns, and the tanks. I should like to preface my question by an example. I understand that the Army Air Force and the Navy, by voluntary enlistments, have piled up a considerable backlog of manpower. According to the press it is manpower of the elite type. Does this bill, by reason of what has transpired before, really amount to this: If it is enacted and we take the 18-year-olds, will we, under the terms of the bill, primarily have to channel the young draftees to be foot soldiers? Will the Navy and the Army Air Force be permitted to have a backlog of additional enlistees, or will some rotation be provided?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My answer to the distinguished Senator is that we cannot channel a volunteer from the Air Force into the Army; but to the best of our ability we can require the armed services to go share-and-share alike, so far as practicable, with respect to the less desirable possibilities. I do not believe that that specifically answers the Senator's question. However, as I understand, a volunteer enlists for 4 years, and he may choose his service. An inductee is taken for 26 months, and he may not choose his service. But there are men who, we will say, are less qualified than others, without drawing invidious comparisons as to why they are less qualified, mentally or otherwise. The great criticism today is that many of those are going into the Army and not enough into the Air Force and the Navy. We discussed that question at length. In our opinion, there was no way by which we could specifically write into legislation the requirement that the number of such men be divided by three. We placed the duty upon the Secretary of Defense, as an administrative responsibility, to try to divide those men as fairly as possible among the various services.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Then, I take it that what the Senator has indicated is that the situation will have to be readjusted by administrative decrees, and the problem will have to be handled by an administrative approach rather than by anything in the bill of a legalistic or statutory nature.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Senator to say, in response to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], that the bill would have no direct effect on the relief of the Reserves, as affecting the Reserves who have been called to active duty. I am sure that the Senator from Massachusetts realizes that the bill does have a considerable effect on the length of time the Reserves may be compelled to serve.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because, unless we are able to get the men which the bill contemplates, we cannot relieve the Reserves. The bill will be a step in perhaps shortening the period of service of the Reserves who have been called to active duty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate what the Senator from Georgia has said. He is absolutely correct. While it will have no immediate effect on the Reserves, it will accelerate the sending of trained men gradually to replace fathers and veterans. What we must do is to build up a sufficiently large force so that we can rotate the men and relieve the Reserves from further service.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, we must get another man to take the place of a reservist before we can rotate him and bring him back.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. Did I misinform the Senator from Kansas on that point?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. No. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that he did not misinform me. However, I felt that the point ought to be brought out because of the fact that many people throughout the country are expecting some immediate relief by reason of the Reserve feature in the bill. I do not think they should be misled. I think they should know the situation definitely, as it has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Too many people have been misled and there has been too much misunderstanding about many of these questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. We cannot afford any immediate relief, but I do not see how we can relieve the reservists without this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say also to the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Georgia that it is my belief that the bill is not merely for this emergency. What we are trying to do is to build up and maintain an armed force, and then provide for an adequate supply of young men with basic training, who will constitute a reserve in years to come. Those are the primary objectives.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator mean, then, that in establishing a permanent program the provision for the induction of 18-year-olds is to be a permanent feature?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill, if it becomes law, will remain on the statute books until it is repealed. Under its terms the 26-month term of service can be cut down, as pointed out by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], either by Presidential order or by concurrent resolution of Congress. So far as the 18-year-olds are concerned, when the emergency is over and the term of service is cut down, an 18-year-old boy will be subject to induction for from 4 to 6 months of basic training. He will then be in the Reserves for the remainder of 8 years. He will not be called upon for active service.

The Senator refers to 18-year-old boys. As I understand, it is the considered judgment of competent educational authorities and competent civilians that the age of 18 is the best period at which to give a boy basic training, with the least detriment to his own life, the least detriment to the community, and the greatest benefit to the Nation.

Mr. CASE. But he would have no option.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He would have no objection. When he was called he would have 6 months of basic training, and then he would go on and lead his life.

Mr. CASE. That is, if he wanted to take the 6 months at the last half of the year when he was approaching 19, because he was in school or for any other reason, he would not have an option?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He could finish his school career, provided he did it before his nineteenth birthday. Then he would be taken after that. But assume that he finished his school year at 18. It is my understanding that then he would be subject to being inducted for basic training. I assume that if there were too many, the program might be postponed for a little while. I do not believe the committee has gone into that question. It proposes to establish a commission of three civilians and two military men to prescribe rules and regulations when we reach that period, which we do not foresee in the immediate future because of the present emergency.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator for yielding, but his answer suggests to me that if this is a permanent program and we are here dealing with a permanent policy, some question is raised with reference to the provisions of the bill which would not arise if we were thinking of it in terms of meeting an emergency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. The committee has not gone into the details of the basic training program for a 6-month period, except to provide for the establishment of the Commission, the members of which must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Commission would be authorized to establish rules and regulations. When that time comes, which will be some time in the future, we can correct any unfairnesses, inequalities, or injustices which may arise.

## INCREASE OF CERTAIN POSTAL RATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 65)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 1660–1661.)

## THE FLEXIBLE-IMPORT-FEE PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION, SENATE 981, FEBRUARY 27, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on June 12, 1934, the Congress transferred to the President, by means of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade.

### FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The flexible-import-fee bill, Senate 981, simply emphasizes and more clearly defines the principle already adopted by the Congress in the 1930 Tariff Act, but not really utilized by the administration following the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

### STATE DEPARTMENT ADMINISTERED ACT

Almost immediately following the passage of the act, the Secretary of State established the Trade Agreements Committee, which quickly proceeded to continually lower the long-standing tariffs and import fees on the basis of which thousands of products were produced in this country.

These tariffs and import fees were lowered without regard to the differential existing between the cost of production in this country and the cost of production in competitive nations. That committee was formalized in February 1947 by the President, through Executive order 9832.

### FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS EFFECTIVELY REMOVED

Mr. President, a tariff or import fee, when properly adjusted, represents the necessary floor under wages and investments. That floor has been effectively removed through the action of the State Department over the past 18 years.

### SUPERSECRET TORQUAY CONFERENCE

The supersecret conference now in session in Torquay, England, with several dozen State Department representatives in attendance, is presumably completing the job of establishing free trade, in line with its "one economic world" theory.

Mr. President, representatives of approximately 40 nations are conferring there on approximately 100 so-called bilateral trade agreements which will lower tariffs or import fees. The benefits of those agreements will, under our most-favored-nation clause, become immediately available to all the other nations of the world, without requiring any concessions whatsoever on their part.

### TRADE AGREEMENTS ONE-WAY STREET

Of course, following their usual policy, the nations with which these bilateral agreements have been made will proceed to improve their quotas, embargoes, specifications, manipulations of currency, and other subterfuges which they use to prevent any benefit from accruing to the United States. Therefore, such trade agreements are simply a one-way street.

Mr. President, American workers, investors, and Members of Congress are not invited to attend the Torquay conference. However, foreign producers are allowed to attend, along with representatives of their respective countries.

### M. S. RUKEYSER, ECONOMIC COMMENTATOR

Mr. President, Mr. M. S. Rukeyser, an economic commentator for the New York Journal-American, on May 11, 1950, in his column, covered the subject when he said that the flexible-import-fee principle which would represent the differential between labor costs and standards in the United States and those abroad, had been recommended to the Senate by the junior Senator from Nevada; and then Mr. Rukeyser said:

> This idea accords with the remark made to me years ago by Bernard M. Baruch, sage and elder statesman of the Democratic Party.

I read further from Mr. Rukeyser's column:

> Mr. Baruch said that it would be psychologically astute to get out from under the onus of protectionism.
>
> Mr. Baruch instead proposed that hereafter we offer removal of all trade barriers to nations which maintain wage and living standards equal to our own. At present, no foreign nation could qualify.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a part of the article from which I have just quoted printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> While Senator MCCARTHY has been dwelling on subversives, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, has been concentrating his criticism on free-trade tendencies of the Fair Deal.
>
> While under the cover of the current armament boom the over-all adverse effect of departure from protectionism has been concealed, Senator MALONE is hammering away at the potential dangers.
>
> Already the labor unions are beginning to take cognizance of the matter, and real progress will start when capital and labor present a united front in discussing matters with their public servants.
>
> As an alternative to the Roosevelt-Truman tariff slashing policy, Mr. MALONE has recommended a flexible import fee principle, which would represent the differential in labor costs and standards here and abroad:
>
> This idea accords with the remark made to me years ago by Bernard M. Baruch, sage and elder statesman of the Democratic Party.
>
> Mr. Baruch said that it would be psychologically astute to get out from under the onus of protectionism.
>
> Mr. Baruch instead proposed that hereafter we offer removal of all trade barriers to nations which maintain wage and living standards equal to our own. At present, no foreign nation could qualify.
>
> This fresh and affirmative manner of dealing with international differences would take the ground from under the "holier-than-thou" nations, which have been sweating their own labor.

### NO HIGH OR LOW TARIFF CONSIDERED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, under the bill which the junior Senator from Nevada has introduced, S. 981, which was introduced in the Eightieth Congress, and again in the Eighty-first, there is no consideration of a high or low tariff or import fee under its flexible provision.

Also, there is no consideration of a high or low tariff or import fee under the flexible provision of section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act, which has been used for a short time, namely, from 1930 to 1934, when the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was passed, and which was then utilized almost to the exclusion of the flexible provision of the 1930 Tariff Act.

### NO OBJECTION TO COMPETING ON EVEN TERMS

Mr. President, as Mr. Baruch has so aptly said, as quoted by Mr. Rukeyser, no one, least of all our workers and investors, objects to competing upon even terms with the workingmen and investors of other nations which have approximately the same wage-living standard.

Indeed, the objective of the junior Senator from Nevada in sponsoring the legislation which would establish a fair and reasonable competitive basis for foreign nations selling their goods in the American markets, is to hold our own standard of living, until with our help and encouragement such foreign nation's living standards can equal our own.

### SECTION 336 OF 1930 TARIFF ACT AVAILABLE

If the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—upon which hearings are currently being held in the Senate Finance Committee—is not extended, the flexible tariff provision in section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act can immediately be utilized for the adjustment of tariff or import rates, and there is no necessity of such regulation reverting to the floor of the Senate and the House.

### AMERICAN MARKET ESTABLISHED FOR FOREIGN GOODS

The bill which the junior Senator is introducing today, S. 331, would immediately establish an American market for the goods of every nation in the world on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, but foreign nations will be the judges of their own living standards.

However, under the flexible provision of this bill they would be encouraged to raise their own living standards, because they would immediately get credit through a corresponding reduction in our tariff or import fee, and when their standards of living approximated our own, then the common objective of free trade would be an almost automatic and immediate result. But in the meantime our wage standard of living could be maintained.

OUR ACTIONS BELIE OUR WORDS

We say that we want other nations to raise their living standards, with our assistance, but our very action in connection with bringing about sweatshop labor competition prohibits or prevents our reaching our announced objective. In other words, with our tariff or import fee making up the differential of costs of production, it would be advantageous to the industrialists of the foreign nations, to pay their labor as much as our workers receive and to establish a living standard comparable to ours, if they are to compete in our market, because they would not profit through holding their wages down. The important difference in costs of production would simply be paid into the United States Treasury. So when such costs had been paid into the United States Treasury a few times, they would understand that it might as well be paid to their own labor, and increase their own living standards. I think it would immediately result in a rise in their standard of living.

The flexible import fee adjusted upon the principle of "fair and reasonable" competition does not prevent imports; it simply brings them in on our level of cost of production. Therefore, no trade advantage could be gained through continuing to hold the wages and living standards down in the foreign nations, including the colonial possessions, since the flexible import fee properly administered would make up that differential of cost of production.

COMPETITION WITH SWEAT LABOR

It must be realized by our overzealous internationalists that we pay more in industrial insurance, unemployment insurance, and social security alone than the total wages in many of the European and Asiatic countries. Therefore, an undue lowering of our tariffs and import fees simply moves our workers, farmers, and investors into direct competition with the sweatshop labor of those areas.

In other words, merely the benefits of industrial insurance, unemployment insurance, equals more than the wages in many of the countries seeking to compete on an even basis with us, encouraged as they are by the State Department to do just that.

FLEXIBLE PROVISION LITTLE USED AFTER 1934

The flexible provision of the 1930 Tariff Act was almost immediately invoked following its passage and was utilized until the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Under this section, tariffs were adjusted upon 135 products, 31 of which were lowered, 32 increased, and 67 were dismissed without change, with 1 marked indeterminate after proper hearings had been held in accordance with the act.

This section of the 1930 Tariff Act is still in effect, except for the fact that any product which has had its duty reduced under section 350, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, was taken out of the scope of section 336, the flexible provision.

FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

The floor under wages and investments would again be established on the definite principle of "fair and reasonable" competition laid down by this Congress if the bill now being introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada, Senate 981, were to be substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. If the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is not extended, the flexible provision of the 1930 Tariff Act is still in full force and effect, and could be utilized in exactly the same manner that it was being utilized from 1930 until the 1934 legislation made it largely inoperative.

FOREIGN-TRADE AUTHORITY

The proposed legislation would improve the operation of the flexible import fee principle, already adopted by Congress, by turning the long-experienced Tariff Commission into a Foreign Trade Authority with the ample latitude in the adjustment of tariffs and import fees on the principle of "fair and reasonable" competition—in the same manner as the Congress long since created the Interstate Commerce Commission and gave them a free hand in regulating freight rates for the carriers on the basis of a "reasonable return" on the investment.

EXISTING TRADE AGREEMENTS NOT AFFECTED

No so-called trade agreements made by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act would be affected in any way through the expiration of the act nor would they be affected by the passage of the presently proposed legislation, Senate 981, definitely adopting the principle of adjusting tariffs and import fees on the basis of "fair and reasonable" competition through the proposed Foreign Trade Authority, except through the provision that all such agreements should be canceled at the earliest practicable date.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT PAY TARIFF

It has often been argued that import fees and tariffs are costly to the defense effort. However, that is not so.

The Federal Government does not pay the tariff or import fee of any products imported for use by the Government (sec. 502 (d) (6), Public Law 152, 81st Cong., Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949); in any case if such import fee were paid, it would simply be paid from one department of the Government to another, from the Department of Defense to the Treasury. In other words, it would merely go from one pocket into another.

TRADE AGREEMENTS IMPOSSIBLE

It is, of course, impossible to make trade agreements with any foreign nation that manipulates its currency—and they all do—since all they have to do in order to nullify their obligations under the agreement is to lower the price of the pound, franc, or guilder, or whatever they use for money. Such devaluation makes the entire agreement ineffectual. Their devaluation or increase in the value of their money, which ever fits their particular requirement and is to their particular advantage at the moment, completely nullifies any agreement.

FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE—1922 AND 1930

The flexible import fee principle was first seriously considered by the Congress in 1922; later the 1930 Tariff Act definitely incorporated such principle.

The legislation which the junior Senator from Nevada introduces today, S. 981, simply makes the method more workable, giving the Authority complete latitude, instead of limiting it to changes of 50 percent and preventing removal from or to the free list.

THE TWO OPPOSING PHILOSOPHIES

There have been two well-defined philosophies in the matter of our domestic production and foreign trade for generations; there is no mystery or secret about the results of either; one school of thought would maintain our economic structure, our wage standard of living through an adjustable floor under wages and investments, called for convenience tariffs or import fees.

The second school of thought has always been that our markets must be divided with all foreign countries through the removal of such floor under wages and investments, and that direct competition must be established between the workers of this Nation and the workers of the lower wage living standard countries. The first philosophy immediately establishes a market for the nations of the world in this country on a fair and reasonable competitive basis, holding our standard while assisting other nations in raising their own; while the second immediately puts the workers and investors of this Nation in direct competition with the sweatshop labor of the world, and can only result in a leveling of our own standards—a one economic world as the objective.

PRIVATE INVESTMENTS VERSUS TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the industrially inexperienced State Department is continually tampering with the floor under wages and investments represented by the tariffs and import fees, the differential between the cost of production in this country and in the sweatshop-labor nations.

By this tampering alone private investments have been discouraged and an increased demand created for Government loans and subsidies, with special reference to the strategical and critical minerals and materials and defense industries.

Private investors will not risk their money, even though the investment might be profitable during the emergency, since it would be destroyed at the end of the emergency by the influx of imports from the low-cost labor nations.

This distrust has stimulated the demand for additional billions of dollars of taxpayers' money where private investments normally carry most of the load. Citizens are unwilling to risk even their time unless the Government becomes their partner.

When Congress regains its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade through the simple expedient of allowing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12 of this year, it will mark the end of an era of experimentation and tampering with the economic structure of this Nation through the division of our markets with the nations of the world, markets which we have built up over a century of time.

soil, or resources and which are complementary to rather than competitive with, the output of our own factories; and

Whereas the remaining 40 percent of competitive imports, if unimpeded in any way, would leave our workers at the mercy of low-wage rivalry, a process that would have only one ultimate effect; namely, the impoverishment of our labor force; and

Whereas many members of unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor know from direct and bitter experience the disastrous consequences of low-wage foreign competition which has not been properly offset by a rate of duty or other protective measure to insure its fairness: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor, while fully recognizing the many economic benefits of a healthy foreign trade, declare its disapproval of such competitive imports as derive their competitive advantage from low wages prevailing abroad, unless this unfair advantage is appropriately offset or guarded against to assure competitive parity; that the undermining of labor standards through wage competition on an international scale cannot be accepted as a legitimate form of economic improvement; that it is not necessary, as a condition of selling successfully in the United States, to offer goods at prices that substantially undercut the market; that the most healthy and voluminous trade can be built around fair competitive methods rather than seeking to base it upon price advantages that threaten loss of employment and reduction in wages; and, finally, that the American Federation of Labor express its concern over further tariff reductions that will expose our workers to unfair competition from foreign wages and thus undermine the wage standards built up in this country over the years.

Referred to committee on resolutions.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Your committee is in accord with and approves the principles involved and the objectives sought in these several resolutions. We fully recognize the many economic benefits of a healthy foreign trade. World economic stability cannot be regained without a large volume of sound international trade.

However, we must not forget that competitive imports that derive their market advantage from low wages prevailing in other countries are a constant threat to our labor standards, unless this unfair advantage is offset or guarded against to assure competitive parity.

We cannot accept international wage competition as a method of economic improvement since such competition, wherever it occurs, inevitably undermines the higher of the competing standards. International trade, like domestic trade, can be expanded most soundly on the basis of fair competition.

Our import duties should prevent low-wage rivalry from abroad as our State and National minimum-wage laws seek to avoid such rivalry at home, to the end that our labor standards may be maintained and further improved.

THE STRAW MAN OF ROBBER BARONS

Mr. MALONE. Those today who look to tariffs for protection are not the so-called robber barons of a half century ago, not the trusts or monopolies or giants of mass production. On the contrary, they are the small producers who lack the advantages of costly equipment, expensive machinery, and production-line economies.

THE WORKERS SUFFER FIRST

It is the workers in these small industries, as well as the owners, who look to tariffs and import fees as a means of protecting their wage standards, their employment, and the better conditions of work which they have achieved. Yet these small businesses are the targets for foreign competition.

All over the United States we have thousands of small businesses where labor is the principal cost item.

STATE DEPARTMENT CALCULATED RISKS

Many of these businesses are represented in the lists the junior Senator from Nevada has asked to be included in his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. It is no comfort to know that calculated risks are being taken by the experts who sneer at labor as a factor in the cost differentials. It is no comfort to know that the ECA officials are encouraging European producers to increase production for export involving a high labor factor.

The importance of labor as a cost factor was recognized long ago and brought about Federal minimum-wage legislation and the abolition of child labor.

These foreign competitors in the United States market have been aided by modern machinery made in the United States and bought with our money but served by cheap labor trained abroad by our technicians.

THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

The reason that this Nation is in the cattle business, for example, is on account of the hoof-and-mouth disease. Certainly the tariff or import fee now applicable to fresh and frozen beef would not make up that differential of cost of production mostly due to the difference in the standard of living wages between this Nation and in Mexico and South America.

FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE PRINCIPLE—1922–30

The first mention of the flexible import fee principle was in 1922, and then later in 1930, when it was made a part of our law. The title of the Tariff Act of 1930 was the first tariff act expressly to mention the protection of American labor.

SMALL PRODUCERS COMPETE WITH OUR MONEY ABROAD

Must we tell these small producers that they must go out of business so that we may recover our European investments? They will be surprised to learn that in giving away our money we have destroyed our own economy. This has all been done in the teeth of Presidential assurances that no industry would suffer serious injury.

ANNOUNCED ECA OBJECTIVE

It is well to bear in mind that one of the greatest alleged assets of the ECA was that it would aid European production and establish unobstructed European markets to absorb its surpluses.

THE RESULT OF ECA ACHIEVEMENTS

But the United States has become the dumping ground for these unmanageable surpluses due to Europe's failure to achieve integration of production, wider European markets, and convertible currencies. Failure to absorb these surpluses in Europe means they will be pushed into our market which will not be very difficult in view of the active official encouragement to this end by our State Department. Our expressed anxiety to accept these surpluses destroys any impulse for the European countries to tear down the protective barriers between themselves in order to sell at home.

PLAN OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE WRONG

The junior Senator from Nevada has debated on the floor of the Senate many times the point that any assistance through ECA or the Marshall plan or in any other manner should have been by way of loans to private industries if the real objective was recovery, under the same rules and regulations that money is loaned through Government agencies to private business in this country in times of stress.

The loans should have been made on the further conditions that there be a free interchange of currencies among the European nations themselves, and with United States currency, and that the European countries discontinue the barriers between themselves in the European area. Europe is not much more than half as large as the United States of America, with many of its countries being much smaller than the States in the United States, but with each holding its own sovereignty, with its own king, its own dictator, or its own president, and having a full organization of cabinet officers, and all other government agencies, all to be supported separately by money from this country. They have been fighting each other economically and militarily for centuries.

STATE DEPARTMENT ENCOURAGES INFLUX OF FOREIGN GOODS

When they would not sell the products of the new plants among themselves, the State Department of the United States wrote off our tariffs and import fees without any regard to any differential between cost of production here and abroad, due mostly to the differences in the wage standard of living.

Instead of encouraging these countries to sell to each other, the Department encouraged them to sell their goods in our markets, putting our own workmen on the streets.

TREMENDOUS PEACETIME UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. President, it is to be remembered that before June 26, 1950, before the so-called police action in Korea started, there were in this country between 5 and 6 million unemployed and between 10 and 12 million partially unemployed. The same condition existed then that existed just prior to World War II, in 1941. Of course, Mr. Sawyer mentioned just after the police action in Korea began, that it surely did alleviate the unemployment situation. However, to me that is not the way to cure unemployment.

POINT 4 AIMED AT AMERICAN MARKETS

I shall mention only briefly the so-called point 4, or the "bold new program," with its guaranteed investment to industrialize the world.

It contemplates American machinery, and know-how, and sufficient new products for export to create profitable foreign trade in every country. We know that the United States is the destined market for the Marshall plan surpluses.

Where are the surpluses to be shipped under this point 4 which is in substance

the Marshall plan applied to the rest of the world? Already there have been certain indications evident in Washington of what will happen. Some of our major American oil companies have substantial investments in Venezuelan petroleum production.

In April, a Venezuelan Chamber of Commerce made an unofficial visit to Washington, but let it be publicly known that if the normal tariff were reimposed on Venezuelan oil entering the United States, then Venezuela, as a market for American exports, would dry up.

CENTRAL AMERICAN COUNTRIES RAISE TARIFFS

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada, together with several other members of a Senate committee, made a trip to the Central American countries in November 1950.

We found there that instead of those countries lowering their tariffs and import fees in line with the supposed reciprocal trade agreements advocated by the State Department, the tariffs and import fees had been raised.

When we asked representatives of those countries what had become of the reciprocal trade agreements idea, they said they were all in favor of such agreements but had no idea that they were expected to conform to it.

I do not wish to go into details respecting that situation now, but it can easily be verified that there had been no concessions of any kind on their part toward us. Nevertheless, we were loaning them money to build roads and steel mills and other industries, with no conditions being attached to the loans. We gave the money direct to the governments of these South American countries.

The same conditions exists with respect to Europe and Asia.

THE REMEDY

What is the remedy? One of the first steps of major importance is the defeat of the proposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act. This does not suggest economic isolation behind a Chinese wall because this bill is a substitute which completely refutes any such charges. This bill is known as the Flexible Import Fee Bill. It has already received the support of many trade organizations, chambers of commerce, farm bureaus, and local labor unions.

Of course, as already outlined, even if such a bill as Senate 981 is not available and the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, were not granted by Congress the flexible provision of the 1930 Tariff Act is available, in the same manner as it had been utilized prior to the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

It is available to be used again until it can be improved.

The junior Senator from Nevada believes it can and would be improved by the passage of the bill Senate 981 which he has introduced today.

THE FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION PRINCIPLE

The essence of the bill is to assure fair and reasonable competition between the domestic and foreign competitive goods.

The bill would reconstitute the Tariff Commission into a Foreign Trade Authority, and would charge it with the duty of fixing the tariff rates so as to assure fair and reasonable competition. At the present time, Mr. President, the Interstate Commerce Commission performs a similar function with respect to freight rates.

This bill could merely take the landed duty-paid costs on the import, or the offered-for-sale price when the cost of foreign production could not be accurately determined, and fix the rate of the import fee accordingly.

Tariffs and import fees would be flexible and would take into automatic account any devaluation or other currency manipulation by foreign countries to obtain a trade advantage in this market. The Interstate Commerce Commission in setting the freight rates has always remained available to revise mistakes or to reconsider any new factors resulting from changing economic conditions.

This bill, introduced today by me, would welcome the products of the world into this market, but domestic producers would be assured that such products could not be sold at ridiculous prices with which they could not possibly compete.

FROZEN AND INFLEXIBLE RATES NOT ADEQUATE

Mr. President, no matter how scientifically our present tariff rates are computed, either by the Tariff Commission or by the State Department, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, they are frozen and inflexible.

During the days when the gold standard prevailed, this was comparatively satisfactory; but in an era of rapid changes in the values of pegged currencies, a change such as the devaluation of the British pound, by which our ad valorem rates up to the equivalent of 43 percent were eliminated in an hour by British Government fiat, inflexible tariffs simply do not make sense.

Such an invisible tariff slash caused our State Department no concern; it was promptly followed by an invitation to the nations of the world to assemble at Torquay to indulge in an additional round of tariff cuts.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S ACTION OVER 18-YEAR PERIOD

It is evident from 18 years of history of the manipulation of the tariffs and in import fees under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act that the State Department has not the slightest conception of the floor under wages and investments principle—and how our workers and industrialists maintain the highest standard of living in the world.

It is time to call a halt by discontinuing the principle under which our economic structure is being wrecked.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to say that, in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall not yield for any purpose until I have finished my remarks.

Second, before I turn to the subject matter of the speech which I wish to make, I should like to make an observation or two in regard to the procedures in the Senate. I think it is a matter of great regret and that it reflects on the prestige of the Senate that on a day when a manpower bill which involves the rights of American citizens to the degree that this bill involves them is before the Senate, a number of committee meetings are being held on the same afternoon, and that at no time during the afternoon has there been on the floor of the Senate a sufficiently large representation of the membership of the Senate to represent properly the obligation of the Senate to the business of the people of the United States which is now being considered. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will give further consideration to the point of view I am expressing again, and which I have expressed several times in the past, as have many of my colleagues. I do not think it is desirable for the Senate to hold sessions and for committees to meet at the same time. I do not feel that an efficient arrangement of the business of the Senate makes it necessary to hold committee meetings while the Senate is in session. I think the Senate should give heed to the public impression it creates when it conducts its business in the manner in which it is conducting it, with Senators engaged in committee meetings at a time when very important proposed legislation is under discussion on the floor of the Senate.

Let me also say, Mr. President, that, again for the RECORD, I wish to raise my objections, as I have in the past, to the practice of the Senate which violates the rights of each Member of the Senate, insofar as concerns failing to carry out the meaning and intent of the rule of the Senate which provides that Members of the Senate are to be recognized in the order in which they address the Chair, not in the order of any list or lists kept at the desk of the President of the Senate. Personally it does not make a great deal of difference to me when I deliver a speech to the Senate, because I have long come to appreciate the fact that, for the most part, I speak to the people of the country on the issues to which I address myself here. I shall always be happy to talk to the people of the country, along with my colleagues at any time when any of them wish, with me, to take those issues to the people.

I wish to say that this afternoon we have a good example of the injustice, I think, which grows out of violating the rule of the Senate that Members of the Senate should be recognized in accordance with the order in which they address the Chair, because we had presented on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, by two speakers, Members of the Senate, the majority point of view in regard to the pending measure; and, through the press in attendance here, that point of view was presented to the people of the country early this afternoon. However, Mr. President, there is a minority point of view in regard to this bill. In my personal judgment, time will prove that the minority point of

view really represents the point of view of the majority of the people of the United States. So I think it is a matter of regret that it is 25 minutes to 5 before the minority point of view can be presented to the people of the United States, through the press, although the other point of view has already been on the wires for several hours.

Mr. President, I wish to turn to the pending military manpower bill, on which I intend to speak at some length in the days to come.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, Mr. President, but I will not yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask the Senator to yield because of a matter in regard to his speech.

Mr. MORSE. I am very sorry, but I am not going to yield.

Mr. President, in the days ahead, I shall speak at some length in respect to the individual amendments which will be under discussion on the floor of the Senate. However, tonight, at least, I should like to give a little thumbnail sketch of the minority point of view on the bill as a whole, because I think at least on the same day when the majority point of view was presented, the official RECORD of the Senate should contain some observations on the other side of the issue.

Mr. President, before I turn to my objections to the bill, I wish to pay a very deserved tribute to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee which reported this bill to the full committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I wish to say that it is due them that the observation should be made in the RECORD that they have given to the hearings and to the study of this bill outstanding public service, because I do not know how two men charged with the responsibilities of their work in the Armed Services Committee could have proved themselves to be more devoted servants to what they believe to be the public interest than have the junior Senator from Georgia and the junior Senator from Texas.

For the other members of the committee, I desire to say that in my years of service in the Senate I have never worked on any legislative issue in any committee when I felt that more careful study and consideration were given to the problems involved than have been given by the members of the Armed Services Committee in connection with the presentation of the pending bill. I also wish to say that I was given a full and fair and considerate hearing on each one of the points of objection I raised to the bill, both in subcommittee and in the full committee.

It has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate today that this bill comes to the Senate, so far as the official vote in the Armed Services Committee is concerned, by a vote of 13 to 0; and that is true. Thus it might be asked, "Why did the junior Senator from Oregon vote to report the bill to the Senate, if he entertained serious objections to certain features of it?" I think it is a fair question, but the answer is a very obvious one, because I believe as a member of the committee in cooperating with my colleagues on the committee and attempting to be fair both as to procedural matters and as to substantive matters, and, having been given both a full and a fair hearing on my objections to the bill, I felt that it would have been very unfair of me to take the position of voting against reporting the bill to the Senate. That vote would have meant, or would at least have been interpreted by many to mean, that, if I could, I would have bottled up the bill in committee and prevented its being reported to the Senate. I think that after there has been full consideration of a bill in committee, even though a Senator's proposals have been defeated and there are certain reservations he wishes to make to the bill, he owes it to the committee to get the bill to the floor of the Senate as quickly as possible. That is the way I always act in committee. So I made very clear, as the committee record will show, that I was voting to report the bill with the distinct understanding that I would offer my amendments on the floor and would do the best I could to persuade my colleagues to adopt some of the amendments. That was understood by every member of the committee.

Furthermore, I so voted in committee—and I want to emphasize this point—because I am convinced that a military manpower bill must be passed at an early date. In my judgment, the crisis which confronts our country so far as its defenses are concerned is so serious that we need a manpower bill. I am so convinced of that—and I want this distinctly understood, at the beginning of this debate—that it is my present intention, unless this bill is made worse, to vote for the final bill that is developed on the floor of the Senate, because again I think we must pass a military manpower bill. I am hopeful that in the course of the debate some amendments to the bill will be adopted.

I was greatly encouraged along that line this morning, at a meeting of the Republican conference, when the pros and cons of this debate were discussed, and a very large number of my colleagues came to me afterwards and said they wanted me to know that, as to a good many of the points I raised, they found themselves very sympathetic, and that they expected to vote in support of the position I have taken, subject, of course, as I would want it to be, to the discussion which takes place on the floor of the Senate. I say that because I want my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee to know that it is my conviction that as various points of the bill are presented it will be discovered that the public will also entertain a great many reservations as to the bill. In fact, I am satisfied that after full explanation of the bill, all points of view being presented to the American people, if then the bill should be submitted to a referendum vote of the American people, it would be overwhelmingly rejected.

Of course, in a democracy we have an obligation as Representatives of the people to seek to carry out public opinion, once it is crystallized, once it has formed itself on the basis of a full presentation of the facts. While it is a conjecture on my part, I am so satisfied that the public would vote reservations and amendments to this bill that I want to make that note as we proceed with the debate. Although I never claimed to be a prophet in politics, and although I am not given very much to political prediction, I am willing to venture one this afternoon. Let us assume that this bill in its present form passes the Congress of the United States, and that we are not in an all-out war within 2 years, but are only within a status which is a continuation of the present tension. It may be truly said that this bill must be considered in the light of a situation of tension, not of war, because we all know that in the case of an all-out war, all ceilings and restrictions are off, and there must be then full mobilization both of our economy and of our manpower. My prediction is that if we continue for 2 years with the status quo of tension, so that 2 years from now we find ourselves somewhat in the same position we are presently in, so far as the danger of an all-out war is concerned, the public reaction against this bill be so emphatic that the Congress of the United States will then find it necessary, under the pressure of public opinion, to adopt some of the very amendments which the junior Senator from Oregon will offer in the course of this debate.

I turn now to the first major point I wish to make. It is that one of the serious shortcomings of the bill is that its provisions rest upon the assumptions of the military authorities as set forth in the statistics which they have supplied the committee. I challenge those assumptions; I challenge those statistics; I challenge the public policy underlying the assumptions of the military authorities. Mr. President, you will read the record of the committee hearings in vain to find any proof which absolutely justifies the assumption of the military officers that we should now proceed to raise an army of 3,462,000 men. That assumption on the part of the military is one of the basic assumptions which will be involved throughout this debate, which I ask my colleagues not to lose sight of. Why 3,462,000 men? With the challenge of that basic figure, on which all the statistics of the pending bill rest, we go to the heart of the debate. It is that figure which needs revision, and the time has come for the Congress of the United States to stop accepting without question such assumptions on the part of the military authorities as that figure represents.

Mr. President, the duty of the Congress, through the medium of this debate and the bill which I hope we shall be able to write on the floor of the Senate, is to make clear to the Pentagon Building that its unconscionable waste of manpower must stop. I shall show how to do it. With respect both to economy of manpower and economy of expenditure, there is no other way to bring the mili-

tary to time than for the Congress to start exercising some of its prerogatives by actual legislative restriction. I suggest that a good place to start is on the 3,462,000 figure, and to say to the military, "You are not going to be allowed at the present time a manpower ceiling beyond 3,100,000 or 3,000,000." I hope before the debate shall be concluded, I can convince my colleagues in the Senate, on the basis of certain statistical analyses which are at present in process of being prepared for me, that we should provide that ceiling for the present, and should say to the military, "We will hear you on the question of hiring civilians, including an increased number of women, and of making greater use of manpower which you are now rejecting for paper-pushing jobs, and jobs of a similar type, which at present are tying up thousands upon thousands of able-bodied men in what amounts to a very inefficient operation of military manpower under the present policies of the Pentagon Building."

Mr. President, it is not pleasant to have to be so critical of the military as I am. The military never should have permitted to arise a situation which justifies such criticisms, but they have done so. I say here, as I have said in committee, that the Military Establishment must be checked by the representatives of the people in respect to its tremendous waste both of manpower and of money. We cannot let the military continue to waste our manpower and economic resources to the degree to which they have been wasting them because of inefficiency in administration.

When we take that position, let me say that we are doing the best we can, we are following the best course of action possible, to strengthen the defenses of America. I make that statement because the Nation's defenses will be stronger when we force the military, by appropriate legislative checks, to eliminate its present waste in the use of manpower and its tremendous waste of money.

Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as an ex officio member representing the Armed Services Committee on the Committee on Appropriations in regard to military expenditures, sometimes I wonder how long the military authorities think the wasteful course of action in administrative policies which have come to characterize the Military Establishment can go unchallenged. The military frequently gives evidence that it does not appreciate the value of a dollar, it frequently gives evidence that it does not appreciate the value of time, as witness the procedure which it is defending in connection with the pending bill which is highly wasteful of precious time, and it frequently demonstrates that it does not appreciate the value of manpower.

Each and every Member of this body can test what I say by going to any one of the military establishments located in his State and observing for himself. I believe he will find himself shaking his head in wonderment that we tolerate such wasteful operations on the part of the military branch of the Government. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have yet to visit a military installation in which I have not found waste and inefficiency rampant. The defense situation of the Nation is too serious to justify any longer tolerating waste in the Military Establishment. I believe the time to show them that we mean business is in connection with the pending bill, because for the most part, with minor exceptions, the bill gives the military what it wants.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can that the Congress has the duty of checking the military in regard to some of its extravagant wants. It is employing a great amount of able-bodied manpower in the less essential jobs. That can be observed in Washington. Any one who visits the Pentagon Building can see for himself how many men there are in the various offices almost falling over each other. As one checks into what they are doing, I do not believe he can escape the conclusion that not only fewer men could be doing what the employees there are doing, but civilians could be doing it just as well, and many able-bodied men could be released for military service of a combat nature.

Oh, I would not care to generalize from minor instances, but my curiosity is aroused by the type of waste I see in the Military Establishment. I was interested a few mornings ago, when I came into the Senate restaurant for breakfast about 8: 30 in the morning, to see the car of a high military officer parked in front of the Capitol, with the engine running, and a chauffeur in uniform sitting at the wheel. I had breakfast, and by my watch an hour and 5 minutes later when I came out the car was still there, the engine still running, and the chauffeur still behind the wheel. That is a small item. If it was a matter of the chauffeur keeping warm, for it was a brisk morning, and if the high military officer needed a chauffeur—which he did not—the chauffeur could at least have stepped inside the Capitol, after turning off the engine of the car, in order to save the taxpayers a few cents in wasted gasoline.

I cite the incident in passing because it is one of the small things which, when multiplied by millions of similar instances, illustrates the kind of economic waste which characterizes the military. I suggest that on that morning it would have been good for the high military officer to have driven his own car. It is that kind of manpower saving when all such wastes are added up which represents a great number of men. It causes me to say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon: Let us put a check on the military. Let us limit the total number of men to 3,000,000 or 3,100,000. Then they should be asked to come before Congress and show that they need to have the number increased in order to take care of the paper, the pen pushing, and the purely administrative jobs on a very low level, which could be performed by civilians. We can then say to them, "We will do what we can to see that you get the money for that kind of American manpower."

Mr. President, let me say on this point, too, that if we gave to the military in the near future the manpower which they have asked for in this bill they could not begin to absorb it. They simply could not begin to absorb in the immediate future the number of men they are asking for. Being satisfied of that, I say to you, Mr. President, that we should delay giving them this number of men until some subsequent date when they can make a better showing of the need, at which time we can take action if it becomes necessary to raise the ceiling.

Mr. President, what I have said leads me to the second point which I wish to emphasize. I am opposed to a policy, stated in the bill, which gives the military the tremendous manpower resources they are asking for, with the come-on provision that, of course, subsequently we have the power to reduce the number if we wish to reduce it. In view of the fact that I am satisfied that the military cannot begin to absorb the manpower which they are now asking for, I say we should not go that far now. We should keep pace with the military only on the basis of its absorption power, in light of demonstrable need. In that way there can be a periodic check by the representatives of the people, who can be assured that we are not giving wide powers to the military, and reserving unto ourselves only the right subsequently to take them away, provided we ever get around to doing it.

We should place upon the military the affirmative duty to prove periodically their case before Congress. In my opinion, such a course is of vital importance if we are to keep faith with the true meaning of the system of checks and balances which are a part of our form of government. We must maintain the system of checks and balances as between the legislative and executive branches, and vice versa, and as between the judiciary and the legislative, and vice versa. The Founding Fathers intended that we should check the operations of the Government periodically and affirmatively, not by way of the negative connotations which I think are inherent in the phraseology of the pending bill.

Mr. President, in my opinion, in considering the statistics of the military authorities which are set forth in the report of the committee beginning at page 5, under title IV, the Nation's Manpower Pool, Members of the Senate would be perfectly justified in taking judicial notice of the fact that the military authorities have presented their figures in what they consider to be the light most favorable to their request. Certainly they have not been guilty of modesty or understatement. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have never found the military to be very modest in its demands. As a matter of practice and policy, it usually indulges in overstatement. I suppose that there is an explanation for that standpoint on the part of the military. I suppose it has learned by experience over the course of years that it is better to overstate, because usually the representatives of the people are very alert

and careful to cut down on its overstatements.

I am satisfied that we need to cut down the statistics set forth on pages 5 to 10 of the committee report. For example, the figure 1,632,249, which appears on page 6 of the report, is finally cut down by the military to 50 percent, or 816,000 men in class I–A. That is the figure left after the military got rid of all their assumptions. I am satisfied that 50 percent is a greater cut than the facts warrant. Thus, as we go through their other statistics, I think the Senate should take judicial notice of the fact that they have overstated their case in promotion of what they want.

To repeat, I think the statistics set forth on pages 5 to 10 of the report, which are furnished by the military establishments, need to be analyzed with a very keen eye on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. MORSE. No; there is nothing to correct. If the Senator from Texas feels anything needs to be corrected, he can correct it in his own time. I wish to finish my statement without interruption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. For the benefit of the Senator from Texas I wish to repeat that the statistics in the report on pages 5 to 10 should be examined by the Members of the Senate with a very keen eye, because I think they represent overstatements on the part of the military establishment. I believe they need to be modified considerably. The way to start to modify them is to put a ceiling on the total number of men which the military may call as of now, and that such a ceiling should be 3,000,000 men. I shall offer an amendment to that effect before I close my remarks. I believe it is an inhibition which must be placed on the military in order to force it to stop wasting manpower, and to bring about greater efficiency and saving in manpower, which it can and should bring about in the interest of the economy of the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to turn now to the question of the length of service provided in the bill, in regard to which I shall offer an amendment in due course of time. The amendment will provide for a military service of 21 months, in place of the so-called compromise figure of 26 months and 1 week, or thereabouts, in the pending bill. Although I shall go into greater detail by way of reasons in support of my amendment when the amendment itself is under discussion on the floor, suffice it to say now that in my opinion 21 months is adequate time to give the men the basic training they need and to afford them adequate opportunity to put the basic training into practice in the field. I shall take the position throughout this debate that the military itself has already demonstrated, by the operatton of the Selective Service Act of 1948, that 21 months is adequate. They have been doing it. I know of no proof, other than assertions on the part of military leaders, that the 26 months or 27 months for which they asked is necessary. I know of nothing in the record to prove—and I underline the word "prove"—that so far as the men actually in training are concerned, they have not received pretty good training under the 21-month program to which they have been subjected.

What does the 21-month program do? It permits from 4 to 6 months of basic training. The testimony is pretty consistent that except for certain job classifications, only from 4 to 6 months for basic training is required. Oh, yes, it is said that it takes 2 months or thereabouts to transport the men to the places where they are wanted and back again. That is said to be true in the Air Force. General Vandenberg testified that it was necessary to allow 2 months for that purpose. I thought that was a confession against interest, as to the efficiency of the Air Force. I was slightly at a loss to understand why the Air Force required anywhere near the same length of time which the Army had testified it needed to transport the men where it wanted to send them and back again. But that is another example, I think, of the waste of time on the part of the military.

I do not know why we should assume that 2 months ought to be allowed to transport the men back and forth, because the military officers say that is what is required. When we talk with men who have gone through the ranks and have experienced the operations of the military in getting them back and forth, what do we find to be their uniform testimony? Their uniform testimony—so far as those with whom I have talked are concerned—is that the military is bogged down in its troops-transportation procedures, with inefficiency, waste of time, and general incompetency. I do not propose to accept the assertion of the military that they need even the amount of time which in most instances they claim they need to get the men back and forth. Rather, I believe that here again the Congress has a duty to call the military up short and say, "The time has come for you to improve some of your operations in getting men back and forth, and to eliminate some of the red tape which now characterizes your entire induction program." A great deal of time can be saved in that field.

Then there is talk about the leave. That represents another 2½ days a month, adding up to a little more than 2 months of a 26-month program of service. That question also needs to be carefully analyzed. In my opinion the compromise in this bill in regard to the so-called leave feature is very unsound. I take the position that the program of leave which we have developed within the military service either is sound and desirable from the standpoint of the health and morale of the men, or it is not. If it is a desirable program from the standpoint of the health and morale and general efficiency of military operations, then I think it is unsound to try to sell this bill, so far as the time of service is concerned, on the basis of the proposition that anyone who does not want to take his leave can get out of the service in 24 months. I do not think that is a sound sales argument, and I wish to tell the Senate why. First, I believe that administratively such procedure will be very wasteful and add more red tape to an army which is already bogged down with too much red tape. I do not believe that such a provision would mean very much in actual practice so far as the individual soldier is concerned, for many reasons, of which I shall mention only one or two.

I believe that in actual practice what will happen is that in most instances the boys will take their leave. A great many psychological pressures are brought to bear upon them while they are in the services, which will cause them to take their leave. I am willing to take judicial notice that in actual practice the superior officers, unofficially and sub rosa, will encourage the taking of leave, because if there is one group of men in a company or regiment which is taking leave and another group which is not taking leave, it will be somewhat disconcerting.

Then there is the reaction of the boy himself. He will say, "I do not know what I am going to be doing a year from now. I do not know what the situation will be a year from now. They read my name off and said I could take 2 weeks' leave." He is going to take it, with the result that, in my opinion, in a very large majority of cases, the boys are going to be in the service for 26 months and 1 week. I cannot support any particular percentage, but I can express an opinion as to how large it will be. The so-called leave provision of the bill is only a "come-on" by way of a sales argument which in my judgment, in practice, will produce administrative difficulties. It would be difficult for a boy to decide, because in actual practice he would find pressures brought to bear upon him to take his leave.

I believe the provision is unsound because it raises a question as to the value of the entire leave program as it now exists in the operation of the Armed Forces. If leave is not needed by a boy, why do we not say it is, and so provide in the bill? Yet you and I know, Mr. President, that the leave program is of great value in the operation of the military establishment, from the standpoint of morale and health of the boy. I do not believe that we ought to hold out a sort of "come-on," which is a hybrid between a penalty and an inducement, that he can get out of the service at the end of 24 months if he does not take advantage of any of his leave time. I do not believe that the United States Government should enter into that kind of bargain-counter arrangement with member of the armed services, and it should be beneath the Congress.

Therefore, Mr. President, I offer a 21-month limitation, because it is an adequate time to give the men the necessary training and to give them field

service to apply the training. I am satisfied that if the military will only put into practice the efficiencies which it ought to adopt, dependent upon the nature of the job to which a boy is assigned, he will have from 8 to 15 months after basic training to make use in the field of his basic training. I think that is long enough.

Moreover, Mr. President, we should not overlook the fact that the military, throughout the hearing, advised us that, of course, the next 4 years will be the critical years. They said that if we can get through the next 4 years without an all-out war we have a very good chance of avoiding such a war. I agree with that. I think the next 4 years will be the critical years. But being critical as they are, and confronted with the danger of a possible all-out war in the next 4 years, what should we do about manpower? It is only common horse sense to take the position that we ought to train in that period of time the largest pool of manpower possible, so that if a general war comes within that period of time we will be able to draw on the largest possible pool of men who have already trained, at least in the basic training period. The 21-month program will accomplish that purpose better than the 27-month program the military asked for or the 26-month-1-week program the committee has compromised on.

As I asked in committee meeting, I ask on the floor of the Senate today, What is the Congress of the United States going to say to the thousands of American mothers and fathers if during the 4-year period all-out war should break out and thousands of boys who would have received training under the 21-month program have not received it, but find themselves on the front line within 3 months after the outbreak of such a war, as we all know will be the case? We had better be thinking about that body of American manpower that we are not going to train in the next 4 years under this 26-month-1-week program.

The emergency is so serious that the Congress ought to proceed with a manpower bill that will result in giving basic training to every possible man we can train, and in giving him some months for applying that training in the field under the 21-month program in preference to the 26 months 1 week program offered the Senate by the committee.

Oh, we are going to have presented to us a statistical problem. It will be said that the proposal of the Senator from Oregon for training more men will result in training only 125,000 more. I question that, because I am satisfied the figure will be much larger than that. But in case of an all-out war, Mr. President, I would be proud of the fact that on the floor of the Senate I voted for the training of even 125,000 more, a figure which I do not assume to be correct.

Believe it or not, Mr. President, it will be said that such a plan will cost more; and it will cost more. But I was not moved to any crocodile tears in the Armed Services Committee when the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, made the great economic argument for 27 months because it would save the taxpayers of America about three-quarters of a billion dollars. I do not take back anything I said in committee on that point. I said, in effect, that I did not think the military was in a very good position to argue in favor of saving some millions of dollars at the expense of taking into the service thousands of American boys for 6 months longer than they were needed in order to train them for the defense of the country. When I think of the billions of dollars the Military Establishment has wasted in recent years by inefficiency and unconscionable waste in the handling of matériel, I am not moved to take back anything I said in committee.

The Senate of the United States can vote to take 5 months and 1 week extra time from thousands of American boys to save a few millions of dollars if it wants to, based on the economic argument of the Pentagon Building, but it will not be done with the vote of the junior Senator from Oregon. When the question goes before the American people, as it will be before them in the years immediately ahead, because the passage of the bill in its present form will never end the argument across the country, I am satisfied what the verdict of the American people will be respecting it. They will be perfectly willing to pay the extra millions of dollars it will cost for a 21-month service program in order to give thousands upon thousands of American boys the freedom of civilian life for 6 months and 1 week which my 21-month program will provide them.

Mr. President, in connection with the length of service issue, let me say that we have heard a great deal said about the problem of the 18- and the 19-year-old boys, but entirely too little said about the problem of the 24- and 25-year-old men. I think we had better direct attention as to some of the results of the passage of the bill on the 24- and 25-year-old men who are going to be taken into service for 26 months and 1 week under the provisions of the bill. I do not believe we can justify taking from civilian production 24- and 25-year-old men for 1 month beyond a reasonable time, and a reasonable time is that which is required to give them their 4 to 6 months basic training, and in round figures, approximately a year to put their basic training into practice. On the basis of present conditions we have no right to take that 24- and 25-year-old men from civilian production longer than that.

Who are these 24-year-old and 25-year-old men, Mr. President. For the most part, they are men who are starting their own grocery stores or their own accounting offices or their own law practices, or are in the process of starting their farms, or they are participating in one or another of almost all of the various types of economic endeavor. The length of service provided for in this bill is unnecessarily disturbing to what I think are their economic rights in this situation. They are perfectly willing to serve a reasonable length of time, and they should, for they owe it to their country. However, when we take into account present conditions, I think it is unreasonable to take 24-year-old and 25-year-old men into the service for 26 months and 1 week. Of course, if conditions become worse, all the ceilings will be off, anyway. But there seems to be an assumption that the Congress must give the kind of blanket power provided in this bill because Congress will not be available to take any future action in case of changed conditions. Mr. President, every Member of this body knows that in the face of an emergency situation, the Congress can take action in relatively few hours, and will do so.

We are talking here about a program, the terminal date of which is not fixed in this bill, so far as the immediate future is concerned. The bill gives great discretionary powers to the Secretary of Defense and to the President of the United States. I shall have something more to say about those powers before I close; but suffice it for me now to say that I object to the term of service provided for in the bill because I think it is unfair to the men in the older age groups who are taking on the economic responsibilities of starting their little businesses, contemplating marriage, or undertaking the building of a home.

Furthermore, I am not at all satisfied that those in the Pentagon Building have sufficient appreciation of the importance of maintaining a balanced industrial manpower along with a military manpower. I think those in the Pentagon need to give much greater consideration to the effects of this bill on our industrial manpower, because, when all is said and done, the greatest defense America will have in backing up its military manpower is its industrial-production power. It seems to me that the long period of service the bill provides for the older age groups will prove to be very disturbing to the balance of industrial manpower.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President; I am sorry, but I decline to yield. I will not yield until I finish my comments on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to another issue, namely, the effect of this bill on the veterans. I think the bill is very unfair to the veterans who are in the Reserve and are being called up in large numbers these days. They have had their basic training. They are equipped to defend their country. So I think it is most unfair discrimination against them not to include in this bill a ceiling as to the length of time they can be called back into service under present conditions. In that connection I emphasize the words "under present conditions."

Therefore I shall offer, and shall argue at length and shall support, at a later time, an amendment providing an 18-month ceiling in connection with calling back into service the veterans who have had 6 months or more previous service in the Military Establishment.

I say it is very unfair to those veterans to call them back into the service for 26 months and 1 week, as the proponents of this bill claim will be the

effect of the bill, if it is enacted, on the Reserve. I am not too sure of that, but I am reserving judgment on it until I can study the point a little further. Be that as it may, I am certain that fairness to the veterans calls upon us to place in this bill a ceiling of 18 months' service for the veterans who are called back into the service from the Reserve, and who have had 6 months of previous military experience.

My reason for wishing to have an 18 months' limitation included is that after 18 months, once this program gets under way in connection with the 21 months program which I am suggesting, plus the enlistments which will occur, we then shall have adequate manpower to meet the needs, provided this period of tension continues somewhat as it is now. Again I say that all this argument and even the bill itself are dependent upon a continuation of pretty much the conditions of the present time. If they become worse, we shall have to act, as we should, in light of conditions as they develop, although at this point I wish to say that I think the Military Establishment drove through the bill a hole large enough for a team of horses to pass through, when its representatives testified before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, at their meeting the other day, that it was going to limit itself, for the time being, to four more divisions in Europe. I think the significance of that testimony must be related to this bill. When the representatives of the Pentagon made that statement, they greatly reduced within the immediate lifetime of the bill the need for preparing to send very many men to Europe. So we do not have to worry so much about how much time it will take to get men back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean, because very many of our men will not be sent over there. That is apparent from the very plan which those in the Pentagon announced the other day.

By the way, I think it was a great mistake for them to make that announcement and it is rather hard on the boys who already are over there. It would have been much better for us to talk in terms of X divisions, but to have made very clear to the American people that we intend to see to it that our allies in Europe produce their proportionate share. In my opinion, it was a great mistake to disclose any such plan as that to Russia. I happen to be one who takes the position that if we are going to have the 150,000 men that we presently have over there, and another 100,000 which those in the Pentagon plan to send there, we should never be committed to the proposition that that is all we will send. Rather, I wish to see my country take such a position that Russia will understand that we will send whatever number it may become necessary to send in order to protect our boys whom we already have over there, if we are going to keep them there.

The argument of those in the Pentagon, when they proposed the figure of 100,000 additional men, for European service weakened their position in regard to this bill, and in my judgment strengthened the position of those of us who both want 21 months of service to be provided for and also want a limitation on the total number to about 3,000,000 or 3,100,000. As a lawyer, I never saw better confession and avoidance than that in which the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, participated when they made their announcement regarding 100,000 additional men for Europe.

So, Mr. President, in fairness to the veterans who are being called back into service, they should be told that on the basis of present conditions we are calling them back for 18 months; and I shall offer an amendment accordingly.

Now I turn to another issue, namely, the so-called issue of the 18-year-olds. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I support the universal military training program which will call 18-year-olds into the service. I have supported it for years. In fact, I was one of the four members of the Armed Services Committee who last summer objected strenuously to postponing action on the universal military training program. I felt then, and still do, that that was the time to take action on a UMT program. I did not like what I felt was the attitude of the Pentagon in not giving the enthusiastic support to a UMT program which it should have given. It never has done so, and I do not think it is now giving it. This bill is not a universal military training program. It simply has the UMT label, but it is in futuro, not in praesenti. There is lacking in it any definite blueprint for a UMT program. Most of the implementation of it is to be worked out in the future.

The bill creates a board along the lines of the Compton report. There is granted wide discretionary power for some time in the future for the President, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, to do something about reducing the term of service, so that such a program may be started. My personal feeling is that that part of the bill is another come-on, another sales argument. It is conditional, and the conditions involved are many.

The fact that the Military Establishment today cannot lay before the Congress a detailed blueprint of universal military training justifies serious criticism of the Defense Establishment. I shall continue to fight for a universal-military-training program, and when we get ready to implement one really in blueprint form, I shall favor 18-year-olds in that program. As I have said in committee, I think that is the best age to take a young man for universal military training. But this is not a universal-military-training bill. It is a selective-service bill which is taking inductees for purposes of combat, if combat service is necessary; and on that point I have manifold reservations of judgment.

True, we are told by the military that if the provision regarding 18-year-olds is written into the bill, making the eighteenth birthday the beginning of registration, there will be little danger that any boy will actually be inducted before he is eighteen and a half. If that be true, let us simply write it into the bill. It would be very simple to do so. But no, that is not what is wanted. The military do not want anything in the bill which says a young man cannot be taken until he is eighteen and a half. I am going to give Members of the Senate an opportunity to tell the Military Establishment that that is the way it is going to be, and they can make their own records on that issue. I am going to offer an amendment which provides that 18 years and 6 months shall be the age for inducton, but that an 18-year-old shall have the privilege, if he wants to present himself for induction at eighteen, of doing so. I think before he gets into the service there is the time to permit a great deal of discretion on the part of the inductee. At that time he is still perfectly free to exercise an untrammeled discretion. So my amendment will provide that if, at eighteen, he wants to offer himself for induction, he shall be eligible for induction upon his own request, but he shall not be taken until he is eigtheeh and a half, so far as any compulsion on the part of the Government is concerned.

I intend to argue that question at much greater length when my amendment is before the Senate for debate, but I wanted to give that thumbnail sketch of my position. I desire a little time to examine certain testimony which I have not as yet had an opportunity to read. But at the Republican conference this morning it was suggested by someone that he understood that the Military Establishment, through General Bradley, had presented testimony on the House side in a manner which would seem to indicate at least that the Pentagon appreciated the fact that an 18½ provision would at least be workable. I am sure it would be, and, on the basis of present conditions, I think that is early enough to take the young men, particularly if we improve upon the statistics of the Military Establishment by cutting down the 3,426,000 to about 3,000,000. That, in my judgment, would do much to eliminate the problem connected with the 18-year-old issue.

I now move to the next issue. I shall in due course submit an amendment which will limit enlistments to 30 months, making the limitation retroactive to June 27, 1950. I will state my reason for my position. In my opinion, the Air Force and the Navy are guilty of so stockpiling manpower as to demonstrate clearly how wasteful they can be in the matter of manpower. I also believe it unfair to the boys to hold out to them, as has been done, 4 year's enlistment in the Navy and the Air Force as a safeguard against the possibility of being drafted into the Army. I do not think that is a praiseworthy thing for my Government to do. I do not like the ethics of the practice. It is a kind of cajoling, blackmailing weapon which the military has been using on the boys. Let us face the fact that many of the boys have been reacting to it because of a feeling of uncertainty and confusion, and a sense of insecurity. They have been told, of course, that if they will but take advantage of a 4-year enlistment in the Navy or in the Air Force, they will

then run no danger of being drafted into the Army to become foot soldiers.

Mr. President, I thought we had a unification law, but the more I study its operations the clearer it becomes that thus far in practice it has fallen far short of its spirit and intent. Somehow I cannot reconcile the enlistment program of the Military Establishment with the spirit and intent of the unification law. Therefore, I dare to say it is wrong to permit either the Air Force or the Navy to take all of its personnel by enlistment. I think each ought to be required to take a fair proportion of its personnel by induction. I do not know how the pending Selective Service Act is to be made truly democratic in operation, unless it is applied democratically to the three services. So I intend to offer an amendment which will limit enlistment to 30 months, and then, if the advocates of this program can sell it and their training to the boys, after 30 months the boys will be perfectly free to reenlist. They ought to have that chance, we should use what amounts in fact to psychological coercion upon thousands of American boys who have been flocking to enlist in the Navy and the Air Force in order to avoid the possibility of being inducted into the Army. We owe to all the branches of our service a balanced manpower from the standpoint of ability, and I see no reason why the Air Force and the Navy should get the cream of the crop. It is not a very democratic procedure.

Then, too, I shall offer an amendment which will place an enlistment ceiling upon the Air Force and the Navy so that they will have to take at least a certain percentage of the inductees. Under the Selective Service Act the pool of potential inductees ought to be given very careful consideration, and I belive it is wrong as a matter of public policy to say to the potential draftee, "Of course, if you wait for the operation of the Selective Service Act you have no chance of getting into the Navy or the Air Force." What is democratic about that? If we are to have a democratically operated Selective Service Act, a boy who exercises his right will get a fair opportunity for assignment to the Air Force or the Navy if he has the aptitudes which indicate that that is where he should be assigned under the Selective Service Administration. They have to wait for the draft and most of them do have good reason for waiting for the draft.

Again, Mr. President, I am not at all impressed with the hue and cry of the military that my amendment will be very disruptive of the whole manpower program. It is the duty of the Congress to decide what is fair by way of a manpower policy, and then to give the military orders about carrying it out, and stop getting ourselves into a position where we are taking orders from the miltary. It would be very good discipline for the military to be really subjected to some Congressional checks for a change, and I am offering a few in the amendments I am proposing.

Mr. President, before I leave the argument with regard to the veterans and the inductees and enlistments, I wish to say something about the problem of the Reserve. It is my opinion that since World War II the Pentagon has not demonstrated that it really has a cooperative attitude toward the Reserves, and the action it has taken toward the Reserves since World War II is all the evidence I need to offer. For the most part its action has been nil. It has had a great opportunity since World War II to build up a strong Reserve system, but it has fizzled and fumbled its obligations in respect to the Reserve.

I leave it to my colleagues to put the matter to the test by going to any Reserve unit anywhere in their States and listening to what they will tell. They will say that for the most part the Reserve program has been ineffective and disappointing because the Pentagon has not given it the support it should have given it. I believe we should start talking turkey to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff about the Reserve program, and I believe we should begin giving some orders about it. But the pending bill does not do that. There is no Reserve program in the bill. No blueprint for a Reserve program was put before the Committee on Armed Services at any time during the discussion of the bill. A promise was put before the committee. At long last we got a promise from the military. I think the record will show that at one time the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, said that within 6 months they intended to lay a Reserve program before us. I got a list of proposals for a Reserve program which I submitted to General Collins for answer, and I received a most unsatisfactory reply from him, so far as any real commitment concerning the Reserve program was concerned. So far as I know, and I believe so far as any member of the committee knows, the Pentagon at this hour has no blueprint for a Reserve program.

Before it ever brought a manpower bill to the Armed Services Committee the Pentagon should have brought forward a bill accompanied with a reserve program. The reserve program cannot be separated from the issue I am discussing. The reserve program cannot be separated from the issue of length of service, because if there were a proper reserve program submitted to the Senate I am satisfied the Pentagon knows it would be cogent evidence and argument in support of my 21 months' proposal.

My suspicion, indeed, is far beyond suspicion. My belief is that the Pentagon did not want to present a reserve program at the time it submitted its manpower bill because it knew an effective reserve program would automatically limit the length of service to a shorter time than it was calling for when it presented a 27 months' program. I say to the people of America today that I believe it to be the duty of the Senate to call upon the Pentagon to come forward with a reasonable reserve program before we pass on the pending bill, because I believe such a program is inseparably bound up with the reserve features of the bill.

I wish to say something else about the reserve program. I believe the adoption of a reserve program is the way to keep the military department close to the people. We had better pause in this debate and recognize the importance of keeping the Military Establishment close to the people. We had better recognize the importance now of placing some very definite limits and checks upon the power of the Pentagon, and of letting the Pentagon take the boys of this country only for the reasonable period of time necessary to give them training and some practice in applying the training, then get them back home in the reserves, and have an adequate reserve program worked out so that they can continue their training in their local communities and States. That is why the junior Senator from Oregon has always been such a strong supporter of the reserves and the National Guard.

He is fully aware of the fact—and he is already getting letters to that effect—that the position he is taking on the pending bill will be misunderstood by some of the reserves, by some in the National Guard, and by some of the national veterans' organizations. However, the confidence which I have in such organizations leads me to believe that when they come to study the RECORD, and when they come to see the effects of the application of the bill proposed by the Military Establishment, they will see the sincerity of the motivation of the junior Senator from Oregon, and of his deep concern in keeping the Military Establishment close to the people through a maximum use of and support of an adequate reserve and National Guard program.

Mr. President, much is being made of the fact that various veterans' organizations are representing to Members of the Senate that they want to have the bill passed in the form in which it reached the floor of the Senate. They will have to speak for themselves, but I shall have to interpret what it is I think they seek so far as the weight which I will give to their representations is concerned. What they are saying to us—and I believe they are right about it—is that we need an improved military manpower bill. I agree with that statement, and I shall vote for such a bill. I have already said that I shall vote for the bill which the Senate will finally pass. I am hopeful that the final bill will contain some of the amendments which I shall offer, because I think they would add definite improvements. However, Mr. President, I am satisfied that the veterans' organizations, the members of the Reserve, and the members of the National Guard will find it very difficult to take exception to what I am trying to do to strengthen their organizations, by bringing into being at the earliest possible date what those organizations know is so sorely needed so far as the manpower defense of the country is concerned, namely, an effective universal military training program.

I say frankly to my friends in the veterans' organizations, in the Reserves, and in the National Guard that I think the course of action which I am advocating would provide an effective type of manpower defense at an earlier date than would be brought about by the pending bill without change.

Mr. President, I now turn to another amendment. It deals with the question of exempting some 75,000 students from the draft until they have completed their special educational courses in the colleges of America. My brief comment on that point today is that I think our only hope of retaining superiority over Communist Russia in the decades ahead is in the field of technology and science, and in the scientific skills of our manpower as opposed to her masses. Therefore, we must be very careful not to make the mistake of cutting ourselves off from an adequate pool of trained scientists and technicians. We should work out a program for the years immediately ahead which would bring about a more coordinated program of military training and educational training of students than the bill provides.

I believe the figure 75,000 is too low. It will be said in the course of argument that the President is given the power in the bill to increase or decrease the number. That is another issue, and concerning it I shall only say at this time that I wish the President were not given quite so much power in relation to so many things by the pending bill. I am satisfied that 75,000 is not a large enough pool. Therefore I shall submit an amendment which would double the figure, to 150,000. Even then I do not believe we would be training too many men in the fields of technology and science.

I hasten to add that I do not like at all the idea of deferring young men. I think it is a mistake to build up class consciousness. In effect, the bill says that we will defer students after they get their basic training. After they have completed their education they will have to complete their military service. It is not clear what the military service would be. I believe the situation calls for an objectivity of attitude. I think the American people will go along once we make the facts known to them. If it is a biochemist whom we are training, because of the contributions he can make to the war effort, or if it is a nuclear physicist we are training, or a doctor, a dentist, or engineer, or some other highly trained technician, I think we should recognize the fact that such training could be considered such a person's war or defense service if he is then going to serve his country for some period of time in the capacity in which he can bring to bear upon the war effort his special skills. It can be said that such a procedure could be worked out under the bill. One of the troubles with the bill is that so much is left to be worked out, and so much is left to future planning, that we do not know what the effect would be in many particulars.

In my opinion, we ought to treat such students in the same way we treat ROTC boys. We ought to put them in the laboratories. They ought to know when they are in the laboratories that they are performing their military service. They should be put under some form of military discipline. When they get through with their scientific training they should be put into the branch of service, for some reasonable period of time, in which they could work out, so to speak, the obligation they owe to the Government, because the Government would have given them the training.

In my opinion, we are dealing with a segment of the bill which has not been worked out at all. It has been left in a very confused and ambiguous state. A board is to be created. The board would select the boys; but when the suggestion is made that there should be some geographical distribution in selecting the boys, the answer is, "Oh, no, we don't want any of that." I am sorry that I must express a fear with respect to this subject. We have had experience with the problem in the past. Let us make a record of it.

I am very fearful, Mr. President, that for the most part a small group of colleges would get the boys, and I am fearful that the selection of the boys would not be made on a geographical basis. I am sorry to be suspicious about it, but the reason I am suspicious is that we have had experience with the problem. We had experience with it a few years ago in connection with the National Science Foundation. There was considerable opposition to a geographical distribution in connection with that institution. The provision in the bill needs to be improved so as to provide some guarantee that certain colleges will not find themselves in a very favorable position and other institutions in an unfavorable position from the standpoint of discrimination.

In view of the way the bill is presently worded, I am not very hopeful that I can do much more with it at the present time than to offer an amendment which doubles the number of the boys to be trained in scientific pursuits. Then perhaps we shall run a little better chance of getting a wider geographical distribution. I express the hope that the military and the board to be established to administer this particular section of the bill will work out some such military service as I have been arguing for in committee.

I cite for the RECORD a conversation which I had not long ago in my office with one of the great chemists of America. He urged the very point which I am presenting. He said: "You are going to find that many of our most able students, who ought to go into scientific training, are not going to undertake it if they have to bear the label of deferees for the period of their training." That label has certain psychological connotations which many sensitive boys do not wish to bear. They are going to object to being deferred. Therefore, they will offer themselves for induction, and we will lose the training of boys who ought to be put in the laboratory rather than in an Army camp.

Mr. President, I am now going to close for today—although I shall speak at greater length at a later time—by saying that I think the bill needs to be strengthened in respect to its so-called discretionary powers. When the bill reached the full committee, interestingly enough it contained a provision—and there is no doubt that this is what the Pentagon wanted—that the length of service could be decreased in the future upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense to the President.

I hear a great deal about limiting the arbitrary discretionary power of the President of the United States. I am always surprised at the differences between the speeches on that subject and the votes in the Senate on it, because so frequently we get bills which give very wide discretionary power to the President, and when some of us protest we are surprised to see that, nevertheless, we are not able to muster a majority vote to limit such powers.

I wish to say, in complete fairness to the committee, that when I raised the protest in the committee against the language of the bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] immediately agreed with the position which I took. Other members of the committee agreed, and we improved it a bit. We at least struck out the requirement that the Secretary of Defense must first make the recommendation. I thought that was quite an improvement, because, let me say here and now, I am going to keep my eyes on the power of the Secretary of Defense. I do not care who occupies the position. I could not have any higher regard for any other Secretary of Defense than I have for the present one; but he is only a man. I believe that under our system of checks and balances the powers of men must always be checked. I do not believe that any Secretary of Defense should be given the power which the first draft of the bill proposed to give to the Secretary of Defense on this point.

So we eliminated that provision. Then a provision was adopted, by way of my amendment, under which Congress itself could limit this power by concurrent resolution. I always try to be exceedingly fair, Mr. President, in the presentation of a point of view. I wish to say to my colleagues that I am now engaged in a very intensive study of some of the constitutional features and implications of my amendment concerning giving to the Congress the power, by way of concurrent resolution, to shorten the limit of service in the bill. Thus far I have checked enough to know that the precedents are very hard to find. I am not sure that one "on the nose," as we lawyers say, exists. I am hopeful that that section of the bill will meet the test of constitutionality; but if at the conclusion of my study of this question I find that it will not, I shall be very frank to say so on the floor of the Senate, and then recommend another amendment to the bill which would take away any power of the President to reduce the length of the service at his discretion. I am not so sure that that is not the better way to do it anyway. Before the debate is over I may substitute such an amendment for the amendment which the committee adopted. I say that because I think that is too much discretion to give any President. Again I make no personal reference to persons holding present positions. I simply do not want any President, Democrat or Republican, to exercise wide discretion. As I stated in committee, for one thing it is too powerful

a political weapon to give any President.

I am not so naive as to ignore the possibility of discretion being exercised for political advantage. Our history is replete with such instances. I can very well imagine a certain political climate existing a few months before a national election which might make the exercise of discretion by a President of the United States in respect to this matter a very powerful political weapon.

So if I reach the conclusion that the provision of the bill which has to do with a concurrent resolution by the Congress has some constitutional objections, I shall substitute for that amendment one which will simply take all discretion away from the President, and leave it where it probably ought to be anyway—an affirmative duty of the Congress to take action, subject, of course, to the signature of the President or the exercise of the veto power, and the congressional check upon such veto.

Mr. President, those are the major amendments which I shall offer. I do not wish to give the impression that they are the only amendments I shall offer, but they are the major ones, and they represent the major issues which I thought ought to be brought before the American people, even at this late hour.

As I stated at the beginning, I regret that I was not able to get them before the Senate at an earlier time so that the American people could have weighed them along with the very able speeches of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in regard to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have followed with a great deal of interest the observations of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. When I asked him to yield for a correction earlier in his discussion, I merely wanted to point out to him something which I was sure he had overlooked. He constantly refers to the figures in the hearings, as found in the committee report, as "the Pentagon figures." No doubt the Senator will remember that before we started hearing on the bill, and certainly in the early stages of the hearings, we insisted not only that the charts presented be not merely the charts of the military services and the Department of Defense, but that they be validated by each agency concerned with manpower.

It is my understanding—and it was so testified—that Selective Service furnished the basic figures. The Bureau of Education in the Federal Security Agency, the Secretary of Labor, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and various other Government departments, each had an opportunity to, and each did, go over the figures of the Selective Service and validate the figures.

I think the RECORD should show that whether the estimates are correct or incorrect, whether mistakes have been made, the estimates appearing in the committee hearings represent the best estimates the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Selective Service System, the various services together have been able to agree upon, and each and everyone of those services has validated the figures.

I thought the Senator, in justice to the other departments, would not want to leave the impression that the figures were merely grabbed out of the air by some general somewhere. As a matter of fact a great deal of time and effort has been spent in getting the departments to agree on one set of figures, and they did agree.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I reply to that statement before the Senator from Texas turns to another matter? I am very glad to have the comments of the Senator from Texas about the statistics, but having raised the point, I thilnk it ought to be amplified by the junior Senator from Oregon. It certainly was not my intention to give the impression that the figures were grabbed out of the air. But it is my assertion that the figures need to be corrected.

It is true that the Selective Service provided some figures, and probably the basic ones; that the Department of Agriculture provided some, that the Department of Labor provided some, but in checking with statistical analysts I find that what we have got in some of the figures are some unlikes added together in a statistical computation which make the final result very questionable.

The record is clear, that after the Pentagon obtained some figures from Selective Service, and some figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and some figures from the Bureau of the Census, and some figures from the Department of Agriculture, it prepared the charts, and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, came before the committee and testified at length in support of them. Before the debate is over, Mr. President, I intend to show, on the basis of an analysis which is now being prepared for me, that what has been done in some of these charts is to add some uncomparables together to produce some fallacious results.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to read a couple of sentences from the record of the hearings. I read from page 38 of the hearings. The Assistant Secretary testifying said in part:

> I would like to say that every figure which we present to you has been validated by all the other Government agencies, so that there is no question that we are starting out on any different basis of figures. That is true of the Department of Labor, of Selective Service, of any other agency of the Government which has anything to do with these figures.

I wanted that to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. That is in the RECORD, Mr. President, but that is no proof as to the reliability of figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not contend that with their experience in two wars, the selective-service officials, the services themselves, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Agriculture, have better statisticians and are more accurate than the statisticians of the Senator from Oregon, but I do contend that the figures presented do not represent merely the estimates of the military, but represent the estimates of each and every agency concerned with manpower, and they are all in unanimous agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, they represent the estimates of each agency of the Government referred to by the Senator from Texas with respect to the figures of that agency of Government. Then they were taken together, put together, irrespective of whether they were comparable or not, and came out in the form of charts which the Assistant Secretary of Defense offered to the committee. I assure the Senator from Texas that, as a lawyer, I think it is very important that one examine very carefully the testimony of special pleaders. In this instance, the representatives of the military, in my opinion, found themselves frequently taking the position of special pleaders.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed, the series of amendments which I referred to in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

## RUSSIAN LEADERS COWARDS—ARTICLE BY GEORGE D. GREBENCHIKOV

Mr. HENDRICKSON obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New Jersey.

The Lakeland Ledger of Lakeland, Fla., is a highly reputable daily newspaper published in a college town. Florida Southern College, a Methodist institution, is a leading educational activity in that section of Florida. My attention has been called to an exceedingly interesting news article appearing in that newspaper on Sunday, February 25, written by Mr. George D. Grebenchikov. It happened that I served as trustee of this college some years ago, and at that time, as now Professor Grebenchikov was a member of the faculty of the college.

Professor Grebenchikov is a native of Russia. He was born in Siberia, the son of a miner, attained eminence as a scholar and later as a writer. He served as a captain in the Russian Army during the First World War. He has written about 40 books, perhaps the best known one being The Turbulent Giant, which he wrote about 1940. I happen to be so fortunate as to have one of the copies. The book was printed privately, I regret to say, so it was not made known to as many people as should have seen it. In that book Professor Grebenchikov served as a prophet to denounce the Kremlin as it operated then and as it operates now. He foretold the kind of machina-

tions in which it indulged, as we have seen them, and called for the liberation of the enslaved people of Russia.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to place in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the newspaper article written by Professor Grebenchikov. While I ask that it be placed in the RECORD in full, I want particularly to refer to two portions of it very briefly. The first is a paragraph in which he bears out the statement frequently made on the floor by various Members of the Senate, and I think particularly of the two Senators from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON and Mr. BENTON], that America must distinguish between the very false leadership of the Russian leaders and the people of Russia. I read this paragraph from the statement:

Russia must be separated, as a nation, from her tyrannic rulers. To expose and to condemn the communistic leprosy, both inside and outside of Russia, is the urgent challenge reserved for America. The leaders of Russia are cowards, fearful of their own silenced and unhappy subjects. And as soon as all the Russian people know that they are not forgotten and that the free world is actively preparing their relief, the walls of the Kremlin will fall and will cease to provide protection for that nest of international criminals.

Mr. President, another paragraph which I think also points the way to a method by which we can better reach the great masses of the Russian people is as follows:

We have in this country a number of distinguished writers, scientists, and artists, who were fortunate in finding asylum in this blessed country after having already acquired a wide reputation in their native land. Their voices should rise in support of the Voice of America. The voices of Russian-born Americans supplementing the voices of American political, religious, and educational leaders will reach straight into the heart of the Russian man-on-the-street and will help achieve the aim of the civilized world: the liberation of hundreds of millions of slaves from the Communist yoke.

Mr. President, I hope that Members of the Senate will carefully read the statement, coming as it does from such a well informed and distinguished source. I believe it has in it much meat for thought and planning.

I am grateful indeed to the Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger of February 25, 1951]

RUSSIAN LEADERS COWARDS, SAYS RUSSIAN AUTHOR HERE

(By George D. Grebenchikov)

(Editor's note: The author of the following is a member of the faculty at Florida Southern College here and the author of more than 40 volumes of fiction, poetry, and drama. He was a captain in the Russian Army during World War I and has been a resident of the United States since he came here as an exile more than 25 years ago.)

Forty-two years ago, when, as a young writer, I had the unforgettable honor of being received by Leo Tolstoy, the immortal author of War and Peace, I was indelibly impressed by his visionary faith in the ultimate spiritual redemption of the Russian masses.

The most intimate recesses of the Russian peasant's soul held no secret for this exponent of the Christian philosophy who so admired the simple peasant that he created an ideal of his natural decency and humanity. As an heir of Tolstoy's prophetic vision and the son of a Siberian miner, I also cling firmly to the belief that the Russian peasant, the very backbone of this huge Slavic nation, has remained what he has always been, a deeply religious, candid, and unassumingly simple individual; an ardent lover of peace, and a devoted brother of his fellowman.

His present plight can best be understood by those who were born and reared in his midst, who shared his vision of social reform and his desire for self-expression in the turbulent years before the Bolshevik revolution. His resistance to that usurpation of power, disorganized though it was, and the crushing defeat of his aspirations in 4 years of civil strife, filled the concentration camps of Russia with men and women who were willing to die for their democratic dream.

LOOKING TO WEST

Despite the impenetrable curtain now drawn over the lives and aspirations of some 200,000,000 enslaved people, we, who still have our roots in the Russian soil, are becoming more and more aware every day that their imploring eyes are hopefully turned toward the West, whence their liberation must come.

Russia must be separated, as a nation, from her tyrannic rulers. To expose and to condemn the communistic leprosy, both inside and outside of Russia, is the urgent challenge reserved for America. The leaders of Russia are cowards, fearful of their own silenced and unhappy subjects. And as soon as all the Russian people know that they are not forgotten and that the free world is actively preparing their relief, the walls of the Kremlin will fall and will cease to provide protection for that nest of international criminals.

It is the duty of all freedom-loving people throughout the world to help bring the day of liberation nearer. It particularly behooves this great and powerful democracy of the New World to become the means by which the desire for freedom of 200,000,000 souls will become a dynamic force in releasing a great sister nation from abject enslavement.

INADEQUATE

For this purpose, the present means employed by the State Department's propaganda agencies are inadequate and wasteful because they attest to a very primitive conception of the psychology of the Russian masses. The Kremlin strategists have learned that the natives of a country are the best agents for the propagation of their nefarious ideas. This weapon, in American hands, can become the instrument of their defeat.

We have in this country a number of distinguished writers, scientists, and artists who were fortunate in finding asylum in this blessed country after having already acquired a wide reputation in their native land. Their voices should rise in support of the Voice of America. The voices of Russian-born Americans supplementing the voices of American political, religious, and educational leaders will reach straight into the heart of the Russian man on the street and will help achieve the aim of the civilized world: The liberation of hundreds of millions of slaves from the Communist yoke.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I rise to address myself to the so-called Wherry resolution, as it may or may not relate to Senate bill 1. I frankly confess, sir, that I do so with mixed emotions.

On the one hand, I want most of all to do what I think is best for my country and its people.

On the other hand, I am definitely convinced from the outcome of two awful and tragic wars, in both of which it was my high privilege to serve as a soldier, that every contribution we make toward the destructive forces of arms, armaments, and warfare generally runs completely counter to the very best interests of our civilization.

But as always down through the history of the world, Mr. President, we find ourselves confronted with the age-old challenge—our flesh against our spirit.

So let us face the issue honestly; let us be perfectly frank with ourselves as we meet all the issues that confront us.

Quite obviously we are not yet sufficiently grown up to let our moral and spiritual forces take over for us.

Quite obviously we still like to pose in the role of Sir Galahad—deluding ourselves that the armor which we provide and wear will protect the basic principles which lay at the bottom of every decent effort which man has made down through history to bring some semblance of freedom to his fellowman.

Well, Mr. President, it is nice to live in an ivory tower—to love our fellowman as long as he follows our convictions.

But on the question of sending troops to Europe, I feel very deeply that we, the Members of our Senate of the United States, should refuse to be swept away by the strong tides created by able and ambitious men toward any false concepts of the course or courses we are here to chart for the future of our country and the world.

Frankly, Mr. President, the parade of witnesses and words on this issue has been at times heavily shaded with definite political overtones.

Now, sir, with that comment and criticism, I shall proceed to my own deep convictions on this most important question, the Wherry resolution. My remarks will be brief.

Mr. President, the Wherry resolution treats with a principle for which America's greatest sons have lived courageously and died fearlessly throughout our history as a people. It declares a policy which must once more be inculcated into our thought processes, as the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has so ably expressed it, himself, this afternoon, for unmistakably it is a policy which came to us as a mandate from our founding fathers.

God forgive us, Mr. President, for our aimless wandering in recent years, during which, influenced by gilded promises, we have drifted far astray from that course which was so brilliantly and intelligently and unselfishly charted for us by the founding fathers and those who followed them.

What a drift, Mr. President, and how Russia loves that drift. I am sure that she wants most of all that we shall never find our course again.

Mr. President, too much praise cannot be said for the most worthy objectives and merits of the minority leader's resolution.

Had it only come sooner—and I make this observation only as a tribute to its sponsor—I would have supported it with every ounce of my being.

The fact is, however, that by a solemn compact approved overwhelmingly by this body, we have morally obligated our people to provide troops for Europe.

There is nothing so important in a crisis, whether it be of a civil or of a military nature, as public confidence. We can ill afford in this critical hour to dissipate either the confidence of our Allies in us or the confidence of our own people in their firm and binding commitments for the good of themselves and their fellow man.

Mr. President, we signed a contract in good faith. The issue is just that simple. I, as a party thereto, as one of those who voted for approval of that contract, will live up to it both by my vote here and by such sacrifice as may be called for by that vote. But, sir, as I do so, as one Member of this body, I shall insist with all the spirit within me, from this point forward, upon complete cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of government in all matters which spell life or death to American youth; and also I shall demand complete compliance in letter and spirit with those words of the Constitution which have to do with war.

For too long, now, have we permitted the executive branch of the Government to sound the "tuning fork."

Mr. President, the Congress, which changes every 2 years, should be the voice of the people.

The fact that the rules of land warfare, as laid down at The Hague and the Geneva Conventions, were completely ignored, bypassed, and circumvented by Adolph Hitler and Benito Mussolini, by flagrant and wanton disregard of well-ordered law, certainly does not constitute a mandate to the President of the United States that he can, with success, completely ignore the basic law which accorded him his high office.

But, sir, what is done, is done; and for my part I would sooner see the immediate end of life itself than ever to face a true friend or a trusting and worthy ally in an atmosphere of desertion.

In my opinion, we have morally obligated our Nation to provide a reasonable supply of ground troops to Europe within the scope of the best judgment of our military leaders; and the sooner we give them our undivided moral support, the better.

In this life which God has given us, we can never save ourselves by sacrificing those who believe in us. If we do so, we may save our flesh for another and more humiliating defeat and death; but the spirit which makes us men would die forever in such an exhibition of betrayal.

Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in his plea that we make the Congress the body, as it should be, for the preservation of our system of checks and balances. This afternoon I listened to what I consider to be one of the finest speeches ever made on the floor of the Senate on an important issue before the Congress of the United States. I commend the Senator from Oregon for his accurate, clear thinking and his able presentation of the issues. I should like to associate myself with his remarks generally, because I think generally he was thinking straight down the sound course for us to follow in connection with Senate bill 1.

Mr. President, it was not my purpose this afternoon to have anything to say on the pending bill; but after hearing the address of the Senator from Oregon, I simply could not resist the impulse to take this opportunity to pay just and fitting tribute to one of the able Members of the Senate for the enlightenment he has thrown on a very difficult and complex subject.

Let me say, further, as to the amendments the Senator from Oregon discussed and proposed as major amendments, that I would not at the moment commit myself fully and finally; but so well do I think he has conceived these amendments in his own mind, and so much merit do they possess, that I hope that when the roll is called I can cast my vote for each one of them, with the feeling that thereby I have contributed a great deal toward the passage of a sound manpower bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, earlier in the day, in colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I commented on certain testimony given by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in another body on yesterday. At this time I should like to read, first, a letter from the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall. It is dated February 27, and reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, February 27, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Chairman, Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In response to your verbal inquiry, I want to stress the conviction of the Department of Defense that the interests of genuine security require that the minimum age for induction into the armed services be fixed at 18 instead of 18½. We feel that 18 is the best age from the standpoint of the Nation's needs and from the standpoint of the young men themselves.

An 18½ age limit will not give us an adequate safety margin if it becomes necessary to step up our manpower goal beyond our present estimate of 3,500,000. Even after allowance is made for reducing our physical and mental standards to the greatest practicable extent and for taking all availables from the 19 to 26 pool, we would still not have enough men to provide reasonable assurance of filling a force of 4,000,000 or larger if necessity requires it. In fact, we would be 245,000 below the minimum reserve pool General Hershey feels his local boards must have to guarantee fulfillment of our needs if the Military Establishment has to go to 4,000,000. Inductions at 18 would overcome this problem. Our safety margin then would be 76,000 above General Hershey's requirement.

When General Bradley testified before the House Armed Services Committee that there was no essential military difference between a man at 18 or 18½, he was limiting himself entirely to the question of the relative military usability of men in these age groups. There is, of course, no difference in the readiness or capacity of men to render effective military service at 18, 18½, or 19. Men are equally strong, equally responsible, and equally effective at any of these three ages. It was this aspect, and only this, that General Bradley was concerned with. He did not mean to suggest that it would not be preferable, in terms of the military requirements that we might have to meet if the international situation worsened, to have available the substantially larger pool of manpower that would come with an 18-year age limit. He made this very clear in his testimony on page 737 of the House committee record.

We are hopeful that it will not be necessary to make any upward revision in our present 3,500,000 figure, but there is no certainty the figure will not have to go higher in a situation as tense as the one that now confronts us. I know it is your purpose to write a bill that will meet any foreseeable contingency and will not have to be reopened every few months because of its initial inadequacies.

The important thing in the present fluid world situation is that we have men in sufficient numbers when the country needs them. An 18-year-induction age is necessary to assure this.

There is one other factor involved in this matter of drafting men between 18 and 19. That is the matter of justice to our reservists. Many men who have undergone arduous service in wartime and who are now well past the age limit we have set for men coming in through selective service were recalled to active duty in the present emergency. Fairness requires that they be released at the earliest practicable date. Unless we have a sufficient expansion in our pool of available manpower, we will have to keep putting off this date. A minimum induction age of 18 will contribute materially to that end.

I also want you to know that the Department has not modified in any way its belief that it is essential for the total needs of the Nation to have up to 75,000 students a year deferred in the first 3 years of the universal military training and service program. If you read the testimony given by General Bradley on page 744 of the House Committee record, you will find that he thought he was responding to an inquiry about the approximately 75,000 students deferred under the ROTC program, and not about the new program for deferment of 75,000 students in the national interest. In this connection, he specifically pointed out that we had always found it necessary, even in wartime, to provide a continuing flow of scientists, technicians and doctors. General Bradley was interrupted before he had an opportunity to go more specifically into the deferment program for the 75,000 students. He would have felt, in any case, that this was not primarily a military matter for comment by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but rather for the civilian representatives of the Department, namely Secretary Rosenberg and myself, who were scheduled to testify later. He repeatedly noted that he was talking strictly from the military viewpoint and that other phases of the measure would be discussed in detail by Mrs. Rosenberg.

The provision for deferring students proceeds from a recognition that our total strength consists not alone in how many men we have under arms, but also in what we do to guarantee our technical and industrial preeminence.

It offers a definite assurance that our educational system will remain strong and that there will be no break in the flow of scientists, engineers, and other technicians who are essential to our preeminence as a Nation. The number was fixed after consultation with leaders in education, science, and industry. It will prevail for only 3 years and it is designed to bridge the gap that would otherwise be created by the wholesale withdrawal of young men from colleges in the early years of universal military training and service. The men involved will not escape the obligation to serve. The fulfillment of the obligation will simply be delayed until they finish their education.

No provision of the program has had broader or more enthusiastic support. To the extent that there has been criticism, it has been primarily from those who feel the number of students should be larger than 75,000. The support has not been confined to educators, but has come from all quarters. It is universally recognized that lasting security depends on how successful we are, not alone in building up our Armed Forces, but in carrying forward the productive and technical leadership that represents such an important factor in our total strength.

The method provided for selecting the students and the types of courses that are most beneficial to the Nation has also won general approval. It is based on the concept that our educational system should remain under civilian direction and control, and that the emergency should not have the effect either of militarizing the colleges on the one hand or forcing them to close for lack of students on the other.

We feel that the universal military training and service bill recommended by your committee, even though it differs in many respects from our original draft, will be a historic contribution to our security. It will enable us to fulfill our immediate need for an expanded combat force, while at the same time assuring for the first time a dependable flow of trained young manpower into the National Guard and our other Reserve components.

The vital gain in the bill is that it establishes an enduring base for our military preparedness. It will safeguard our ability to maintain our strength over the years at a cost that is within the capacity of our economy to bear, and that reinforces our democratic traditions in all its aspects.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate will support the measure in substantially the form you have presented it.

Faithfully,

GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

P. S.—General Bradley has read this letter, and is in full accord with it.

G. C. M.

I now desire to read into the RECORD a letter, delivered by hand, from Gen. Omar N. Bradley. The letter is dated February 27, and reads as follows:

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
*Washington, D. C., February 27, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: There seems to be some misunderstanding concerning the intent of parts of my testimony before the House Armed Services Committee yesterday, February 26. Perhaps in the question-and-answer exchange I did not make my views perfectly clear.

The first point was in relation to the desirability of drafting men 18 years old or 18½ years old.

In this connection, I would like to invite your attention to the testimony, quoted below, from the verbatim transcript:

"The CHAIRMAN. General, this bill provides that he registers at 18 and he is classified when he gets to 18½ years of age. Now, what is your viewpoint or comment if he was registered at 18 and he was classified before he gets to 18½ years of age?

"Now, it is testified that it takes about 3 months. Under the law today he registers at 18 and is classified at 19, and in classing it takes about 3 months. Now, what is your comment? If he registers at 18 and he is classified before he gets to be 18½, you would save 3 months, would you not?

"General BRADLEY. Yes; that would be about 3 months. Mr. Chairman, I would not fight with you over 3 months anywhere in that age bracket. From the military point of view, I think a man 18, 18½, 19—they all make grand soldiers. But the reason we asked for the 18, as I understand it, was the figures indicated that we would have to into the 18-year bracket in order to get sufficient men to meet the numbers, and we were told by educators and labor people that that was the age at which it interfered least with their education and career and avocation. I do not believe anybody would fuss over that 3 months (of classification)."

I have added the words "of classification" myself because these were the 3 months in point, as the question was phrased by the chairman. As a matter of fact, in the version of the bill presented, we were losing exactly 6 months over the original proposal.

When I said "From the military point of view, Ithink a man 18, 18½, 19—they all make grand soldiers." I had reference to their abilities as soldiers and to their readiness and capacity to render effective military service. But as you can see, the reason we asked for 18 and the reason we need to continue to ask for 18 was contained in the remainder of my answer to the chairman.

There is another point in the discussion which may have given some ground to the feeling that I support the 18½-year-old proposition. It was in the following exchange with Mr. HÉBERT:

"Mr. HÉBERT. By Executive order. I understood that. Then you do accept the 18½-year-old proposition?

"General BRADLEY. The way the chairman has explained it to me, I do not think it delays the department bill but 3 months. As I say, I personally——"

As you can see by this quotation and the way it was written by the recorder, before I had a chance to give my personal opinion of it I was interrupted by Mr. HÉBERT. I don't believe one could construe this answer as a support of the 18½-year-old bill.

Personally, I continue to support the induction of men into the Armed Forces at age 18, and, from the information I am given, I think that any compromise with this figure will result in a shortage in the numbers of men if we ever have to extend ourselves beyond the 3,500,000 we now have recommended.

As can be seen from the transcript of the testimony, the question I answered was in reference to a posible saving of 3 months in classification time. It was not in reference to the age at which I believed inductions should begin. I expected to be asked further questions bearing on this and was prepared to give my views at that time.

There is another question on which misunderstanding might have arisen. This point also came up in the exchange of questions and answers with Mr. HÉBERT.

"Mr. HÉBERT. There is another part of it, the selection of 75,000 students by some agency to determine who shall and shall not be educated in this country. That is out.

"General BRADLEY. Well, in previous wars we found it necessary by experience to provide some kind of flow, continuing flow, of certain scientists and medical students, for example. You have always come up with an authorization for an ASTP or V-12 program of some kind. That is why we think that ROTC is a good provision. We think it belongs in there. However, there is an ROTC bill coming up before your committee soon and if you do not put too many restrictions in this one and leave it so you can cover that point in your next bill, I think that is the best way to solve it.

"Mr. HÉBERT. As I understand it, General, the proposition is this: Under the Department's bill 75,000 inductees were to be selected by an agency to determine 75,000 individuals who are to be educated. By dropping that provision in this bill, the determination of whether an individual is to be educated or not resolves itself with that individual, whether he wants to be educated or not, and how he wants to be educated and nobody telling him how.

"Now, as I understand it, the provisions of the bill, by dropping that section, merely allow to remain in effect that which is in effect now in our educational system in the country.

"General BRADLEY. If he has a chance to carry out his will, now when you asked me whether or not—"

I thought the question was in reference to the 75,000 ROTC students. In this exchange my answer was incomplete, and there was no opportunity to develop the matter fully and place my views completely on the record. I still believe we must have a continuing flow in this country of certain scientific and medical students.

But the specific manner in which this is to be accomplished is not, in my opinion, a matter for the military to determine. The Defense Department's position on this should best be explained by the civilian heads charged with responsibilities in this field.

I am sorry that this misunderstanding has arisen and I will certainly pay closer attention to the questions. And I will, in the future, insist on being allowed to answer completely the question that is asked.

I hope this will clear up the matter and let you know that I support 18-year-olds for the Armed Forces, and 75,000 men partially deferred for education.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

Mr. President, I desire now to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

## UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William Quillen Treseder to be United States marshal for the district of Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 28, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William Alvah Stewart, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Hon. Nelson McVicar, retired.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, to be a Civil Service Commissioner, vice Harry B. Mitchell.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Laurance T. DuBose, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years; and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a Presidential order as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Personnel).

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William Quillen Treseder, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Mar. 1, 1951
For actions of Feb.28, 1951
82nd-1st. No.36

CONTENTS

Alcohol.....15
Appropriations.....4,39
Banking and currency.....7
Claims.....22
Communications.....13
Dairy industry.....34
Education.....8,38
Electrification.....36
Expenditures.....24,25
Farm program.....33
Foods, surplus.....33
Foreign affairs, aid.2,23,37
Forests and forestry.16,27,29
Grain.....12,17,23,37
Housing.....31
Inflation.....24
Labor.....8
farm.....10,34
Lands, reclamation...6,18,35
Livestock and meats....19,29
Loans, farm.....26
Marketing.....11,33
Military training.....9
Organization, executive.1,5,30
Personnel.....14,28
Postal rates.....21
Potatoes.....11
Prices, control.....3
Public works.....32
Reports.....20
River basin development.36
Taxation.....24
Transportation.....12,22
Water utilization.....32
Wool.....19

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee ordered reorganization bill reported. House committee approved aid to India bill. Rep. Javits recommended authority to control farm prices at support level. Sen. Thye urged deferment of essential farm labor to maintain production. Sen. Hickenlooper said USDA "foisted potato...marketing program" onto Iowa producers. Senate debated military training bill.

HOUSE

1. REORGANIZATION. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee ordered reported, but did not actually report, H. R. 1545, which authorizes the President to submit temporary reorganization plans to carry out the defense program (p. D135).

2. AID TO INDIA. The "Daily Digest" states: "Committee on Foreign Affairs approved a new bill, which is to be introduced..., in connection with emergency food aid to be furnished to India. This new bill, as amended, will authorize approval of a grant not to exceed a $190,000,000 for food grains to alleviate famine in India. The committee will consider the new measure at an executive session tomorrow morning, at which time it is contemplated that the bill will be ordered reported to the House." (pp. D135-6.)

3. PRICE CONTROL. Rep. Dollinger, N. Y., spoke in favor of rolling prices back to the pre-Korean level (pp. 1737-8).

Rep. Hoffman, Mich., said the administration wants to increase wages and roll back prices and commented, "Just another version of the Brannan plan" (p. 1740).

Rep. Javits, N. Y., recommended amending the Defense Production Act so as to permit control of farm prices at the support level (pp. 1742-3).

Rep. Andersen, Minn., spoke against the Javits recommendation (p. 1743).

Rep. Holifield, Calif., proposed general price control and criticized various aspects of the price administration (pp. 1756-7).

4. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Canfield, N. J., inserted a Washington Post article reporting Rep. Cannon as saying the Democratic leadership was against a consolidated appropriation bill (p. 1740).

5. REORGANIZATION. Rep. Lovre, S. Dak., urged further reorganization and spoke in favor of H. R. 2886, "to reactivate the Hoover Commission." (p. 1746.)

6. RECLAMATION. Rep. McDonough, Calif., spoke against the proposed Central Arizona Project (p. 1747).

7. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Multer, N. Y., defended the Treasury Department's position on interest rates in the controversy with the Federal Reserve Board (pp. 1748-52).

8. EDUCATION; LABOR. Agreed, as reported, to H. Res. 73, authorizing the Education and Labor Committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction and giving it subpena power (pp.1735-6).

## SENATE

9. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military-training, selective-service bill (pp. 1705-6, 1726-34).

10. FARM LABOR. Sen. Thye said "current policies of the Selective Service System have had a particularly adverse effect upon agriculture," and "the time has come when we must examine that policy, not to place the individual farm boy in a preferred class but to make absolutely certain that there are skilled workers in this field so that there will be a sufficient production of food and fiber." He also inserted letters from farm organizations on the subject and discussed present policies on farm deferments.(pp. 1703-4.)

Sen. Langer inserted a N. Dak. Legislature resolution urging that the drafting of essential farm help be kept at a minimum (pp. 1704-5).

11. POTATO MARKETING. Sen. Hickenlooper said a potato-marketing agreement has been "foisted, against their will, upon the potato growers of 11 counties in northeastern Iowa," and inserted a grower's letter claiming that the referendum was held over protests of the growers involved, that it was held after the crop was grown, and that the method of election was "illegal" (pp. 1706-7).

12. GRAIN TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Langer discussed the urgent need for boxcars to move the N. Dak. wheat crop, commended ICC for its cooperation in trying to get cars and suggested the charging of a higher per diem rate when cars are off their own railroads (p. 1706).

13. COMMUNICATIONS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments H. R. 1730, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 (amending organizational, procedural, and appellate sections) and to authorize radio monitoring stations (S. Rept. 142) (p. 1693).

14. PERSONNEL. Sen. Humphrey inserted statements of the Council of Guidance and Personnel Associations making recommendations for personnel practices and manpower utilization in the present emergency (pp. 1692-3).

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee's subcommittee voted to report to the full committee S. 621, to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949 regarding rates of compensation, agreed to hold hearings on March 7-9 on S. 354, overtime and holiday compensation bill, and S. 622, compensation of certain officers and employees of the Government. It also agreed to recommend to the full Committee that S. 402, to raise living standards among Government employees, and S. 402, compensation to Government employees restored to duty after erroneous removal or suspension, be indefinitely postponed. (p. D134).

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 28 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 69, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948".

On page 71, strike out lines 3 through 10, inclusive.

On page 73, line 11, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948".

On page 74, line 10, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948".

On page 76, line 10, beginning with the comma strike out all through and including the word "claimed" in line 3 on page 77.

On page 78, beginning with line 20, strike out all to but not including the period in line 6 on page 80 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "all of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of the second sentence, and the last two sentences of the fourth paragraph, of section 4 (a), sections 4 (b), 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), and 14 shall become inoperative and shall cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such time".

Page 91, line 1, beginning with the word "All" strike out all through line 7.

Page 92, line 17, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States, and for other purposes."

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 28 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 28 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. PASTORE) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: On page 93, immediately after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 22. Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "man of the Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "person of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard,".

2-28-51——B

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. PASTORE) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 28 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

North Dakota be maintained during the period of the present emergency; and

Whereas to produce and harvest a crop in North Dakota and otherwise to engage in agricultural pursuits to the maximum capacity of the farmers of this State, it is absolutely necessary that adequate help be available on the farms of this State; and

Whereas it now appears to be the policy of selective service to draft and induct into the service of the United States farm boys essential to the operation of the farms of the State of North Dakota and to the production of the maximum amount of crops and the proper harvest and care of our agricultural resources: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That we do hereby urge and request that the drafting of essential farm help in the State of North Dakota be kept at a minimum, and that no farm boys or farm help be drafted or inducted into the service of the United States where such draft will materially reduce the operation of farm units to maximum capacity; and be it further

*Resolved*, That veterans of World War II who are now actively engaged in farming be given priority over nonveterans insofar as agricultural deferments are concerned; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Director of Selective Service be apprised of the action of the thirty-second legislative assembly by the adoption of this resolution, and that a copy be forwarded to him; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the entire congressional delegation from the State of North Dakota.

LEO STICKA,
*Speaker of the House.*
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
*Chief Clerk of the House.*
RAY SCHNELL,
*President of the Senate.*
W. J. TROUT,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

## INVESTIGATION OF MARYLAND SENATORIAL ELECTION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, there appeared in a recent issue of the press over the country an article by a very distinguished commentator, Mr. David Lawrence, entitled "Senate Probe of Tydings Defeat Presents a Startling Spectacle." Ordinarily I do not ask that such items be inserted in the RECORD. However, this article by Mr. David Lawrence is on a subject which is in the minds of all Senators. So far as I am concerned it expresses by views 100 percent, and I am inclined to think that most Members of the Senate would agree with it. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PROBE OF TYDINGS DEFEAT PRESENTS A STARTLING SPECTACLE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Maybe the United States Senate should investigate every election among its Members and let the loser come in and complain about the statements made by the victor. Maybe the so-called liberals want a national board of censorship which shall pass upon what the candidates say and what their overzealous managers and supporters write or print during a campaign.

Maybe the liberal of today isn't much different under the skin from the totalitarian who wants to regulate everything by a law and who doesn't really at heart believe in free speech or a free press unless the views expressed happen to agree with his own.

Unfortunately, the hullabaloo which has been started by Senator Tydings, of Maryland, Democrat, because he was defeated by JOHN M. BUTLER, Republican, isn't going to resolve any of these questions. It is merely going to prove that Mr. Tydings is a bad loser—which in politics is rather unpardonable.

It was the late Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and a true liberal, who said that freedom of speech is "freedom for the thought we hate." Few liberals today show that degree of tolerance in defending freedom of speech.

Now, there is no doubt that the attacks on Senator Tydings were bitter. But he let himself in for much of it by his own vitriolic condemnation of those who had sought a fair and impartial inquiry by the Senate into the alleged communistic influences in the Government. The Tydings report had in it many statements which were unfair and might even be called scurrilous in relation to those who had asked for a fair investigation. The report itself was so unsatisfactory that the job now has to be done over again by a new committee.

Hardly an election contest occurs in which one side doesn't argue the other side is unfair. The laws of libel and slander protect a candidate against extremes. Sometimes during the campaigns a threat to sue for libel is made and usually these suits are never heard from again or filed.

But the spectacle of a United States Senate committee inquiring now into election literature and trying to set itself up as a judge as to what is fair or unfair in a political campaign is something startling. It represents a trend which began with the recent interference with the right of petition under the Constitution.

It certainly is puzzling just why under a so-called liberal concept there are such frequent attempts to muzzle free speech or to question it. Thus, it is the liberal of today who wants to abolish congressional immunity and make it possible to intimidate a Member of Congress and prevent him from exposing fraud and crime. The gamblers and racketeers would certainly have made short shrift of the Kefauver committee if Congressmen were subject to libel suits for what they say in speeches or reports on the floor of the Congress.

Campaign literature has no immunity from suits. If anything libelous was said about Senator Tydings in the last campaign, he has a right to file suit against his opponent or anybody connected with his opponent's campaign. But to denounce somebody in public office whose views are unpalatable is not yet a crime or an offense for which the laws inflict punishment.

If the Senate committee means merely to give publicity to the nasty methods used in campaigns, that's a worthy objective. But, to be honest about it, the committee must not hesitate to go into Ohio and take a look also at the campaign literature circulated against Senator TAFT. Some of the stuff would hardly be covered by such a gentle word as "scurrilous."

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To Senate bill 1, the Committee on Armed Services has reported an amendment in the nature of a substitute. To the substitute there is no pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the pending measure, Senate bill 1, which amendment is sponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement with respect to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as Senators now realize, Senate bill 1 is a combination of two measures. It is an extension and an expansion of the Selective Service Act, and it also has tied into it in a great many places a plan for universal military training and service. The purpose of my amendment is to separate the selective service aspects from the bill which, of course, we recognize today as hurry-up legislation, something that cannot wait. It is important legislation, and should be enacted promptly. However, the universal military training aspects of the bill, to which there is considerable objection, and with respect to which there is much question in the Congress, can very well wait.

As a matter of fact, Senate bill 1 would not make universal military training effective for perhaps 5 years. I do not know how many years, and no one can tell me how many years; but at some future time it will become effective. It seems to me that it is not logical to merge a bill which is necessary at the present time with something which may be desired at some future time. For that reason I have submitted the amendment, which completely separates the two measures.

So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to vote for universal military training, with the right kind of provisions, if we had before us a measure which would not disrupt the manpower of the Nation from early boyhood. I believe that universal military training can be accomplished along certain lines in such a way that the boys will be protected in obtaining an education and getting started in life. However, the pending bill leaves a great deal of uncertainty. As I say, no Member of this body, sponsor of the bill or otherwise, can tell us now at what date the universal military training aspects of the bill will become effective.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, in support of the pending bill.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 26, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*Washington, D. C.:*

The 3,000,000 members of the American Legion urge you to support Senate bill No. 1 as reported by the Senate Committee on

Armed Services on February 15. It provides for drafting 18-year-olds and contains the American Legion's principles of universal military training. Thank you kindly for your assistance. Best regards.

ERLE COCKE, Jr.,
*National Commander, the American Legion.*

THE SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in North Dakota last fall we had a wet harvest. In the first place, we had a very late spring and the crop was put in unusually late. About the time of the harvest of small grains, especially in the northern half of our State, we started having adverse weather. In late August we had a frost. Then it started raining. Even as late as the middle of October a good deal of the grain was still standing in the fields saturated with moisture.

Our winter comes early. A good many farmers, desperate for fear they were going to lose their entire crop because of its being covered with snow, harvested their grain, even though it had a very high percentage of moisture.

What were they going to do with this grain? They tried to bring it to the country elevators, but there was no room. We have had a perpetual boxcar shortage ever since last spring. A good deal of the grain which the Commodity Credit Corporation took over on loans was never shipped out of the country elevators because of the shortage of cars. What were the producers to do with their wet wheat? Some of them had to leave it in the field. Others put it in their farm granaries. When an elevator would get a very occasional boxcar there would be a race to the elevator to see who could get unloaded. We have had a very cold winter and the grain, while it still has the moisture, up to now very little has gone out of condition. But with warm weather coming on in a comparatively few weeks, all of that grain would start to go out of condition and when it does it gets so bad that it is unfit for human consumption, and there is even a question of whether it should be fed to livestock.

I have had increasing pressure put on me all the time to help remedy this situation. One reason is that there are more than 5,000,000 bushels of this wet wheat in the northeastern section of North Dakota, more than a million bushels in northwestern Minnesota, and 3,000,000 bushels in northeastern Montana. All that wheat is going to spoil unless it is taken care of.

I am very glad to report that the Interstate Commerce Commission has put in an order to furnish approximately 1,200 cars a week for 6 weeks, to be supplied by the eastern railroads and to be turned over to the western railroads. That is an example of splendid cooperation, Mr. President.

The western railroads and our farmers are not asking for anything they should not have. The railroads in the upper Middle West have been running only about 50 percent of ownership of boxcars on their lines. Where are they? They are in the East, where small railroads have as high as 269 percentage of ownership. Of course, they are glad to use these cars, as they only have to pay $1.75 per diem.

Already we can see efforts being made by certain interests to try to have canceled, at least in part, the boxcars which the Interstate Commerce Commission has ordered to be turned over to western railroads. We propose to keep that order in effect, until this wet grain is moved into terminals. I would say that that will give us immediate help, but we still need to have the whole matter corrected.

First, a higher charge should be made for the per diem rate when cars are off their own railroads, with penalties when in emergencies they are not returned. Next, more steel should be granted for the building of boxcars. The railroad companies have "missed the bus." They have been waiting for years putting off building boxcars, and now they are threatened with losing a great share of their business in the grain territory to trucks, which are not nearly so economical a way of handling grain as are boxcars.

POTATO MARKETING AGREEMENT FOR IOWA—LETTER FROM H. L. McKINLEY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on day before yesterday I received a letter from a very prominent Iowa farmer who is one of the largest potato growers in the State of Iowa. His name is H. L. McKinley, of St. Ansgar. Mr. McKinley has consistently refused to go into the potato program. He has consistently refused to take Government benefits or payments. He now finds that Mr. Brannan, through his Washington PMA political organization has foisted, against their will, upon the potato growers of 11 counties in northeastern Iowa, cooperation in the so-called marketing program, of which they want no part, and have had no part in the past, and from which they desire to be relieved.

He wrote me a letter at some length about the matter and in the letter clearly stated his position. I ask unimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACORN PARK FARMS,
*St. Ansgar, Iowa, February 22, 1951.*

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I know that you are burdened with tremendous responsibilities at this time and I dislike to add to them.

The problem which confronts us seems to me to be an attack on fundamental and constitutional personal rights which will take us further down the socialistic road. I am therefore taking the liberty of presenting the facts in this case for your consideration and investigation.

Iowa has never produced more than a small percentage of the potatoes needed for its own use. Twenty-five years ago we started growing potatoes on a commercial scale and have continued to do so until the present time.

In 1946 the Agriculture Department still gave the all-out signal on potato production and the resulting crop was staggering. Lured by high support prices tens of thousands of new growers had gone into the potato growing business. We found our long-time regular outlets flooded for the disposal of this 1946 crop so we turned a large proportion over to the Government since they had urged all-out production.

In 1947 and succeeding years potatoes have been raised on a quota basis. The records in our Mitchell County PMA Office will show that for the years 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950 we planted from 10 to 25 percent less potato acreage than our allotment called for and that during this same 4-year period we did not take a dollar of Government-support money for potatoes.

In 1949 Secretary Brannan called for a marketing agreement on potatoes for the entire States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. Due to the fact that so many growers had gone into the business in order to get high support prices for potatoes which they intended to dump into the Government's lap the referendum was pronounced as having carried and Mr. Brannan placed marketing order No. 60 in effect.

In the spring of 1950 Mr. Brannan, through his publicity and propaganda department (its official name is State PMA headquarters) commenced pushing for a potato marketing agreement for Iowa and Indiana. Illinois, which is in between and also produces potatoes was conveniently overlooked. From that time until the present the procedure follows a pattern which is the reason for this letter.

The growers in Iowa held a meeting at which 24 out of 25 stated that they did not want anything to do with such an agreement. The facts also show that Indiana growers, in a meeting, voted 198 to 2 against a marketing agreement. In spite of this Mr. Brannan's representatives kept pushing the matter and called for a referendum. Knowing that the measure would be defeated if submitted to the growers of Indiana and Iowa separately, Mr. Brannan arbitrarily forced a referendum which would include the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan which were already in the marketing agreement stranglehold on their 1950 crop and could not get out until the end of the marketing year (June 30, 1951). Although potatoes are grown in other sections of Iowa, Mr. Brannan arbitrarily selected 12 counties in northern Iowa and 20 counties in Indiana.

The election by mail was very loosely conducted. Ballots were mailed out from the PMA offices. We received two. We did not use either of them. There was no place on the ballot for a notary public seal showing that the signature of the person was genuine. There was nothing to hinder duplicate voting. The ballots had to be sent to Chicago. Growers who asked to witness the ballot counting were ignored. The front of the ballot carried propaganda favoring an affirmative vote. Mr. Brannan announced the election carried by the necessary majority. This election was held in September after the crop was grown and mostly harvested. The effective date for these new territories of Iowa and Indiana was November 27, 1950, after part of the crop was disposed of. Since this packed election was held after the crop was grown there was no chance for a grower to decide in advance whether he wanted to produce a crop under the complete and dictatorial domination of Mr. Brannan.

Under Marketing Order No. 60, Mr. Brannan has allocated to himself powers as sweeping as any dictator. I will cite a few:

1. He appoints the committee to handle the area. The growers are allowed the privi-

adversary proceeding. Speaking for myself, I have great confidence that under the leadership of the Senator from Iowa no injustice will be done.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have one or two simple questions to ask, because I cannot enter into this debate as a member of the bar, but as an entire outsider with reference to the whole proceeding.

I believe I can understand the psychology which impresses new Members of the Senate who are elected with what I should call a large majority, let us say 40,000 or 50,000 majority, and then have a proceeding of this kind brought against them. I may not be correctly advised, but I am told that there are no charges brought against the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. GILLETTE. Charges of what type?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I understand there are none.

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, yes; charges were filed on which the subcommittee, in the initial stages, undertook an investigation into the Maryland complaints. There were written complaints filed with the subcommittee.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The Senator himself has said that there are no rules of evidence applicable.

Mr. GILLETTE. There are none to my knowledge.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If charges are filed, it must be of violation of some State law or Federal law. There are courts for handling such charges, rather than have them referred to a committee of the Senate.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is very true.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I can easily understand the attitude of a group of new Members who come into the Senate and find a proceeding of this kind started. If there were a difference of only a thousand or a few thousand votes, I could understand why there should be an investigation ordered, and perhaps the ballots be counted, as happened 2 years ago, but not in a case of the kind we are now considering.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Nebraska is very sound in what he has said. There is confusion; there is confusion everywhere.

With reference to the courts as a forum which can be used in a matter of this kind, the Constitution makes the Senate "the judge of the elections returns and qualifications of its own Members," and we cannot say "Go into the courts," when we have that constitutional responsibility.

It was in an attempt, in my poor way, to explain the steps which have been taken, and the reasons for them, that I have made the statement here this afternoon.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I served as a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in the past, and I learned that a majority of the Members of the Senate feel that they have no right to question the standing of one who is elected to the Senate by the people of a State. The people of Maryland have the right to elect anyone they desire to elect, the people of Nebraska have the same right, and if the election is conducted according to law, and a candidate receives a majority of the votes, we have no right to reject him because we do not like the color of his hair or his demeanor here.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am 1,000 percent in agreement with the Senator from Nebraska in that statement, contingent on what he mentions, namely, that the election is properly conducted, and that the vote is a reflection of the wishes of the electorate.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa and my colleagues. There is not a Senator on the floor whom I esteem more highly than the Senator from Iowa. I did not hear everything he said on the subject, but I did hear the latter part of his remarks. I admire him very much for making his statement. I want him to know that the closest friends I have in the United States Senate sit on the subcommittee which is hearing the matter. I have no fear of any action the subcommittee may take. I have no fear of any prejudice. I know justice will be done. It must be done in any committee which the senior Senator from Iowa heads.

In the opinion of some persons, perhaps I should not have made my speech this afternoon. I happen to be one of the freshman Senators. We are in what we call the maze of our first induction into the Senate. As I said previously, I deeply love JOHNNY BUTLER. I spoke in his behalf today, not in criticism of the able committee headed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], or in criticism of any member of the subcommittee, but in defense of an able friend and great American, as I would want to be defended if I were in JOHNNY BUTLER'S position.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say again that I have no fear of what the committee headed by the able Senator from Iowa will do. That is not what prompted me to speak on the floor today. I wanted to give JOHNNY BUTLER support at a time when he is tremendously worried about the publicity.

Mr. GILLETTE. I appreciate the kindly references of the Senator from Idaho. As I have said, my purpose in speaking was that I feared the Senator's remarks, by implication or inference, might reflect on the members of the subcommittee, every one of whom, as I said, is of the highest character. They are among the finest Members of this body. I know how they are proceding with their work. I know how carefully and meticulously they are endeavoring to arrive at a just conclusion.

To repeat, Mr. President, this is not an attack on the junior Senator from Maryland. He will not have more ardent advocates than the members of the subcommittee, when they have completed their study of the facts, if the facts indicate that that should be their course, and their advocacy will be as earnest and sincere as that of the able Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I am certain of that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did I understand the Senator to say that the committee would first examine into all charges covering the entire country, and then file a consolidated report with the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no; not charges covering the entire country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. But charges which have been filed with the committee, and which were considered by the committee to warrant action on its part.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Only in this particular case?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; in all cases which were filed and on which action was taken. Those cases will be considered and reported in a consolidated report to the Committee on Rules and Administration. That will be done as soon as we have concluded the investigations in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator able to make an estimate as to how long it will be before such a report is filed?

Mr. GILLETTE. I cannot say. I had hoped that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would proceed in the Maryland case, and that at the same time the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] could be carrying on the investigation in Pennsylvania. I had hoped that the work could be completed in February. However, because of the fact that the two Senators who were assigned to the Maryland case requested that the other two members of the subcommittee, as lawyers, sit with them, the Pennsylvania case is still pending. Therefore they cannot go to Pennsylvania to conduct hearings in Philadelphia and Wilkes Barre until such time as they have finished with the Maryland case. However, I shall be very much disappointed if the investigations are not completed by the middle of March.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to say that the appointment of the five members of the committee—not four members—and the appointment of counsel was carried out exactly as the Senator from Iowa has said. I also want to say that I have full faith and confidence that the committee will make its recommendations, which I hope will be very soon. I have been continually in very close touch with the Republican members of the committee, and I am satisfied that they will be able to speak for themselves when recommendations are made.

In response to the very forceful address made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I wish to say that I think his address has served a most beneficial purpose. It is one thing to file a complaint and use it as a fishing expedition to smear someone. The Sen-

ator from Iowa knows what I am talking about. It is another thing, however, when a victim of libelous charges does not proceed against his accuser in a court of law.

Mr. President, I have served in many investigations of this kind. As the Senator from Iowa knows, the junior Senator from Nebraska has been lambasted as much as any other Member of this Senate. I have had to take many scoldings and many libelous statements have been made against me. I say all this is a shame; it is a pity. What the American people want more than anything else today are the facts. They do not want to be misinformed. They do not want the facts to be misinterpreted. They should have the facts.

If there is any way by which we can stop the use of scurrilous literature and composite pictures in campaigns, we should stop it. Certainly it would be a healthy thing for the people of the United States. I am all for it. However, it is not being stopped. I do not know whether it can be.

Mr. President, I saw some of the literature which was used in the Ohio campaign. Such literature as was put out against the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was the work of a character assassin. I was in Idaho. I know what the Senator from Idaho has been talking about. I know what he thinks of that kind of literature. But that is what is done in campaigns.

Mr. President, I know something about the Tydings committee and its investigation. I know something of what that man Morgan, who wrote the committee report, said about me. Senator Tydings knows what he is talking about. He is a lawyer. He has been using the committee as a mouthpiece and as a springboard in his effort to try JOHN BUTLER. He knows there are legal ways of doing it.

As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I wish to say that the Senator from Iowa has done a very fine and impartial job of assigning committee members to the investigation, and I desire to substantiate what he has said. I have not read the transcript of the hearings before the subcommittee. I have only read some newspaper accounts of the investigation. I do not want to prejudge the work of the committee, because it has a right to go into every piece of so-called evidence which can be brought before it. It has a job to do.

I hope the matter will be given their immediate attention and cleared up as quickly as possible, so that the right of the junior Senator from Maryland to his seat will be established without any cloud on his title. I think he is entitled to it. I speak from experience with such investigations when I say that when a committee finally gets through with its investigation, all that can be said is: "If a State wants to send a man to Congress, and does not want to change its election laws, what are we going to do about it?" That is all there is to it.

I commend the Senator from Iowa for his remarks. He has a right to speak on any subject at any time, either before a committee reports or after it reports. At the same time, I want the RECORD to show that I have absolute confidence in the committee and in the subcommittee. I have been in close touch with the work of the committee, and certainly I subscribe to what it has done. Several years ago I took part in a similar investigation into an election in Maryland. I know that at that time I wanted to get rid of the matter as quickly as possible. I should like to stand with other Senators in an attempt to prevent the circulation of scurrilous literature and composite pictures. If there is a way of doing it legislatively, while still permitting people to have full freedom of speech I would like to do it. It is a difficult problem to solve.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to make a brief comment, with the indulgence of the Senator from Nebraska. I am in full agreement with the statement which he has just made. I know that every member of the subcommittee is anxious to accomplish the purpose which he has described.

I should like to take this opportunity to state on the floor of the Senate that if any Member of the Senate has any suggestions as to policy or as to legislation which might accomplish what the Senator has in mind, we shall welcome them and embody them in our report if they merit inclusion therein.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observation.

## CONVICTION OF WILLIAM W. REMINGTON

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How William W. Remington Got Clearance From LRB."—that is, the Loyalty Review Board—published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of February 15, 1951.

I may say that this editorial deals with Mr. Seth W. Richardson, one of the outstanding Republicans in the United States, a man who, under President Herbert Hoover, was Assistant Attorney General. I invite the attention of all Senators to this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HOW WILLIAM W. REMINGTON GOT CLEARANCE FROM LRB

Conviction of William W. Remington, former Federal official, of perjury in denying that he was ever a member of the Communist Party, adds fuel to the flames of criticism of the Truman and Roosevelt administrations. This conviction, like that of Alger Hiss, shows that there was more communism in Government circles in the 1930's and 1940's than many were willing to admit. Reds of various hues were given entirely too much freedom to hold Federal office and to influence Federal policy.

Although Remington had been under suspicion for some time, and had been investigated by various agencies, he was never convicted until the recent jury found that he had perjured himself. He got the maximum sentence from the court—5 years in prison and a $2,000 fine—and has appealed.

The question naturally has arisen as to how Remington managed to get clearance in 1949 from the Federal Loyalty Review Board, in the face of suspicions expressed prior to that time concerning his loyalty. The answer seems to be that the Loyalty Review Board had to reach its findings on the basis of an entirely different set of facts from those put before the recent jury which found Remington guilty.

Under the Executive order issued to the LRB by President Truman, and interpreted by the Attorney General, the board cannot consider testimony that is too remote in point of time to be material to the question of present disloyalty. Furthermore, the board is forbidden to find disloyalty on the basis of reasonable doubt.

As applied to the Remington case, this means that the Board had to decide whether the party in question was disloyal in 1949—not whether he had been a Communist a decade or two prior to that time. Not only so, but none of the evidence presented at the recent perjury trial was before the Board, with the sole exception of Elizabeth Bentley's statements, and Miss Bentley failed to show up in person, although twice summoned by the Board.

The LRB has had before it various cases involving Federal employees who in their college days had toyed with communism, and may even have joined the party, as Remington was alleged to have done at Dartmouth College. Under the Attorney General's interpretation of the President's Executive order, the Board had to find for the defendant in these cases, where evidence of subsequent good conduct was shown.

Seth W. Richardson, conservative Republican, headed the LRB throughout this period, and he has been nominated by Mr. Truman to membership on the new Subversive Activities Control Board. Mr. Richardson seems to have acted, while LRB Chairman, in strict accordance with the directives given him by the Attorney General and the President, as he was compelled, by law, to do.

These are factors which cannot be ignored by the Senate, as Mr. Richardson comes before that body for confirmation to the new agency.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gillette | Lehman |
| Butler, Md. | Hayden | McFarland |
| Cain | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Carlson | Johnston, S. C. | Thye |
| Case | Knowland | |
| Dirksen | Langer | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr.

McKELLAR, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names, when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. IVES, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HOEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. BYRD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services devoted many hours to the study of the question whether the induction age should be lowered from 19 to 18. I wish to call again to the attention of the Senate what has been pointed out in the hearings, namely, that the subcommittee held 37 hearings, and took about 100 hours of testimony relative to the over-all bill which now under consideration.

The bill in its present form was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee though it is only fair to say that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] indicated he would have a number of amendments to offer. Lowering the age to 18 is one of the basic issues of the bill. We recognized that not only from the day the hearings on this particular bill were started, but also from our background of experience with previous bills in previous years.

I can assure the Senate that our position in this matter has been taken only after the most careful and painstaking consideration.

We feel that the induction age should be lowered, lowered to age 18. We feel that this action should be taken now. We feel that the decision should not be put off until some time in the future. We feel that the issue should be met fully; not just part way, not just half way.

The committee feels just as strongly, and has so provided in the bill, that each local board should first exhaust its pool of available men in the 19-to-26 group before it dips into the 18-year-olds and inducts them for service.

The committee feels just as strongly—and has again so provided in the bill—that when a local board finds it necessary to induct 18-year-olds for service, the older ones should go first.

With the situation as it stands today, we feel it is highly unlikely that a single 18-year-old will be inducted this fiscal year. It is already practically the first of March, and the proposed legislation has not yet even been enacted by the Congress. And even if this bill were to be signed tomorrow, Selective Service still requires an average of 90 days in which to process these young men.

Furthermore, even if we assume the impossible — that some 18-year-old should actually be inducted the day the bill was signed—that young man would of necessity be very close to age 19. That is true because the bill specifically requires that the oldest from among this group shall be chosen first by the local board.

To this limitation, add the fact that this young man would get about 21 days in which to arrange his personal affairs, plus the fact that his basic training would take four months, and I believe all will agree that, even if this unlikely hypothetical case were to happen, it would still be well beyond the end of the current fiscal year, and this young man would be well over age 19, before he could possibly see any active service.

Now, let us look beyond the present fiscal year for a moment; let us examine the possibilities for fiscal year 1952.

I invite attention to exhibit C, on page 689 of the printed hearings, which is a little over half way through the volume which all Senators have on their desks.

The fifth vertical bar from the left of the chart shows that if we extend the induction period as recommended, if all expiring enlistments not previously extended are frozen for 12 months, and if no special rotation is provided for the thousands of veterans of World War II who were recalled as enlisted reservists—and many of these men saw combat, and many were themselves inducted as 18-year-olds during World War II—if all of these things happen, if the enlistment and reenlistment rates continue, and if we have no casualties to replace, we will have a total of 682,000 men still remaining in the 19-to-26 selective service pool on June 30, 1952.

I therefore feel that if all the ifs happen strictly according to plan, and if no buts are thrown into the picture from behind the iron curtain, it is quite possible that no significant number of 18-year-olds will be inducted in fiscal 1952. And even these would be from among the older segment of the age group—cases where particular local boards had no 19-year-olds immediately available. Cutting heavily into the industrial and agricultural deferments of the 19-to-26 group might alleviate this particular aspect of the problem even more, but at a very obvious cost to our over-all mobilization effort.

Mr. President, is it any wonder that gentlemen who have not probed below the surface of this issue ask: Why, in the face of these figures, are members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, colleagues of ours who have studied this problem in detail, concerned with 18-year-olds Or why they object to making it 18 years and 6 months.

Why do I say at one moment that it does now appear probable that we will take any 18-year-olds this fiscal year, and only a relatively few next fiscal year, but at the next moment object to a move to strike the 18-year-old provision from this bill, or change it to 18 years and 6 months?

Mr. President, the answer is fairly simple, and it is a very compelling one. For if there were not the most compelling reasons for our recommendation, I can assure the Senate that the committee would not have made it.

To begin with, this is not a bill geared solely to the needs of fiscal year 1951 and fiscal year 1952. It is long-term legislation. It seeks to meet the issues on a long-term basis. From all indications the threat of Communist aggression will be a long-term affair.

At the moment, our normal pool of selective service availables has been heavily reinforced on a temporary, short-term, emergency basis.

By the end of this fiscal year approximately 800,000 members of the Reserve components of the three services will be on active duty. A very substantial portion of these individuals are veterans of the last war. Many of them saw combat. Many are over the age of 26. We have all received letters from them. These letters point out that many of these enlisted men have famiiles; many of them were themselves inducted during the last war at age 18. These men are all exempt from induction through selective service until war, or a declaration of national emergency made by the Congress.

It is said that they asked for it, that they joined the Reserve components voluntarily, with full realization of their obligation, that they were all getting paid for belonging to the Reserve components, and getting Reserve retirement. Why should they not gladly go on active duty?

We all know the facts. These men joined the Reserve components in good faith. It has been our tradition, and our custom, that a large scale call of the Reserves is resorted to only as a prelude to general mobilization. And these men were not all getting paid, or getting retirement benefits. Many of them did not even realize that they were in the Reserve. The bald fact is that the crisis in Korea caught us in such a sad state of unpreparedness that to get trained men for immediate duty as replacements—trained replacements—the services simply had to call large numbers of enlisted veterans from the inactive Reserve. Everyone realized that this was not fair. But the emergency was there. It had to be met. Selective service gave us untrained men. The need was for trained men. It was therefore necessary to temporarily reinforce the selective-service pool by calling up men who were exempt from the draft.

Mr. President, it seems to me this phase of the problem should be given serious consideration, because I submit that many of these men had given 2, 3, 4, and in some cases, which I know from my own personal knowledge, 5 years in the armed services during World War II. Many of them had seen combat service overseas in the Air Force, in the Army, or in the Navy. They finally returned home after they had devoted that part of their lives to the protection

of their country and in fulfilling their obligations as good citizens in its defense. After they have given that service, it should not be found necessary to call on them again, especially when there are a large number of young men who have not had an opportunity of serving their country in its great hour of need.

I do not believe that any person who served in World War II would hesitate for a moment to make himself available in the event of an all-out war. I believe, however, that there is considerable equity in the argument of those who feel that after their years of service to their country, they should not be called again from their famiiles—and they are getting into an age bracket where they have families—from their business, from their professions, or from their farms, when they have already been away from their profession, or business, or farms for a period of 3, 4, or 5 years, serving their country during World War II. It does not seem quite equitable to call upon them a second time, while there is a considerable part of our population in an age bracket which has not had an opportunity to serve the country in an hour of peril.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator has referred to the situation which resulted from calling up inactive Reserves. Can the Senator tell us why the inactive Reserves were called before the Organized Reserves, or reservists who had reason to think they were on the active list? It has been brought to my attention many times that men were called to active duty who were on the inactive Reserve list, which resulted in great inconvenience and, in many cases, as the Senator has said, in great hardship.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only answer I can give to the able Senator from South Dakota is I assume that there was a great need at the particular hour, and that some of the men who were called had certain specialties which the Army needed at the time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator tell us approximately how many men there were in our Armed Forces in June, at the time of the invasion of South Korea?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Approximately one and one-half million men.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator tell us why we were totally unprepared at the time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should add that the one and one-half million men included the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It was our total armed force.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator tell us why we were so totally and wholly unprepared when it was necessary to send our Armed Forces to Korea, and why we have been in so much difficulty since that time insofar as our armed personnel is concerned? What was the reason for the unpreparedness?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Idaho that a great number of factors entered into the picture. In the first place, as I said before, the one and one-half million men were the total number in the Navy, the Air Force, and the Army. They were not all troops in the Army.

Secondly, we are spread pretty thin around the world. We have responsibilities in Germany as an occupying power. We have defenses to maintain in the Panama Canal area, in Hawaii, in Alaska, and in other places. We have our own garrisons to maintain in the United States. We have occupation forces in Japan. I will say very frankly to the Senator from Idaho that I do not feel—and I have raised the point, as numerous other members of the Armed Services Committee have done—that we are getting as many combat divisions out of the men we have in our Army as we should get. The fact remains that we did not have, to meet the crisis which we were facing, a sufficient number of troops without calling up some of the reservists.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is entirely possible, is it not, that many of the personnel in the Armed Forces were serving in housekeeping duties at that time

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is always some of that to be done in the Army. I myself have done some KP duty, if the Senator calls that housekeeping. There is always a certain amount of maintenance of barracks to be done, and so forth. However, I also feel, as I have said, that we are not getting the number of divisions that we should out of our manpower. That is a matter about which I think the Armed Services Committee should constantly keep after the Military Establishment so that we may find a way to get a larger number of troops out of the manpower available.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I know that the distinguished Senator from California, as a student of military affairs is probably aware of the fact that the monthly report for December 31, issued by the United States Civil Service Commission, shows that a few thousand less than 1,000,000 civilians were employed on that date by the Department of Defense. So it is obvious that members of the Armed Forces should not be used for housekeeping services or for work which could be done by some of the 1,000,000 civilians in the employ of the Department of Defense, thereby releasing personnel of the armed services. I think that is a point which should be stressed. Personally I believe there is an unjustified waste of manpower, both civilian and in uniform, by the Department of Defense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say, however, in all fairness to the Senator from Idaho, in connection with the civilian figures, that of course they include civil-service employees who work in arsenals under the Ordnance Department, and in great naval shipyards, and navy yards, so that a considerable part of those employees are by no means overhead, as that term is sometimes employed. So I think in order to get a fair picture one would have to break down the figures and ascertain where the civilians work.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am aware of that fact; but I realize that civilian employment by the armed services is at a high level, and that fact should be taken into account as we consider the lack of trained personnel in the armed services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has stated the over-all number in the armed services, for the three services. Can the Senator state the number in the Army at that time, as distinguished from the Air Corps and the Navy?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will get that figure for the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The totals show, as of October 31, 932,000 for the Army; 510,000 for the Navy; 146,000 for the Marine Corps; and 519,000 for the Air Force. I think that is the approximate breakdown on October 31, 1950. It is shown on page 1230 of the hearings, if the Senator desires to examine the figures.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator state how many persons have been taken into the Army, as distinguished from the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The figure for the Army itself is now approximately 1,100,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The second emergency step was to extend all expiring enlistments for a period of 12 months.

At the time the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel we had about 1,300,000 enlisted men in the armed services, all serving on a basis of voluntary enlistment. The great bulk of these enlistments would have expired by June 30, 1953. On July 27, 1950—which was just a few days after the aggression across the thirty-eighth parallel—the Congress authorized the President to extend, for a period of 12 months, those enlistments which normally would have expired by July 9, 1951. The pending bill additionally authorizes the extension of enlistments which normally would expire within the next 2 years, or until July 9, 1953.

This extension of enlistments is necessary as an emergency measure, and to provide trained cadres for the build-up and training of our expanded Military Establishment.

Although this emergency step temporarily relieves our manpower problems to an appreciable extent, its end result will bring about an abnormally large number of separations during fiscal years 1953 and 1954, and ending early in fiscal year 1955.

The point of these matters is, Mr. President, that our manpower picture for fiscal 1951 and 1952 will begin to change radically in fiscal year 1933. We have simply borrowed—part from the past, by recalling large numbers of draft-exempt veterans who are in the Reserve, and part from the future, by extending enlistments. By virtually freezing all separations during fiscal year 1951, and by going outside the selective-service pool, we can effect the build-up to a strength of 3,500,000, and provide a big enough backlog to meet the turn-over during fiscal year 1952, without going below age 19.

It is at this point that we arrive at the crux of the whole matter. For at the end of fiscal year 1953 the net number remaining available in the 19-to-36 pool will be only about 300,000, as compared with 682,000 for 1952. And for fiscal year 1954 the balance will be only slightly larger—something under 400,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What this bill attempts to accomplish is to prepare now for the next 3 or 4 or 5 years, and at the same time to make it possible to cover an extreme emergency occuring even within the next year. Am I not correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So this is an effort to enact more or less permanent legislation covering a span of years in the future, as far as we can foresee the present emergency. The object is to get such legislation on the statute books now.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say that I think no prudent person could advocate doing less, considering the situation now confronting the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the purpose at the present time of putting the 18-year-old provision in the bill, as reported by the committee, is to have one bill which will cover any unforeseen emergency now, if another war should occur, and also to provide over the next few years, a plan under which the young people coming along can determine their life plans.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. It is an attempt to enunciate a military policy which will support a posture of defense, and to do it on a long-term basis, rather than merely nibbling at the problem.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. These apparent surpluses are not surpluses at all. They are deficits. They are very seriously short of the estimated selective-service pipeline. Furthermore, they are based upon a complicated statement of estimating factors each of which must work out according to plan. The committee also feels that the estimating agencies—and I might parenthetically add this was not alone the estimate of the Pentagon, as some have tried to maintain, but the estimating agencies included Selective Service, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Labor—have been optimistic rather than conservative in their calculation.

There can, therefore, be no doubt, Mr. President, that it will be necessary to induct substantial numbers of 18-year-olds beginning in the fiscal year 1953.

I might again say that that is assuming the general world situation holds about as it is now until that time. I do not know any person who is willing to underwrite that the Kremlin will not press itself at some other part of the world as it did in Korea, and that the situation may not, in fact, remain even as unsatisfactory as it is at the present moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I presume the Senator from California is assuming that three or four amendments which are now at the desk will not be adopted. I assume the Senator from California realizes that we would have to get down to the bottom of that 18-year-old pool much quicker than 1953 if we adopted an amendment reducing the period of enlistments from 48 to 30 months.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. It would about double the manpower requirements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Or if we adopted another amendment whittling away at the manpower pool by reducing the time of service from 26 months to 21 months. Is that not correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; the Senator is correct. It would require annually approximately 125,000 more 18-year-olds if that amendment were adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Or if we adopted a third amendment now at the desk, which would limit the Reserve service to 18 months.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator is correct. I think that would affect about 400,000 persons now on duty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So is it not true, after all, that the amendments which are now at the desk, including the ones I have listed, and an additional one that increases the deferment of specially selected students from 75,000 to 150,000, all bring nearer the day when we are going to have to take all the 18-year-olds?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the Senator understand the consistency in one breath of saying that we are going to defer 150,000 instead of 75,000, and we are going to limit Reserve service to 18 months, and that we are going to cut the term of service from 26 months to 21 months, but at the same time saying we are going to raise the age limit for induction from 18 to 18½?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the subcommittee—and I did not happen to be a member of his subcommittee, though I sat in on many of the sessions of the subcommittee—that I know he has ably gone into the whole question, has contributed greatly, I believe, to the defense needs of the Nation, and held the hearings not with any preconceived ideas to start with, but with a desire to obtain the facts, to develop them in the course of the hearings, and then, based on the facts, to bring out a bill which would meet the defense requirements of the Nation in the very critical period in which we now find ourselves. I would say to the Senator that it does not seem to me to be consistent to take the steps which have been advocated and at the same time to raise the age limit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For these reasons, the committee urges that the present law be changed so as to lower the induction age to 18.

We have thrown all possible safeguards around that recommendation. We insure that it will be used only where it is necessary to do so. We have provided that no young man age 18 years and 7 months will be inducted by his local board if there is a young man 18 years and 10 months old who is available. Similarly, no young man age 18 years and 4 months can be taken by his local board if one whose age is 18 years and 7 months is available.

These safeguards, Mr. President, are specific and absolute. They are clearly spelled out in the bill, beginning on page 81, line 10.

We feel that the provisions as we have recommended them are necessary. To fail to put them in the bill at this time, to put them off until the future, or to change the age to 18 years and 6 months, simply avoids the issue. It implies that such action will not be necessary in maintaining a force of 3,500,000. The committee felt that a failure on our part to make this 18-year-old recommendation, clearly and without equivocation, would put us somewhat in the position of attempting to sell a pig in a poke. It would suggest that we were not being frank with the people of this country—that we were not telling them the whole story—that we were hinting that a force of 3,500,000 could be maintained with the induction age retained at 19.

I should like to say at this point that it seems to me what the Nation needs, and what the whole free world needs more than anything else, is that we deal frankly with the people. I believe that one of the reasons why so many of us admired Mr. Winston Churchill during the period of Britain's darkest hour in World War II, was that he treated the British people as adults, and that they responded as such, as, in my judgment, a free people always will do if they are given the facts. It seems to me that this is no time to spoon-feed the American people or any free people. I think the Government, both its executive and its legislative branches, have an obligation to lay down the cold hard facts of the situation which confronts us. I personally believe that if that is done, if the people are given as much information as the security situation will permit, they will respond to the tremendous challenge which faces a free world today. I think that government in all its branches has an obligation to do that, and frankly to deal with the public.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Possibly the Senator went into the matter I have in mind with the Senator from Texas, but I was not at the moment in the Chamber to hear it. Did the Senator go into the question of maintenance, and the number of men required to maintain a force of 3,500,000 men?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We discussed that general situation, and I think it was perhaps before the Senator from Massachusetts returned to the Chamber. I expressed the personal opinion, which I think represented the opinion of a good many members on the committee, if not all of them, that we were not satisfied we were getting as many combat troops out of our manpower as we feel should be secured. I also think it is quite true that in order to maintain combat troops in the line we must deal with the whole logistical problem of support. Many individuals are needed behind the lines, so to speak, in order to maintain the Army. I did not go into the specific figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator has just said. I did not hear his statement on the subject. The figure which sticks in my mind, which was given to us by the Department of Defense is that in order to maintain a force of 3,500,000 men, merely the turnover each year will require approximately 901,000 new men, and if each age group has approximately 1,050,000 men, of which only approximately 545,000 are A–1 available, even if we take the whole of each year's 18-year-old group, we have got to count on a number of enlistments and reenlistments and volunteers outside the age groups. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I believe it to be a fair statement. The figure of 901,000 which the Senator mentioned, I think, is the very minimum figure that would be required.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from California has said in his speech that after 1951–52 the men coming from the Reserves and from reenlistments will no longer be available, so that after that period we shall have to fall back on new men. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. President, with regard to the lowering of the age limit to 18, as mentioned in the discussion I had prior to the recent colloquy with the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that I feel that elimination of the 18-year-olds from induction cannot be done without recalling the veterans, if we are to maintain what we have to maintain in order to supply our forces.

A second and equally compelling reason for lowering the induction age to 18 relates, not to the requirements of the three-and-one-half-million force, but to the program for universal military training which this bill recommends.

We realize that the military-training program will not begin to operate today, or next year, or probably the year after.

Our immediate problem—and I think it is vital—is to build and maintain the active forces.

But we all hope for the day when this active-duty force can be reduced in size—ultimately to the point where it will no longer be necessary to induct men for service. Beginning at that time, the universal-military-training program begins to operate.

All physically fit young men attaining age 18 will become liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps, for a period of basic military training lasting not less than 4 months, nor more than 6 months.

Following their initial basic military training, they would be required to serve in the Reserve components of the armed services for the remainder of their basic obligation period of 8 years; that is to say, they then would go into the Organized Reserve units or the National Guard, and so forth.

The bill proposes that liability for this period of basic military training in the National Security Training Corps shall begin at the age of 18.

I believe the reason for age 18 for universal military training is well understood by all Members of the Senate. Numerous studies of the question—most notably the report of the Compton commission—all recommend this age. The overwhelming majority of the witnesses appearing before the committee confirmed the previous recommendations. Even persons who objected to induction at age 18 for service generally favored it as the best age for induction for universal military training.

Mr. President, a basic objective of this bill is to authorize a system of military training. The bill does not address itself merely to the shorter-term problem of maintaining a force of 3,500,000.

We feel that any raising of the induction age to 18 years and 6 months would do irreparable harm to that program for military training.

It would cut in half the period during which a young man could participate in this program. In actual practice, that would be bound to increase the number of training facilities required, and to allow almost no elasticity in choosing the period of the year—summer, winter, or fall—when training would be held. At least half of the trainees would be fairly well into their 19th year before they would have completed their training. The meeting of induction quotas on such a close schedule by the local boards would, as a practical matter, render a flexible and reasonable postponement policy extremely difficult, if not impossible. The disruption to the individual trainee's plans and his opportunity to exercise choice as to the time of his induction would be seriously increased.

The committee therefore concluded that it was unwise to set the induction age for the universal military training program at age 18 years and 6 months, in preference to age 18.

Mr. President, I believe that the remarks I have just made summarize the reasons why the committee recommends the induction age which appears in the bill.

I support the bill as it has been reported from the Armed Services Committee.

We realize that this issue is of fundamental importance. Our recommendation is based on the most thorough and complete examination of the evidence presented to us.

Mr. President, no person can predict what the Kremlin may do to again challenge the free world next week, next month, or next year. Our freedom and our life as a Nation may depend upon how rapidly we put our defenses in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest that we proceed to the consideration of, and vote on, the committee amendment, unless there is some other amendment to be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee to the bill, the amendment being in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. If we proceed with the committee amendment at this time, would that in any way foreclose me from offering my amendments in my own time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now before the Senate is the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. If it is agreed to, that will foreclose the offering of further amendments to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the suggestion of the Senator from Texas is that we now agree to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. The Chair did not understand that there was a motion that the Senate agree to any amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It was merely a suggestion, was it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon has any doubt about the matter, let me say that I have just suggested to the Chair that if no Member of the Senate is willing to call up an amendment, then let us proceed to the consideration of the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I submitted earlier today and asked that it be printed and lie on the table. It has not yet been printed; otherwise, I should be glad to have it brought up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | O'Mahoney |
| Cordon | Johnston, S. C. | Pastore |
| Ellender | Kem | Robertson |
| Ferguson | Lehman | Russell |
| Hayden | Long | Saltonstall |
| Hoey | McFarland | Smathers |
| Holland | McKellar | Thye |
| Humphrey | Martin | Williams |
| Hunt | Morse | |
| Johnson, Colo. | Murray | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ERICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. GEORGE, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. DOUGLAS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. WILEY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to the majority leader along the lines of a possible unanimous-consent agreement to fix the date on which to vote on the bill. Before I suggest any language for a unanimous-consent agreement, courtesy calls upon me first to ask the majority leader if there is any inclination at the present time to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, because I think it should flow from the majority leader and not from the acting minority leader.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, of course I should like to have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote, if a reasonable time could be fixed. This is important legislation. We ought to dispose of it by tomorrow evening, not next Wednesday or next week. We have boys fighting in Korea, who have been fighting there for some time, and who have not been relieved. This bill should have been passed in 2 days.

In my opinion, there will be no more important legislation before the Congress in this session than the legislation which is now under consideration. I do not believe that we should have unanimous-consent agreements in order to consider the amendments. I think we ought to be able to proceed in our regular and orderly manner and get through with the bill by Friday evening at the latest. I am not willing at this time to propose a unanimous-consent agreement to vote next Wednesday.

What have we accomplished today? We have had one speech on this bill—a very short speech and a good one—but that is the only progress made on this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the Senator that a part of the bill is emergency legislation. There can be no question about that. A part of the bill is designed to do the very thing which the Senator says it is supposed to do, that is, to relieve the situation in Korea, or wherever we must have manpower. The military is entitled to have whatever manpower it needs to carry out the program of the Government.

But that is not all that is contained in Senate bill 1. One part of the bill is emergency legislation. Another part of the bill would perhaps not be effective for 5 years. Is not Congress going to sit during the next 5 years? Will there not be intelligent Members of the Senate and of the House who can write a bill which may not be effective for 5 years? Why does such a proposal have to be pinned onto this bill and made a part of the emergency measure? That is the very thing that is delaying the passage of the bill today. It is the universal military training section, which I am told may not be used for 5 years.

Why must we plan so far ahead? If this is emergency legislation—and the Senator from Arizona has well stated that it is, and I believe that it is—I am ready now to vote for that part of the bill. However, as to the other part of the bill, I think we should give serious consideration to it. The country ought to understand it.

The bill as it is written, merging the two purposes, is almost impossible for me to understand. Perhaps other Senators can understand the bill better than I can; but I have great difficulty in understanding where the bill begins and where it ends, merging, as it does, universal military training on the one hand, and an extension and expansion of selective service on the other.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator's feelings with respect to the pending legislation. I will say to him that he has never unduly delayed the passage of any proposed legislation since I have been a Member of the Senate. He always has been anxious to expedite the work of the Senate. He has an amendment which proposes the elimination of one aspect of the pending bill. I hope that his amendment will not prevail. However, I do not see any reason why we cannot go ahead with the prompt consideration of all amendments and vote on them.

Why wait until next Wednesday or some other time? Why not start tonight or tomorrow to really work on this important bill? The boys in Korea are not waiting for a unanimous-consent agreement to act. They are acting today; and I think it is time for the Senate to act.

Let me say another thing while I am on my feet. Some Senators have said to me, "I must go here, or there, or I must do this, or that." I say, in a spirit of utmost kindness and good feeling, that there is no more important work for any Senator at this moment than that of the United States Senate. The time has come when Senators must be present. I should like to go to Arizona, where the sun is shining. It is a beautiful place. I should like to take other Senators with me. I hope that we can conclude our labors at a reasonable time this year so that Members may have some time to spend at home. That is going to be our aim. But we must have the complete cooperation of the Senate. On important emergency legislation such as this is, we cannot talk about entering into a unanimous-consent agreement for action to be taken a week ahead; we cannot get anywhere with that kind of procedure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply to the majority leader, as acting minority leader I wish to point out to the Senate that in the House a similar bill is not even out of committee yet. It has not been reported by the House committee. The House committee is still calling witnesses before it.

So far as the Senate is concerned, the pending bill was reported to the Senate only last Wednesday. The Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate have been holding joint meetings every day since the bill came to the floor of the Senate, except for the week end, and even then one hearing was had on Saturday. Many Members of the Senate have told me that they have not had an opportunity as yet to study all the sections of this very long bill.

The majority leader is correct in saying the bill is of utmost importance to the country. I want the RECORD to show that in discussion with the minority leader a few minutes ago he authorized me to offer to the Democratic leadership a unanimous-consent request to proceed to vote on the bill and amendments thereto, beginning next Wednesday at 3 p. m. If such an agreement were entered into it would, in my opinion, expedite the handling of the bill; and would dispose of the bill in the shortest possible period of time.

Mr. President, on this side of the aisle a number of speeches on the bill are being prepared for delivery tomorrow and Friday and the first part of next week. It is for the majority leader to decide what course of action parliamentarily he wishes to follow. If he does not want to enter into a unanimous-consent

agreement we will proceed with the bill amendment by amendment, but it is my honest opinion that we would save time if he accepted the suggestion that we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to start voting on the bill and amendments thereto next Wednesday at 3 p. m. Because the bill is of such great importance, Mr. President, it should not be handled quickly on the floor of the Senate without adequate debate. I am sure that it is going to be subjected to full debate between now and next Wednesday.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a brief observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely want to say that I think we are all sensible of the fact that the unanimous-consent rule does not operate in Korea, but we are equally sensible of the fact that there is an effective operating draft act on the books right now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be the last one to wish unduly to hasten the bill through the Senate. I do not believe in shutting off any Member from discussing any point or any amendment he might care to discuss or propose. But it seems to me that we could at least proceed with the measure in an orderly fashion. I do not know whether or not it will be possible to vote finally upon the bill by Wednesday. I had hoped we would be able to pass the bill this week. I think we could have disposed of a number of amendments had they been proposed, brought forward and discussed as individual propositions, and votes taken on them.

The unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from Oregon, as I understood it, was to proceed to vote upon the bill and all amendments thereto, at 3 o'clock p. m. on Wednesday next. I think it would be very unfortunate to have a unanimous-consent agreement of that kind now. In the first place Members of the Senate should remain and hear the discussion on the bill. If a unanimous-consent agreement were entered into there would be an exodus of Senators from Washington tomorrow afternoon, and they would return here on Tuesday and would have had no opportunity to hear such statements as might have been made on the bill during that time.

There are a number of important amendments proposed to the bill. I am not contending that the bill is sacrosanct or that it should not be amended. The Senate has a right to amend the bill in any manner it sees fit. But I know that the Senate should not come here on Wednesday at 3 o'clock, and have the amendments read from the desk, and then vote on one after the other, when Senators could not possibly understand all the details involved in the amendments. That is a very unsatisfactory way to deal with important amendments to an important bill. The bill is an important one. It deals not only with the defense of the United States, but with the lives and the safety of thousands of our young men. That is my primary objection to the suggestion.

I have seen unanimous-consent requests of this nature on important bills proposed and agreed to. Then the clerk would read a long, involved amendment from the desk, and Senators who had been out of town and had not heard the amendment discussed would be compelled to vote on it, and I have seen some very bad legislation as a result of procedure of that kind.

I hope we can proceed with this bill in an orderly way, and that amendments which are proposed may be fully discussed. Any Member who desires to discuss them should have all the time he desires to do so. But we have had the bill before us all day today. One general speech has been made on the bill. I do not think any amendment has been called up and brought to the attention of the Senate. It seems to me in the case of a measure of this kind that on tomorrow any Senator who has an amendment he desires to propose should do so. The amendment can then be discussed, Senators will be present and will understand it, and the amendment can be voted on. Then another amendment can be proposed, and an orderly procedure followed, in an endeavor to see if we cannot make some progress with the bill.

It is true, as the Senator from Illinois has indicated, that the draft act does not expire, as I believe, until July 31 of this year. But I should like to point out that there are thousands of young men who are undertaking to plan their lives, and it would be very unfortunate if we were to wait until the 30th of July to take action on the bill. The boys of America are entitled to know exactly what will be required of them by the legislation at the very earliest possible date, in order that they may make their plans, as to whether they are going into the Army, or are going to school. The decisions they must make are very important to them.

I am not trying to cram the bill down anyone's throat. Any such idea is repugnant to me and is contrary to all I have ever stood for as long as I have been honored by being a Member of the Senate. But I hope the attendance on the floor can be good, in order that we may make progress. We cannot make good progress with proposed legislation when only a handful of Senators are on the floor.

On so important a bill as this—and everyone agrees it is important—it seems to me that any Senator who has an amendment to propose should offer it, and it can be discussed as fully as any Senator may desire. Then we might vote on it and proceed to another amendment, to the end that at some time we may conclude consideration of the bill, after having proceeded in a fair manner and in such a way as to assure the very best legislation when we have reached the time to vote upon final passage.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Georgia is aware of the fact, is he not, that a large number of committees are meeting during the afternoon of each day?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I am fully aware of that fact.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator be willing to cancel such committee meetings in order to have a full attendance of the membership of the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I certainly would.

Mr. WATKINS. The request has been made in some cases, as I remember, by the majority leader himself, that Members of the Senate be excused to enable them to attend committee meetings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the majority leader to make the announcement—during the consideration of this bill today—that he would object to any further meetings of committees in the afternoon, in order to assure the very best attendance in the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I stated that beginning tomorrow I would object to committee meetings during the sessions of the Senate while this bill is under consideration. I did not object today, because it was my thought that a number of the committees already had called witnesses before them today. But beginning tomorrow I am going to object to committees sitting while the pending legislation is under consideration.

Will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I realize that perhaps we would obtain a vote much more quickly if we entered into the proposed agreement. But I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia that amendments to legislation of this importance should not be considered in that manner.

It has been our experience that once we enter into such agreements, we might as well proceed to the consideration of some other measure in the interval between the time of the entering into the agreement and the time when the voting is to occur pursuant to the agreement. In the present case, if an agreement not to vote on this measure before next Wednesday were entered, our experience would indicate that little would be done on this measure before next Wednesday, for once such an agreement is entered into, further dscussion of the proposed legislation does not seem to get us anywhere; and during the interval of time preceding the vote on the bill, we generally find that only two or three Senators are on the floor, and that it is often impossible to obtain a quorum.

I do not wish to take the responsibility for causing that much delay in taking final action on this measure. If some other Senator wishes to do so, that is his responsibility.

I think we should proceed to the consideration of the amendments and should vote on them in an orderly way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope that will be done. Of course I fully realize that the resourceful Senator from Oregon can see to it that the Senate will

not vote on any amendments before Wednesday of next week, if he desires to do so. However, I hope and trust that he will not see fit to take that course, but that he will bring up his amendments, with some of which I have considerable sympathy, in order that we may discuss them and may dispose of them in an orderly way, rather than forestall the taking of any action whatever until Wednesday.

I realize that the Senator from Oregon has a right to postpone the taking of action until that time; and if he sees fit to do so, no word of criticism will fall from my lips. However, I hope the Senator from Oregon will not take that course.

I realize that he can talk about the question of whose ox is being gored, and that there would be considerable merit to a discussion of that kind.

Nevertheless, I express the definite and strong hope that we may proceed in an orderly fashion on the amendments, without attempting to stifle or gag any Senator, in order that we may conclude action on this measure, and then may proceed to the consideration of other measures.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; or I am willing to yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to keep the record straight.

Mr. President, the suggestion of a unanimous-consent agreement to have the Senate vote on this measure next Wednesday was a result of my cooperative endeavor after the majority leader came to me, earlier in the day, and in a good-natured way suggested that in connection with an effort to expedite the passage of this bill, he wondered whether there could be an agreement in regard to voting on the amendments and on the question of the final passage of the bill.

I think it should also be said, because the Senator from Arizona is a man who always plays the game with his cards on the top of the table, that when I suggested that the agreement be for next Wednesday, he said, "You had better think about having the agreement for next Tuesday."

I said, "No; I think that would be too soon."

However, I called the minority leader and talked to him, and then came back with the proposal I have suggested.

Mr. President, Senators should not think that any responsibility for delay on the bill will be left on the doorstep of the junior Senator from Oregon, because I am going to kick it off the doorstep now. I wish to say that the offer of a cooperative agreement was the product, so far as I am concerned, of a very friendly conversation with the Senator from Arizona. If he does not wish to have the Senate enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, that is agreeable to me; and then we can go ahead with the regular course of business, and can consider the amendments one by one. However, when we come to next Wednesday and then discover, as I think we shall, that we have not gotten as far with the bill as we would have by means of such a unanimous-consent agreement, I shall ask that Senators remember that I tried to cooperate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, in order to permit me to reply to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I know that any proposal made by the Senator from Oregon is a friendly one, and I wish to say that any proposal I may make is equally sincere.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon which of his amendments he desires to call up first, and also whether we shall be able to reach a vote on that amendment at some time tomorrow, after agreeing to a division of the time available for debate on it. Does not the Senator think that would be the most orderly way to proceed, so that we could vote on that amendment; and, then, perhaps we could reach an agreement to vote on the next amendment, and thus we could get one amendment at a time out of the way.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, inasmuch as he has been discussing this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to assure the majority leader that I shall advise him at 12 o'clock tomorrow as to what amendment I wish to call up. I make that statement now because I am having some of the amendments redrafted and am having some star prints made. They will be on the desks of Senators tomorrow noon. So I will be willing to enter into the discussion of this matter at noon tomorrow, but I will not be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to have the Senate vote on any of the amendments tomorrow. I make that statement now because I wish to assure my colleagues that I shall see to it that adequate time is made available for discussion of the amendments which I shall offer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon says he thinks we shall reach a vote on the amendments by Wednesday. I am glad the Senator has made that statement, because so often have I heard the Senator from Oregon condemn the making of unanimous-consent agreements as being entirely contrary to the policy under which the Senate operates, that I must confess that when the Senator from Oregon first made such a proposal in connection with this measure the thought which came into my mind was, "Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts," or perhaps I should say, "Beware of Oregonians bearing gifts."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Georgia appreciates the fact that I have given a very clear demonstration of cooperation in connection with this matter, because, so far as I individually am concerned, I should prefer not to have any unanimous-consent agreement at all.

On the other hand, in view of the fact that this particular debate involves some of my own amendments, I thought it would be very selfish of me to insist upon my own preferences, so far as unanimous-consent agreements are concerned, and I was willing to go along with such an agreement as the one I offered to enter into, in conversation with the majority leader.

However, having made that offer of cooperation and having had it rejected by Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle, I now shall be perfectly willing to let the procedure of the Senate run its normal course; and we shall take up the amendments as we come to them, one at a time, and shall devote to each of them whatever time is required for debate.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Utah, I merely wish to observe that, upon considering the nature of the amendments of the Senator from Oregon and the nature of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, I think it is still fairly well for us to beware of the gifts the Senator has brought.

Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader will not propose any unanimous-consent agreements in connection with this measure, at least not for the next 2 days, for the reason that—after listening to the very persuasive argument of the Senator from Georgia, which argument has been concurred in by the majority leader—I am almost convinced that unanimous-consent agreements produce bad legislation, not good legislation. Of course, I am sent here to work for good legislation. Therefore, I am inclined to object to any unanimous-consent agreements, unless the Senator can produce arguments sufficient to convince me that we should enter into them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is wholly within his rights in proposing to object to unanimous-consent agreements, and he has served notice that he will do so.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that we should proceed as rapidly as we can in the fashion in which the Senate has operated now for some decades.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Georgia takes his seat, I wish to have the RECORD show clearly that it was the effective eloquence of the Senator from Georgia that persuaded me that we should not have a unanimous-consent agreement in connection with a bill of this kind, in view of its importance and in view of the fact that by entering into a unanimous-consent agreement in connection with the consideration of the bill, we might thus obtain some bad legislation on the subject. After all, the bill will affect many of the young men of the country, and we should not have bad legislation on such a subject. The Senator from Georgia did make that statement; did he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that I was opposed to unanimous-consent agreements whereby we would have to vote upon 25 or 30 amendments without having any

explanation made of them. If the Senator from Utah cannot see any difference between a unanimous-consent agreement which requires us to vote upon a great mass of amendments which affect every feature of this bill, and other unanimous-consent agreements which might permit of orderly procedure, he can, within his rights, object.

Mr. WATKINS. I think I can see the difference, all right; but many a piece of legislation of importance has many amendments proposed to it, and the same argument can be made against almost any unanimous-consent agreement which might be proposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. And time and again I have made it. I have said that it is bad practice to have a unanimous-consent agreement which requires the Senate to vote upon many amendments at one time, without having any explanation made of them. That is the position of the junior Senator from Georgia. I have made that statement time and again.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not imply that there was anything wrong; but I want to have my position made clear, and I want the RECORD to show it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have the point of view expressed by the Senator from Utah, even though the bill is one in which I happen to have unusual interest.

Mr. WATKINS. I have the same interest, and I am in favor of legislation on this subject. I am in favor of doing everything we can for the boys in Korea, but they are not the only boys we have now, whose lives might be at stake. I want this measure to be carefully considered. If we can vote by Monday, or by tomorrow night, I shall be very happy about it. Still, I think it is one of the measures, as the Senator from Georgia pointed out, which should be considered very carefully, and we should not arrive at any point on Wednesday or at any other time, when we shall consider 25 amendments merely by reading them, and then be required to vote without knowing what is in them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute for the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has any business been transacted since the previous quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, Mr. President, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the appeal from the decision of the Chair. (Putting the question.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" seem to have it. The "ayes" have it, and the decision of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is evident that we shall be unable to transact any business this evening on the pending bill. It is my hope that we shall proceed tomorrow in an orderly manner, and that we shall be able to make some progress. With that hope, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years, expiring December 31, 1952, vice Harold Armstrong Jones, resigned.

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph E. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 7, 1951.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Mar. 2, 1951
For actions of Mar. 1, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 37

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....8
Appropriations.....2
Banking and currency.....7
Buildings and grounds....29
C.C.C.....23
Civil defense.....2
Claims.....17
Cotton.....8
Dairy industry.....23
Defense production....20,31
Electrification.....27
Farm production.....2
Foods, surplus.....23
Foreign affairs, aid,3,8,15
Forests and forestry.2,4,16
Fuels.....21
Grain.....3,19
Inflation.....5,12
Insect control.....2
Law.....22
Legislative program.....8
Military training.....9
Minerals.....18
National defense.....
.....2,10,12,30,31
Newsprint.....4
Peanuts.....1,8,28
Personnel.....6,11
Postal rates.....25
Prices, support.....23
Purchasing.....17
Roads.....2,16
Selective service.....26
Small business.....30
Soil conservation.....24
Trade foreign.....14,18,23
Transportation.....19,27
Water utilization.....13

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared peanut-quota bill. House committee voted to report aid-to-India bill. Senate debated military-training bill. House received various appropriation estimates for this Department.

## HOUSE

1. PEANUTS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2615, relating to acreage allotments and marketing quotas on peanuts (p. 1805).

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President requests for appropriations, which were referred to the Appropriations Committee, as follows: (p. 1805)

Supplementals for 1951 (H. Doc. 67). It is understood that these items include $370,000 for forest-pest control, $5,800,000 for forest development roads and trails, $1,351,150 for payment to 15 States representing that part of collections from grazing permittees not heretofore paid to these States, and authority to use $1,750,000 of the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota appropriation (1951) for assistance to farmers in obtaining equipment and supplies for food production in connection with national defense.

Budget amendments for 1952 (H. Doc. 66). It is understood that these items include $3,150,000 for forest-pest control, a reduction of $10,750 for the Office of Hearing Examiners, and a change in the name of the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota appropriation to "Agricultural production programs" with authorization for use of part of this appropriation for providing production guides and assistance in obtaining equipment and supplies.

Federal Civil Defense Administration (H. Doc. 68), $403,000,000, for 1951.

Defense production, 1951, $51,000,000 (H. Doc. 69).

3. AID TO INDIA. The Foreign Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 3017, to authorize a grant of not to exceed $190,000,000 for food grains to alleviate famine in India (p. D141).

4. NEWSPRINT. The Rules Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 116, to direct the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint (H. Rept. 183)(p. 1805).

5. INFLATION. Rep. Abernethy, Miss., deplored the "walk-out" of organized labor from the anti-inflation program (p. 1798).

6. PERSONNEL. Chairman Murray of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Majority Leader McCormack, and others commended Harry B. Mitchell, the retiring Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and Robert Ramspeck, the new nominee as a Civil Service Commissioner (pp. 1798, 1803).

7. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Received from the President the report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (H. Doc. 70) (pp. 1797-8). Also received in the Senate (p. 1759).

8. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 5 (p. 1804). Legislative program for next week, as announced by Majority Leader McCormack: Mon., consent calendar; Tues., private calendar and peanut-quotas bill; probably Wed. or Thurs., defense-housing bill and aid-to-India bill. During this announcement Rep. Rankin asked if there was "any chance for our getting an amendment on the bill for the relief of cotton growers who are being robbed of about $135 a bale on their cotton now by this attempt to fix the price or to hold it down." (p. 1797.)

## SENATE

9. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military-training, selective-service bill (pp. 1763-5, 1773-95).

10. NATIONAL DEFENSE. The report of the Alaskan Task Force of the Preparedness Subcommittee, Committee on Armed Services, was ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 10 (pp. 1761-2).

11. PERSONNEL. The "Daily Digest" states that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee "referred back to subcommittee for further study S. 621, to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, regarding rates of compensation, and ordered further consideration of S. 198, to provide maternity leave for Government employees." The Committee also "postponed indefinitely five bills, as follows: S. Res. 25, S. 189, 192, 402, and 403, regarding hospitalization, pay increases, living standards, and erroneous suspension." (p. D140.)

12. INFLATION. Sen. O'Mahoney discussed a committee print of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, "The Economic and Political Hazards of an Inflationary Defense Economy," and urged increased taxes to curb inflation and pay for increased defense spending on a current basis (pp. 1762-3).

13. WATER UTILIZATION. Received a S. Dak. Legislature resolution favoring the sealing of existing wells within the areas to be flooded by the Missouri River dams in S. Dak. (p. 1759).

14. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Malone spoke in favor of his bill, S. 951, to create a Foreign Trade Authority to administer the trade-agreements program and handle other aspects of foreign trade (pp. 1772-3).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

15. FOREIGN AID. H. R. 3017, by Rep. Morgan, Pa., to furnish emergency food-relief assistance to India; to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 1805). See item 3.

16. FORESTS. H. J. Res. 178, by Rep. Stockman, Oreg., to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the U. S.; to

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 83, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 19 on page 84.

On page 84, line 20, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d) (1)".

On page 86, line 10, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 86, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".

On page 86, line 18, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

On page 87, strike out lines 14 through 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction; if—

"(A) he is enrolled as a freshman;

"(B) he is enrolled as a sophomore and ranked in the upper half of his freshman class;

"(C) he is enrolled as a junior and ranked in the upper two-thirds of his sophomore class;

"(D) he is enrolled as a senior and ranked in the upper three-fourths of his junior class; or

"(E) he is pursuing, or has been accepted by an established graduate school to pursue, a course of study leading to a graduate degree and ranked in the upper half of his senior class.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'full-time course of instruction' shall mean a course of instruction which requires the enrollment of a student for a period equivalent to eleven and one-half months out of each calendar year. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

One page 91, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new subsections:

"(aa) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"'SEC. 22. (a) The Federal Security Agency acting through the Office of Education is authorized to make loans to students attending universities, colleges, and similar institutions, and deferred pursuant to the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of this title. Such loans shall not exceed the sum of $100 a month and shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum. Repayment of such loans, together with interest thereon, shall be made by annual payments equal to 25 per centum of the borrower's annual Federal tax liability computed pursuant to chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, with the privilege of making larger repayments if the borrower so desires.

"'(b) The Federal Security Agency is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States for use in making such loans, but the amount so obtained shall not exceed a total of $ at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed $ are hereby authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to such Agency from the revolving fund when requested by such Agency and any repayments

of such advances shall be credited directly to such revolving fund.'

"(bb) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"'SEC. 23. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title every two years after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act with a view of determining whether the international situation necessitates a review of the provisions of this title.'"

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: On page 91, beginning with line 25, strike out all through line 4 on page 92 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of three million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this Act."

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

The evidence submitted to the committee and analyzed by the staff shows that already spending units in the low-income brackets, particularly below $3,000 per year, are carrying such a relatively high tax burden, including all taxes—Federal, State, and local—and their consumption is so low that additional tax burdens on these low-income groups will interfere with production and harm the defense effort. The evidence shows that the additional taxes largely have to fall on those with incomes above $3,000 per year. Evidence submitted to the committee shows that the approximately 2,500,000 spending units with incomes in excess of $7,500 spent nearly 3 times as much on durable goods as did the 17,000,000 spending units getting less than $2,000. About half of the Nation's spending units get about $3,000 or less but they account for only about three-tenths of total consumer expenditures.

The staff report indicates a wide area of agreement that unless present direct controls over wages, prices, and production are backed up early enough and vigorously enough with tax increases our monetary system would permit an increase in prices to a level easily five times higher than the present. This could happen even if the United States Treasury did not borrow a single additional nickel.

The report presents evidence of the well-known fact that inflation is the enemy's sixth column. Examples are shown of several countries, including Austria, Eastern Germany, Hungary, Rumania, France, Italy, and China, in which inflation has served the purposes of communism. As one observer, quoted in the report, states:

> Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the capitalist system was to debauch the currency. * * * Lenin was certainly right. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose (p. 19).

It is significant that, almost without exception, every country suffering a run-away inflation in recent years has not only had rigorous laws on the books providing for direct controls over prices, wages, and materials, but virtually astronomical interest rates and drastic penalties for noncompliance.

This staff study indicates that without prompt tax increases, prices could continue to rise at the rate experienced from June to December 1950. This might bring the consumers price index by June 1951 to a level 10 percent above June 1950 while wholesale prices might reach a level almost 22 percent above June 1950. Spiraling wage and price pressures could easily carry the price level far beyond this.

All the destructive elements which history and economic analysis show to be necessary to disintegration of the currency and destructive run-away inflation are as prevalent here in the United States as in almost any country in which hyperinflation has ever occurred.

So, Mr. President, the task must be met; and I am sure that Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives and the people of the country will find interest in reading this document, which may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents at 25 cents a copy. I make this announcement and have made the arrangements for the sale of the document, because I feel that those who are interested in obtaining the information should be willing to help contribute in a little way toward paying the cost of getting it out.

## THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, February 16, 1951, marked the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This republic declared its independence on February 16, 1918. It was free and independent until May 15, 1940, when, by force of arms, it was brutally occupied by the Russian Communists. The same fate fell on the unfortunate people of Latvia and Estonia. The Russian Politburo took advantage of the war to snuff out the independence of these brave but small states.

Since that time, the godless Russian Communists have deported hundreds of thousands of unfortunate Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to the forced labor camps in Siberia, where their only escape is a slow and lingering death.

The United States has fortunately never recognized the occupation of these countries by Russia. But I believe we should do more than simply withhold recognition. Mr. President, I am only one Senator, but I want to raise my voice against this ruthless exploitation and enslavement of these valiant peoples. And I think it shows, without any doubt, the type of country and the type of system we are dealing with. We must stop this evil philosophy which clearly seems bent on taking over and enslaving all the peoples of the world; and ultimately Lithuania, like the other Baltic peoples, must be free and independent. May the Lord speed the coming of that day.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To Senate bill 1 the Committee on Armed Services has reported an amendment in the nature of a substitute. To the substitute there is no pending amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would like to be recognized. However, since, under the present plans of the distinguished majority leader, his address could not be concluded prior to the time when I understand a certain ceremony is scheduled to take place, he would rather wait until later.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the President of the United States expects to visit the Senate at 12:30 o'clock. Notice has not been given of the visit. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the call of the roll be announced with one ring instead of the usual two rings. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hayden | Maybank |
| Anderson | Hendrickson | Millikin |
| Bennett | Hennings | Monroney |
| Brewster | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Bricker | Hill | Mundt |
| Bridges | Hoey | Murray |
| Butler, Md. | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Nebr. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Byrd | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Cain | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Capehart | Jenner | Pastore |
| Carlson | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Case | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Chapman | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kem | Schoeppel |
| Connally | Kerr | Smathers |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Dirksen | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Langer | Sparkman |
| Dworshak | Lehman | Stennis |
| Eastland | Lodge | Taft |
| Ecton | Long | Thye |
| Ellender | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Watkins |
| Frear | McFarland | Welker |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Wherry |
| George | McMahon | Wiley |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Williams |
| Green | Malone | Young |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I stated before the quorum call a few moments ago, the President of the United States is here and wishes to address the Senate. I ask that the Vice President appoint a committee of two Senators to escort the President to the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from Arizona wish the Senate to take a recess while the committee prepares to escort the President to the floor?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President, but I ask that no business be transacted in the meantime.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. The Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to escort the President into the Chamber.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. WHERRY, entered

the Senate Chamber and was greeted with applause, Senators rising.

The President having taken the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk,

The VICE PRESIDENT said: Members of the Senate, it has long been a trite saying that criminals return to the scene of their crimes sooner or later. [Laughter.] We are happy to have with us today, not a criminal, but a former Member who has returned, not to the scene of his crimes, but to the scene of his triumphs when he was a Member of this body. It is an unexpected pleasure, I am sure, to most of you, as it is to me, that the President has in his busy days seen fit to come here for some purpose which I am sure is worthy. [Laughter.]

It gives me great pleasure to recognize, in the sense, as lawyers would say, of "nunc pro tunc," the Senator from Missouri, Mr. Truman. [Applause, Senators rising.]

PRESENTATION OF GAVEL TO THE VICE PRESIDENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, I wish it were a fact that I was returning permanently to the scene of my former crimes and misdemeanors, which got me into more trouble than perhaps any other man in the world has ever experienced. [Laughter.] But I am here for a specific purpose today.

On March 4, which will be Sunday, your Presiding Officer, the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, and the former leader of the majority—leader for longer than any other man in the history of the Senate—will have served 38 years in the Congress of the United States. To commemorate that event, I have had the White House carpenters make him a gavel out of wood which was put into the White House in 1817, after the fire, and was removed in 1949, during the reconstruction of the building.

I have had this inscription placed on the outside of the box:

This box and gavel were made from wood in rebuilding the White House about 1817; removed in 1949.

Then I had this inscription placed on the gavel, which I am sure the Members of the Senate will agree is justly deserved:

To the Vice President of the United States, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, to commemorate 38 years of continuous service in the Congress of the United States.

I have signed it as President, and dated it "The White House, March 4, 1951."

The President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, has a record, when it comes to speechmaking, of having no terminal facilities; but in his position as Presiding Officer of the Senate he never has the opportunity or the right to demonstrate his "no terminal facilities" capacity. Yet I am sure that today the Senate, by unanimous consent, is going to give him a chance to reply to me, for presenting him with this gavel.

Mr. Vice President, I hope you will use it for the welfare of the Government.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

REPLY BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. President, I am glad you have resumed your seat, because I am going to make a speech. [Laughter.]

I appreciate more than I can express your thoughtfulness in presenting to me this gavel, approximately on the thirty-eighth anniversary of my entrance into service in the Congress, on March 4, 1913, at the beginning of the Woodrow Wilson administration. During those 38 years, momentous events have transpired, that have changed the face of the earth—events which in their shadow may stretch across the centuries, to affect the welfare of mankind.

It is one of the human weaknesses with which all of us are familiar, though probably "weaknesses" is not the correct word, for it is a desirable quality, to collect souvenirs—souvenirs of events, souvenirs of men, souvenirs of institutions.

I think it is a good trait, an admirable trait, that actuates all men and women and children to gather together mementos of various kinds commemorating events of importance in their lives or in the lives of others. I have had given to me, for instance, a gavel made out of the elm tree that George Washington planted in front of the Capitol, on the Capitol grounds. Of course I cherish it.

I have a gavel made from walnut wood in the home of old Judge Bishop, in whose law office I was a stenographer and law student. He was the original of Irving Cobb's Judge Priest stories, which are so delightful. Many persons reading those stories thought Judge Priest was a fictitious character; but he was a great judge, and served on the bench for 17 years in the district in which I live and was born.

Over the 38-year period which represents my service in the Congress, I have collected many souvenirs representing events in which I participated or institutions in which I was interested or occasions which it seemed worth while to commemorate. But none of these, Mr. President, do I appreciate more than or as much as I do this gavel, which you have given me, made from timber taken from the White House in its reconstruction.

I cannot promise you that this gavel will enable me to quiet all the mental disorders which now and then afflict us here as a body [laughter], but I shall try at least to keep physical order in the Senate by the use of this gavel. I am sure the sentiment connected with it will be so respected by the Members of the Senate and our visitors in the gallery that whenever I rap for order with it, immediate quiet will ensue. [Laughter.]

It is not an inappropriate thing that you have done, Mr. President. When I was a boy in school my teachers told me that some day I would be President of the United States [laughter]—that I had all the qualifications, for I was born in a log cabin and worked my way through college as a janitor, and that fitted me in an additional way to be President of the United States. [Laughter.] I have disappointed those teachers; I have not made the White House; I have not been able to enter it in the capacity in which they predicted I would. So it is very gracious and thoughtful of you to bring a part of the White House to me. [Laughter.]

I greatly appreciate what you have done. Not only shall I treasure this beautiful gavel as long as I live but I shall hand it down to my children and to theirs with the deep appreciation which I feel not only for your thoughtfulness as President of the United States in presenting it to me but in token of the warm, heartfelt friendship and comradeship which existed between you and me when you were here in the Senate for 10 years, which existed between you and me when you became President and I was still majority leader of the Senate, and a little later, unfortunately, minority leader of the Senate [laughter], and which likewise has existed since you have been the President of the United States and I have been the Vice President.

The President frequently says that no President and Vice President ever got along as well as he and I get along. I have an explanation for that: The reason is that I have let him have his way about everything. [Laughter.] But, regardless of that, it has been a very happy association, which I greatly cherish and appreciate.

This gavel is one of the evidences of the human quality which you, Mr. President, possess, and which makes so many people love you and appreciate you and respect you because you are human. As Artemus Ward, the great American humorist, once said:

One man has as much human nature in him as another, if not more.

Sometimes you may appear to have more, Mr. President. [Laughter.] That is a quality which all of us admire.

Let me from the bottom of my heart thank you for this gracious act on your part in commemorating a period that represents almost my entire adult life in Washington, while attempting as best I could to serve the people of the United States. I deeply appreciate your kindness. [Applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT. It is good to be here, and I wish I were back with you. [Laughter and applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. While the Senate is in recess, the President will be glad to have any Senators, who wish to, greet him on the floor, where he served with such distinction, for so long.

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m. when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEY in the chair).

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the com-

mon defense by establishing a universal military training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it printed and lie on the table. It is an amendment which proposes to place a 3,000,000 manpower ceiling on the Military Establishment until July 1, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask permission to call up and to have made the pending question my amendment marked "D," which provides for 18½ years as the age for compulsory induction, but leaves to the individual the privilege of presenting himself for induction at 18 years of age, if he so desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 72, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "word 'eighteen'" and insert in lieu thereof "words 'eighteen years and six months'."

On page 80, line 9, to strike out "(1)."

On page 81, beginning with line 10, to strike out all down to and including line 4 on page 82.

On page 82, beginning with line 8, to strike out all down to and including line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" the following: "and prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment ordered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding.

## AN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, 93 years ago, Abraham Lincoln, in a speech at Springfield, Ill., declared, "If we could first know where we are, and wither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it." That statement by the immortal Lincoln is just as much in point today as it was in 1858. We must find out just where we stand in the world. We must make up our minds where we are going. Then we can better judge what to do, and how to do it.

Shall we continue our present policy of furnishing men, arms, and dollars to a circle of countries around Russia and her satellites—the Truman-Acheson doctrine? Or shall we adopt a new kind of foreign policy—a more realistic policy—an American foreign policy?

### WE MUST NOT SPEND OURSELVES TO OUR DESTRUCTION

Of one thing we may be certain. That is, the Reds mean to destroy us. We have Lenin's word for it:

As long as capitalism remains we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism.

The danger faces us both at home and abroad. Our Nation can be destroyed just as thoroughly by bankruptcy within as by conquest from without.

There is every reason to believe the Reds prefer to bring about our downfall without risking war—that is by bleeding us white—by destroying our economy.

We must never allow ourselves to forget the Russian slogan, "We will cause the Americans to spend themselves to their destruction."

The plans we adopt must be geared to our capacity to perform. They must be carefully drawn in the light of both our assets and our liabilities.

### THE TRUMAN-ACHESON DOCTRINE HAS BEEN GIVEN A COSTLY TEST—IT HAS FAILED

According to the Truman-Acheson doctrine the United States will strike down aggression whever it raises its head. The latest installment is the project to send American troops to Western Europe to become part of an integrated international army under the control of the Standing Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. One fact is becoming more apparent every day: We do not have the resources to continue the Truman-Acheson doctrine in all its phases. It has been given a fair test; a costly test, and it has been found wanting. There is no reason to believe it would be any more successful in the future than it has been in the past.

Since World War II, more than $45,000,000,000 of money taken from the American people—more than $300 for every man, woman, and child in the United States—has been sent by the administration to some 80 foreign countries. Since World War II the Federal Government has given away to countries abroad more than 18 percent of all the taxes it has collected from the American people. I am from Missouri. Is it not about time we were shown some results?

The most lavish of all the administration's foreign spending schemes is the ill-fated Marshall plan for Western Europe. More than $10,000,000,000 has already been funneled to 16 participating countries.

Late last fall I visited five countries in Central America as a member of a Senate committee making an investigation of the Inter-American Highway.

I found people there were resentful of the fact that the United States had not seen fit to include them in the Marshall plan. The Marshall plan, they said, is supposed to aid people to resist communism and raise the standard of living.

"We have those problems, too," they said. "We think foreign aid, like charity, should begin nearer home."

"We are your next-door neighbors. Why don't you do more for us?"

This all proves that we cannot solve all the problems in the world. It proves that we lose good will by picking out some countries and showering gifts on them and overlooking others.

What have our generous gifts from Bretton Woods to the Marshall plan accomplished? The facts speak for themselves.

Our foreign gifts have not proved to be insurance against war, as we were told they would be. We are now in one war and preparing for another. Our foreign gifts have not bought us any friends. We have fewer friends than we had at the end of World War II. Great Britain has received more than $7,000,000,000 from us since the end of World War II, yet she was willing to shake the bloody hand of Mao Tse-tung as soon as he had finished ravaging China. Great Britain today is shipping vast quantities of war materials through Hong Kong to Communist China.

Have we not had enough of this nonsense of trying to purchase friendship abroad? Have we not had enough of this silly business of trying to ward off war with hand-outs?

There is an old Greek saying, "Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad." It is madness to assume that the United States can undertake to solve all of the world's political and economic problems—wherever they may occur. It is madness to assume that this country, with 6 percent of the world's population, can effectively garrison a multithousand-mile perimeter all around the Communist bloc.

Powerful as the United States is, there are very definite limits to our resources, both human and material.

At our peak strength in World War II, we had 95 divisions under arms, 89 Army and 6 Marine Corps. Russia and her satellites, including Red China, now have some 275 divisions in their active ground forces, and probably as many in reserve. It is obvious, on a cold-blooded mathematical basis, we have no troops to fritter away in more foolish military adventures on the mainland of Europe or Asia. Hitler hurled 240 German divisions, with powerful air and tank forces, against Russia and yet failed to reach Moscow.

### THE BITTER LESSON OF EXPERIENCE

Before 1917, when our foreign policy was changed from the Monroe Doctrine to interventionism, America was sound to the core. Our well-balanced and smoothly functioning economy was a marvel to the rest of the world. Our people were busily engaged in spiritual and material development. During the last 33 years we have involved ourselves in two and a half world wars. We have spilled a tragic amount of American blood.

What have we now to show for these foreign adventures? Some of the best of our manhood—killed or wounded; a public debt of astronomical proportions; the danger of uncontrolled inflation; the threatened ruin of our economic system; and a world in turmoil.

Five years ago we emerged victorious from a terrible war with Germany and Japan, Russia's natural enemies. Now we are told we should rearm Germany and Japan so we can use them against our former ally. Have we not had enough of this Alice in Wonderland fantasy?

It has been said that if all our policy-makers in the State Department were laid end to end, they would still point in all directions.

Many years ago Prof. William Sumner, of Yale, pointed out the marvelous opportunity the people of this continent had to avoid the mistakes of Europe.

Professor Sumner said that the geographic separation of the two Americas made it possible for men to make a new start here. "It was a marvelous opportunity," he said. "It seems incredible that it ever could have been offered. The men who founded this Republic recognized it and tried to use it. It is we who are now here who have thrown it away; we have decided that instead of working out the advantages of it by peace, industry, and thrift, we would rather do it in the old way by war and glory, alternate victory and calamity, adventurous enterprises, grand finance, and power government. Future ages will look back to us with amazement and reproach that we should have made such a choice in the face of such an opportunity and should have entailed on them the consequences, for the opportunity will never come again."

Our ancestors came to this country to escape from the cockpit of Europe. In Western Europe wars occurring at periodic intervals since the dawn of history not only killed off millions of people but reduced the standard of the majority to a mere subsistence level. Our ancestors dreamed of better things in America for themselves and their descendants. Now we are told that we must continue to buy stock in the same old business of wars and rumors of wars. We are told that our frontier has new been fixed at the River Elbe. We are told we have a moral obligation to do this. How about our moral obligation to save the young men of America from massacre and slaughter?

ARE WE GETTING OURSELVES INTO ANOTHER KOREA?

When things go well, our friends overseas are all for us. But when things go badly, they drag their feet. Our fair-weather friends on the bench talk a good game. They like to coach. They want us to provide the uniforms, do all the blocking, carry the ball, and collect almost all the headaches and almost all the bloody noses. We need friends with cool heads, not with cold feet. We need friends who want to play the game.

General Bradley disclosed a few days ago that some 250,000 Americans are now fighting in Korea, not including air or naval forces. Recently, Navy officials said that 90,000 officers and men were assigned to Korean waters. The Air Force has not disclosed its strength in Korea, but it is substantial. I think it is safe to estimate that at least 400,000 Americans are now serving in Korea.

And how about the other 58 United Nations? It was disclosed yesterday that they have sent only 40,000 troops to Korea—1 for every 10 American soldiers there.

American boys have borne the brunt of the fighting in Korea. They have suffered at least 90 percent of the casualties. Have we any assurance that other UN nations will be any more ready and any more willing to fight in Europe? Are we getting ourselves into another Korea?

At first the people of Europe asked for economic aid and we gave them the Marshall plan. Then they asked for arms, and we gave them the military assistance program—MAP. Now it is apparent that they expect the young men of America to fight their wars. Shall we send our sons?

A MISSOURI SOLDIER REPORTS FROM KOREA

Recently I received a letter from a Missouri boy fighting in Korea. This young soldier was a member of the Army Enlisted Reserves and was called to active duty shortly before he was to have graduated from the Kirksville State Teachers College.

He wrote:

This so-called police action we are engaged in has me puzzled. * * * The Army has stuffed me full of glory talk as to why we are fighting here. I am still in the dark on the subject. Never have I seen a filthier or more stinking place for which to fight. I can't see who would want it. We are not only fighting the Chinese and North Koreans, but also the South Koreans. You can see by their faces that they don't want us here.

Today I saw the UN flag flying above the Stars and Stripes, and not only did it hurt me, it made me mad. Are we to give our national sovereignty to a group of individuals, who after 5 years of talk are still unable to carry on a respectable war, let alone prevent one?

This so-called police action has many of us puzzled. This Missouri soldier has been guilty of no overstatement.

AMERICA WANTS NO MILITARY DICTATORSHIP

Last June 27 a major step was taken by the President of the United States toward the establishment of a military dictatorship. On that day Mr. Truman ordered our Armed Forces into Korea. He consulted neither branch of the Congress. The first the Senate knew of it was when the then majority leader, Senator Lucas, of Illinois, read in the Senate a copy of a press release issued from the White House.

Many Senators will long remember the reading of the President's release.

The President had written:

I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa.

"I, I." It is always "I." Not once in his 407-word statement did the President refer to the Congress of the United States, the elected representatives of the people, which has the authority—the sole authority—under our Constitution to declare war.

As soon as Senator Lucas finished reading Mr. Truman's press release, I raised the question as to whether the President had taken over the power to declare war. The answer was the pretense that our participation in Korea was only a police action. We know differently now. American casualties already number 50,000. Some 50,000 young Americans killed or wounded—and the Congress—8 months after the President's order—has not recognized that a state of war exists.

This is government by a man, not by law, not by the Constitution.

A bit of important evidence is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 11, 1950. On that day the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] inserted in the RECORD an article by the well-known columnist Holmes Alexander, based on an interview with an administration Senator who is described as being as close to the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon as anybody in Washington.

This Senator is stated as believing among other things that—

It was a mistake to go to Korea and it is a mistake to stay there.

The writer then continues:

We should understand, better late than never, that the cheers which greeted Mr. Truman's bold act of last June drowned out solemn military warnings. The Senator of this interview presided at some secret hearings, and sat in on many more, where the Joint Chiefs of Staff plainly stated that Korea was useless to occupy and impossible to defend.

These opinions were overruled by the President. It is as simple as that. He reversed both his Secretary of State and his military advisers—all of whom might properly have resigned in order to alert the country. We went into Korea on the gamble that neither Russia nor Red China would fight us there. If either or both did fight us, the A-bomb was known to be our last resort—and still is. But the fate of the Korean campaign was always in Communist hands, not ours. Mr. Truman was playing his luck.

Ernest T. Weir, chairman, National Steel Corp., has commented on this statement:

If this is true, it is a sad commentary on our Government. This statement should be investigated and the facts determined. If the President ignored the warnings of military advisors and on his own initiative and authority plunged this country into war, steps should be taken immediately to see that neither he nor any other man shall have such power in the future.

The President has now decided to send American troops on a new military venture. This time Europe is to be the scene. That the President has already committed us to this fateful enterprise is abundantly clear. In the issue of the Saturday Evening Post for February 10, there appears an article evidently compiled from authoritative sources entitled "The Big Step." The subheading reads:

Our Government has just reached the most dramatic decision in our history. It means much higher taxes for you; foreign military service for your sons and brothers; shortages and a lower standard of living for us all. Here is the full story.

When and where did our Government reach this epoch-making decision? Certainly the Congress had no part in it.

Are we of the Congress mice or men? Are we ready to abandon wholly our duties and responsibilities as the legislative branch of the Government? Is the Eighty-second Congress willing to be bridled and saddled, and to serve as the charger for an American Napoleon?

This brings me to say something about the argument that the judgment of our military chiefs should not be questioned. It is said they know best. The military

survival. First, let us see why it is impossible with our existing machinery to develop a mobilization plan which does not demand far more money and manpower than is available.

Foreign policy commitments, involving both men and money, are proposed by the President and are, or should be, cleared through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That committee may have excellent reasons for believing that the commitments proposed would enhance our security. But the Committee on Foreign Relations is not responsible for supplying the necessary men and money, or with protecting the value of the dollar.

The Senate Armed Services Committee acts on legislation providing manpower for the Armed Forces. It must try to satisfy commitments approved by the Foreign Relations Committee, but the raising of money to pay for the Armed Forces is beyond its jurisdiction.

The Appropriations Committee passes on all Federal spending. It may approve expenditures which would be justified only if the Finance Committee approved the necessary taxes, or if the Banking and Currency Committee adopted more effective measures against inflation. However, action taken by the Senate Finance and Banking and Currency Committees may be based on the erroneous belief that the Appropriations Committee will not approve expenditures in excess of a certain amount.

The greatest handicap which the Senate faces in preparing a national mobilization plan is its specialized committee system. At the present time, there is no way in which the five committees which deal primarily with manpower and money can cordinate their planning and their work. While recommendations of our committees may be modified or rejected by the Senate as a whole, those recommendations carry great weight. In addition, since those recommendations are considered piecemeal by the Senate, it is now impossible to act in accordance with an over-all mobilization plan. I offer for appropriate reference at this time, Mr. President, a resolution to create a Special Senate Committee on National Defense Mobilization.

V. THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Mr. President, our two main problems are manpower and money. Both are limited. Five Senate committees are primarily concerned with the mobilization of manpower and money in the present emergency. They are the Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Appropriations, Finance, and Banking and Currency Committees. My resolution provides for the appointment of two majority and two minority members of these committees by the chairmen. The chairman of this bi-partisan special committee would be elected by the 20 Senators who serve on it.

The Special Senate Committee on National Defense Mobilization would be tempofary. Its sole purpose would be to draft an over-all plan for national survival for the guidance of the Senate. To serve any useful purpose the plan would have to be submitted not later than June 30, 1951. The special committee would then be dissolved.

The special Senate committee which I have proposed would work entirely in executive session, insulated so far as possible from day to day publicity. It would require only a very small staff. As I visualize its work, this committee would not hold formal hearings or listen to the reading of lengthy statements. The committee members would be expected to roll up their sleeves and get down to brass tacks with heads of Government departments and agencies which have primary jurisdiction over manpower and money. These men include Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of Defense Mobilization, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Director of Economic Stabilization.

The sole function of the special committee would be to devise a plan which devotes maximum effort to the job of defense against Communist aggression without incurring the risk of disastrous inflation at home. The special committee would have to maintain a close liaison both with the five standing committees primarily concerned with manpower and money and with individual Senators. In no other way could the plan reported by the special committee receive general acceptance and serve as a guide for future action. If a proposal similar to mine should be adopted by the House of Representatives, the work of the Senate and House special committees should be coordinated.

I cannot describe the operation of this special Senate committee except by giving a few hypothetical examples. The special committee might begin by finding out from Secretaries Acheson and Marshall the maximum size of the Armed Forces which they feel is required for a long-range preparedness program. It is obvious that we cannot continue to incur ever-increasing commitments abroad or drift by degrees into having 6,000,000 or 10,000,000 men under arms. It would have to be clearly understood that in the absence of all-out war no more than X men would be available. With this figure definite, it would be possible to devise a tentative annual budget for years to come, a semipermanent tax program, and an anti-inflationary program which would not have to be changed every month. If the special committee should decide that appropriations can be sharply reduced, that taxes can be greatly increased, and that the causes of inflation can be eliminated, it would be possible to devote X plus Y men to our defense. On the other hand, if it should be decided that proposed spending cannot be materially cut, that the budget cannot be balanced by higher taxes, and that the resuting inflation cannot be checked, the permanent size of the Armed Forces would have to be set at X minus Y men.

The President's hodge-podge of defense plans cannot be carired out without destroying the productivity and the solvency of our economy. The Nation cannot survive a long period of mobilization which calls for mushrooming foreign policy commitments, unlimited growth of the Armed Forces, unlimited spending, confiscatory taxation, and wild inflation. Some one has to strike a balance between competing programs which call for the use of more manpower and the spending of more money than is available. The President has not struck that balance. Congress must act.

There are many reasons why the work of the special committee which I have proposed might prove disappointing. Any plan which it recommended would be meaningless unless a majority of the Senate acknowledged it as a blueprint for future action. In addition, the recommendations of the special committee would be valueless unless accepted in principle by a majority of the standing committees most vitally concerned. The special committee might agree on a plan, for example, which required a reduction of $5,000,000,000 in proposed Federal spending. The whole plan would fall apart unless the Appropriations Committee announced its intention to reduce the budget by that amount. Accordingly, Senators selected for the special committee would have to keep their own committees fully advised concerning the deliberations of the special committee.

Mr. President, I hope that my resolution will not be interpreted as in any way derogating the importance of the work performed by other committees or by other Senators. The fact remains, however, that five Senate committees are primarily responsible for the emergency mobilization of men and money. If we have a plan which solves these two shortages, the work of all committees and all Senators can be performed more easily and more effectively.

For obvious reasons, a plan for national survival cannot be formulated by either of the party policy committees. Their plans would inevitably be suspect on partisan grounds. Moreover, neither party policy committee is fairly representative of the committees primarily concerned with manpower and money.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to explain why my resolution does not provide for the membership on the special committee of the able majority leader. The majority leader must work closely with the White House. His primary job should be to persuade the President to draft one coherent mobilization plan for the consideration of the Congress. I hope that the majority leader succeeds in that effort, although I am not optimistic about his chances. Membership of the majority leader on the special committee I have proposed seems inconsistent with his duty to advance the 100 or more administration defense plans.

It is possible to suggest many reasons, Mr. President, why the creation of a Special Senate Committee on National Defense Mobilization would prove to be a waste of time. However, merely because there has been a total failure of executive leadership is no reason why the ship of state should drift without a rudder for the next 2 years. The American people have a right to know exactly what sacrifices they must make for an indefinite period. Business, labor, farmers, our young people, and our schools must be given a chance to plan for the future.

Congress must supply leadership by drafting a long-range plan for the Nation's survival. The job is supremely difficult, but our freedoms are at stake and this is an able body of men.

The resolution (S. Res. 90) submitted by Mr. BRICKER, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

*Resolved*, That (a) there is hereby established a special committee to be known as the Special Committee on Defense Mobilization to be composed of four members, two from the majority and two from the minority, of each of the following committees, to be selected by the respective chairmen thereof: Banking and Currency, Appropriations, Armed Services, Finance, and Foreign Relations.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to formulate a long-range plan for national defense mobilization which will provide for coordinating the military and industrial needs of the Nation for manpower and materials with a view to (1) making the most effective use of our limited manpower, material, and financial resources in the present emergency, and (2) insuring that excessive commitments of such resources at home and abroad will not result in disastrous inflation, confiscatory taxation, curtailed production, undue regimentation, or any other consequences which would prejudice the ability of the Nation to survive an extended period of defense mobilization. The committee shall report to the Senate on or before June 30, 1951, the results of its study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems desirable.

(c) The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(d) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words.

(e) The committee is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary.

(f) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $ , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(g) All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on June 30, 1951.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the perfecting amendment lettered "D," proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hayden | Martin |
| Anderson | Hendrickson | Millikin |
| Bennett | Hennings | Monroney |
| Brewster | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Bricker | Hill | Mundt |
| Bridges | Hoey | Murray |
| Butler, Md. | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Nebr. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Byrd | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Cain | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Capehart | Jenner | Pastore |
| Carlson | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Case | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Chapman | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kem | Schoeppel |
| Connally | Kerr | Smathers |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Dirksen | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Langer | Sparkman |
| Dworshak | Lehman | Stennis |
| Eastland | Lodge | Taft |
| Ecton | Long | Thye |
| Ellender | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Watkins |
| Frear | McFarland | Welker |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Wherry |
| George | McMahon | Wiley |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Williams |
| Green | Malone | Young |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the perfecting amendment lettered "D" offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my amendment, identified as amendment D which is now before the Senate, proposes to change the bill as reported to the Senate in regard to the age for induction by changing the age from 18 years to 18½ years, with the continuation of the present provision of the law that any 18-year-old boy may present himself for induction, if, at 18, he wishes so to do. That is found in the present Selective Service Act, which on this point reads as follows:

> Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

So I think we need to face very clearly the simple issue which is now before us. What the junior Senator from Oregon proposes is that the compulsory induction age be 18 years 6 months, but that the boy shall continue to have the privilege of presenting himself for induction at 18 years if he wishes. This privilege or condition, made available to the boy, in my opinion, disposes of the argument of those who have been heard to say on the floor of the Senate that to increase the compulsory induction age to 18 years 6 months would be very confusing to and disruptive of the life of the boy, who, after high school, would have to wait for induction until he attained the age of 18 years 6 months. It is said that many boys want to be inducted at 18. I think that is true and I believe they ought to be provided the opportunity to be inducted, if they want to get their military training out of the way at that time. On the other hand, in my opinion, it is equally fair to the young men of the age of 18 to have a provision placed in the law whereby they cannot be compulsorily inducted until they are 18½ years of age.

I do not desire to repeat at any great length the points I made the other afternoon in the major speech which I made on this over-all bill, because I am very desirous of coming to an early vote on the bill. As I said at that time, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, once he had his amendments perfected to his satisfaction, which he was sure would be today, and such is the case, he would be perfectly willing to let the debate of the Senate proceed on the amendments and on the bill to the earliest possible vote on both amendments and bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the bill as reported by the committee provides that if an 18-year-old boy is in high school he may continue until he graduates, even if he is more than 18 when he finishes?

Mr. MORSE. He may remain until he is 19.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not understand from the Senator's original explanation of his 18½-age amendment that he had made that point clear.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator did not understand it, because the Senator from Oregon had not even covered the point. I made no reference to the problem of the high school boy and the privileges under the bill. I am merely in the very beginning stages of the discussion of the bill, and all I have sought to do thus far, I may say to my good friend from Virginia, is to point out that the continuation of the privilege of presenting himself for induction disposes, in my judgment, of the argument of those who seem to feel that the adoption of an 18 years 6 months compulsory induction age will cause a boy a great deal of confusion and will be very disruptive of his life if, after he gets out of school, he must wait for induction until he is 18 years 6 months. That is all the junior Senator from Oregon has been able to cover thus far in his explanation of his amendment.

As I was saying, Mr. President, I do not care to repeat at any great length the points I made in my major speech on this bill the other day, but as I proceed I should like at least to present my summary on each of the amendments. I point out that in the hearings the committee was advised, as I said the other day, that there is very little danger that a boy will be inducted compulsorily under the bill proposed by the committee, before he is 18 years 6 months old; and I say, if that be true, why not simply write it into the law? If that representation, which was made to us by the Pentagon, is the way the bill is going to operate, then what is wrong with my amendment? The military cannot have it both ways. So far as I am concerned, the bill will either mean that a great many boys will be compulsorily inducted at the age

of 18, or that they will not; and if they are going to be, then the military should not be representing that for the most part they will not be inducted until they are 18½ years of age. The military points out that, with the registration date fixed at 18, it is going to take at least about 90 days to process the boys before they are inducted; so, even on the basis of the argument of those who say they do not like the 18 years 6 months provision of my amendment, they admit that the boys will not be processed for at least 3 months; so the difference between is only 90 days anyway.

So the difference, from the standpoint of the time element, is not as great as would be implied from some of the fears expressed as to the effects of my amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to complete my statement on the amendment, then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that in his statement the Senator will explain why it will not take so long to process the boys under his amendment as it will take under the bill.

Mr. MORSE. It will take just as long.

Mr. RUSSELL. So it would be 6 months, then.

Mr. MORSE. No; under my amendment boys would be registered at 18. The registration date is the same under my amendment as under the bill of the committee, and if the Senator does not think that is clear in the amendment, We will make it clear. I said in the committee, as the record will show, that I was one of those taking the strongest position for registration at 18. I think that would help. Under my amendment it would even improve the work of processing under the Selective Service Act, because if it were made plain that as to those registered at 18 and under, compulsory induction is not to start until they are 18 years and 6 months old, the organization will be in a position to do a better job than it is at present doing. I wish to make it plain that I have a very high regard for the work done by General Hershey and his staff. They have performed and are performing for the American people a very outstanding public service.

Mr. President, I wish to cover again the point in regard to processing under my amendment. On the basis of the testimony given as to when it would be possible to get the boys into the service even under the present law, the impression which was left, at least with me, by the military—and I have expressed this view to individual members of the Military Establishment in high position, and they have said nothing that would cause me to modify what I now say—was that there is very little danger that, by and large, the boys will not be inducted, under the bill presented by the committee, until they are 18 years 6 months old. If that is so, let us write it into the law, let us have them register when they are 18, let us give the Selective Service organization plenty of time to do the best posisble job in processing the boys. I believe the 6 months' period can be put to very profitable use in providing the most efficient distirbution of the boys in accordance with their special aptitudes.

One of the things we need to watch for in the years ahead is the use to be made of American military manpower. In my opinion, we are faced with a long pull. The questions asked by the junior Senator from Oregon in the hearings, as they appear in the printed proceedings, leave no doubt as to where he stood with respect to how long the pull is to be. I believe we are in for a 25-year pull. I believe it is going to take a quarter of a century for freedom to prevail in the world over the threat of totalitarianism.

I believe we need to lay down now, in regard to every major legislative problem which comes before the Seante, some foundations on which we can build a structure strong enough to sustain the military defense of the Nation and its economy to meet the emergency for a quarter of a century.

One of the strongest points of my amendment is that the longer period of time, the 6 months' period from registration, will give the Selective Service forces a better opportunity to process the boys and see to it that they have made a very reliable check upon their special aptitudes so that they can be directed into those branches of the Military Establishment that will make it possible for the country to get from the boys the best possible service. I repeat, I do not believe we are so far apart, really, in regard to the time element, for it is only 90 days.

I was about to say that I have read the letter from General Marshall and the letter from General Bradley, which have been inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Texas, having to do with what the military meant in the testimony given before the House committee a few days ago. Although I think the letters are somewhat clarifying, I do not believe they eliminated the confusion entirely.

Mr. President, I express the personal opinion that I do not believe the military is in fact very far apart from the proponents of the 18 years, 6 months proposal. There is no question about the fact that their testimony has been consistent to the effect that they prefer 18 years; there is no question about the fact that they prefer 18 years as the time for induction, and 17 years as the time for registration. Yet it is also true, as the record of our committee will show, that when the committee said that it would hold to the 18-year registration provision, the representatives of the military who met with us in executive session said that would be acceptable, although they made it clear again that they preferred the 17-year registration provision.

We should take note of the fact that most of the countries on the freedom side of the ledger do not draft their boys at 18. I should be the first to recognize that it would be a nonsequitur for me to argue that because X country does not take its boys at 18, the United States should not take its boys at 18. I am not advancing the observation to support a conclusion that because some other country does not take boys at 18, therefor we should not. I am advancing the observation because I think the American people have been observing the situation in other countries, and I believe there is considerable feeling on the part of the American public that we should, at least in our deliberations in preparing an American manpower bill, take note of the fact that most of the other countries who are allies do not take their boys at 18.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I desire to point out that I have been left in some doubt, or at least in some confusion, in regard to some of the statistical analyses of the Military Establishment throughout the hearings in regard to the reservoirs of manpower. As I stated the other day, I believe we have to be accurate as legislators, and check very carefully the requests made by the military, because I have never noticed that they understate their demands. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services and on the basis of my experience as a member of that committee, I believe it is proper for us to review very carefully all the major requests the military make, both as to matters of appropriation and as to matters of manpower, because they have left me, for a long time, with the impression that they are given to overstatement, and are prone to request more than they really need for efficient operation. That is why I said the other day, and now repeat, that I believe it to be the duty of the Senate, to put some definite checks into the bill which will force the military to make a more efficient use of its manpower, and eliminate some of the great manpower wastes, which I think presently characterizes the operations of the military.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us the average age of a young man when he graduates from high school?

Mr. MORSE. There seems to be some little dispute even about that question. My conclusion is that it is around 17½ or 18 years.

Mr. THYE. Then I should like to ask another question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Assuming that the average age at which a young man graduates from high school is 18, would it be better for the young man to make his choice of military service at that time, or wait 6 months before making it? I am very sincere in asking the question.

Mr. MORSE. My amendment gives him that choice. It makes it possible for him to present himself for induction at 18. It also makes it impossible for him to be inducted until he is 18½ years of age.

Mr. THYE. Let us assume that he graduates at 18. He would have to mark time for 6 months before he would be called to the service. Of course, he could choose to enlist in a branch of the service.

Mr. MORSE. He has the privilege of presenting himself for induction and to be taken into the service as soon as he can be processed. He stands in the same position as any other 18-year-old. He can be taken into service only as fast as he can be processed by the military. He could do something else during the 6 months period, of course.

Mr. THYE. If a young man waits for 6 months, and in the meantime does not enlist and is not processed, but enters the service at the end of the 6 months' period, he will be discharged in the middle of a school year, will he not?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad that the Senator had raised that point. I see what he is driving at. He believes that when such a boy was discharged from the service he would have some more time in which to wait before he could go back to school.

Mr. THYE. That is my question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator raised the point. I believe many people share that point of view. However, I wish to raise very serious doubt as to whether or not a young man would be confronted with the predicament which the Senator from Minnesota suggests. In the first place, I believe we will find a great reorganization taking place in the term-scheduling by American institutions of higher learning, which will start almost in the immediate future. College presidents have testified before the committee, and I have conferred with college presidents and teachers. I find a uniformity of opinion that the scheduling of a 9-months' term for training in the colleges is rapidly becoming passé, and I believe the present crisis will bring the practice to an end permanently. We will see American colleges go on a 12-months' schedule. They should do so. I believe there is a tremendous waste of time in the present scheduling of terms by educational institutions.

Under educational conditions which will prevail from now on I do not believe any boy who is discharged from the Army will have to wait more than a few weeks before he can enter a new term in college. I cannot prove it statistically; I can only give the opinion evidence of college presidents, professors, and administrators with whom I have discussed the subject since the bill has come under debate. It seems to be the opinion of college administrators and presidents that any boy discharged from the service in November, for example, would be able to enter a new college term in January. No matter when a boy makes his exit from the Army he would have to wait no more than 6 months, on the average, before he could start his studies.

Mr. President, while I am on this point, in the light of the question asked by the Senator from Minnesota, I think it is relevant to suggest that it also seems to appear, on the basis of such objective data as are available, that if a group of boys who went into the Army at 18, 18½, or 19 is broken up into two categories, one consisting of those who had spent some time in college, and the other of those who had spent no time in college, after giving consideration to the so-called statistical weights which must be applied in any such analysis, a larger percentage of the young men who spent some time in college will go to college after their military service than will be the case with those who never spent any time in college.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Is it the Senator's opinion that if a boy were inducted at 18½ years of age there would be a greater possibility that he would have been in college for one semester or a half a year before entering military service, and therefore he would have had his first little break away from home during that period of 6 months? It is that first break away from home which is so difficult for many young men to undergo, and which usually tears the heart out of a youth, whether he is away at college or serving in the Army. Does the Senator feel that a boy who has had the experience of being away from home for perhaps a week, 2 weeks, or even a month, would find it easier to adjust himself to military service and to being away from his community and home environment?

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not draw that conclusion at all.

Mr. THYE. The Senator does not draw that conclusion?

Mr. MORSE. No. If a boy is going into the Army, I am quite as willing to have him go directly from high school as from college, so far as making it easier for him to break away from the home ties is concerned. What I am saying to the Senator from Minnesota is that from such testimony as we have had and from such opinion evidence as I have been able to gather it seemed to be agreed among educators, based upon a limited analysis of World War II cases—because we took some 18-year-old boys into the service in World War II, some of whom had spent some time in college and some of whom had not—when subsequently the two groups of boys to whom I have referred are presented with the opportunity, through the GI bill of rights, of going to college, a larger percentage of the boys who have spent some time in college will go to college than will be the case of boys in the other group who have never been to college. I am not presenting what I say in that respect as a strong argument in behalf of my amendment. I am simply making the observation.

I would add to the observation the statement that, in my opinion, we dare not lose sight of the importance during the next quarter of a century, if the present tension persists, as I think it will, of maintaining our superiority over Russia in the field of scientific skills and education. It is a great advantage, and we must maintain it. We must continue the education of talented students and see to it that we increase, rather than decrease, the number of scientifically and technically trained men.

In such an argument as this there is danger that someone may get the impression that we are placing an undue weight on some single point. I am offering this point for what it is worth. I believe it is worth some consideration, and should have some weight in the argument.

If we follow a procedure of induction which will make it possible for boys who have a desire to go to college after high school—and I would prefer a 9 months' course rather than a 6 months' course—to spend some time in college before they go into the Army, that fact will exert a pull on them to cause them to return to college after they have completed their term of service in the Army.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Were the educators and college presidents who appeared before the committee of the opinion that they would rather see the youth go directly from high school into the military service, or did they feel that they would rather have the youth in college for 6 months or a year?

Mr. MORSE. I think the testimony of the college presidents, with some modification here and there, was practically uniform to the effect that they thought the best break was between high school and college. However, I believe one of the confusions about the bill also permeated some of the thinking of the college presidents, because the college presidents were talking and thinking in terms of the dual nature of the bill, which is a selective service bill in praesenti and a universal military training bill in future. If we were to separate the bill into a selective service bill independent of a universal military training bill, I do not know whether or not there would be a considerable modification of views, at least on the part of teachers.

In my discussion of the bill with educators one of the interesting things was that the point of view was somewhat different at the level of the college teacher, who deals every day with the student, and who becomes much more his adviser and father confessor than does either the dean or the college president. The teaching staff has a somewhat different point of view from that of the college presidents in regard to this matter. But here again we must watch out for special pleading and selfish interest. We must weigh such testimony pretty carefully, because I do not know to what extent some teachers might be slightly influenced by the fact that enrollments mean teaching jobs. I do not want to do them an injustice, but we must always be careful in weighing any testimony obtained from those who have an interest.

Mr. THYE. I recognized that when the ROTC was being allocated or assigned to various educational institutions. I made a very definite complaint, and suggested to the administrators of that program that military students be allocated to the colleges somewhat geographically, so as not to dry up one educational institution in a certain area of the Nation and expand another beyond the possibility of adequately caring for the students.

I think the Senator has placed his finger on one important question. Everyone is concerned about his job. We in

Congress must be concerned with making certain that the students are reallocated somewhat on a geographical basis so as not to dry up one educational institution and expand another unduly.

I should like to ask another question. This question deals with the administrative function. Are recruitments in all the military branches to continue after this bill is enacted and we have what may be termed universal military training? If the bill goes through in its present form we shall have universal military training. We now have selective service. Will we still continue to recruit in the same manner in which we are now recruiting?

Last night I asked military officials to give me a breakdown of all the military personnel engaged in recruiting men for the various branches of the service. I had heard that 40,000 men were so engaged. I have also heard the figure 60,000 mentioned as the number of military personnel engaged in recruiting. I asked for information as to the total number, and a breakdown thereof. I have not yet received the information. I do not know how many thousand military personnel will be shown to be engaged in recruiting; but it is a certainty that if one group of military personnel are engaged in administering the selective service, and another group continue to engage in recruiting, a great deal of the taxpayers' funds can be wasted, and certainly a great deal of the time of military personnel can also be wasted.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think the question can be answered. I cannot answer it.

Mr. THYE. I am trying to obtain an answer to the question how many men are now engaged in recruiting.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is entitled to that information. The answer certainly can be supplied by the military.

As to the substance of the question put to me, as to what the procedure is to be after we get into the era of universal military training, I do not believe anyone can give an answer to that question now, because it will require review by Congress as of that time. I take it for granted that necessarily we shall require a certain professional standing army, even after universal military training goes into operation. But under this bill the plan is to set off, pretty much by itself, the universal military training program and treat it as an entity unto itself, leaving the military administration of the professional army to other legislation.

I assume that when we reach the point where we think we can handle universal military training, then we shall rely upon enlistments for the three branches of the service, and will be able to dispense with the Selective Service System entirely. But that, again, may be a gradual accomplishment so far as time is concerned, and may not come automatically when we start the universal military training program.

I am glad the Senator raised that question, because it gives me another opportunity to emphasize the fact that this is not a universal military training program as of now. It only contains the promise of one, and also a commitment on the part of the Congress, that when the discretion provided for in the bill is exercised by cutting down the length of service, at a time when we can have a period of service of from 4 to 6 months for 18-year-old boys, a universal military training program will be set up.

I always try to present on the floor the positions which I have taken in committee. If I do not, it is only a matter of oversight, and not intent. It will probably be pointed out in debate, if I do not say it now, that I happen to be one who believes that a universal military training program should start at the age of 18 for the boy. I think that is the time to put the boy into the universal military training program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like first to explain fully the observation just made by me. That contemplates a training program of from 4 to 6 months. It contemplates a program which puts one 18-year-old boy with other 18-year-old boys. It contemplates a universal military training program for the 18-year-old which will give him the basic training he needs properly to assume his obligations in the Reserves and for some years thereafter. That is quite a different thing from the immediate application of this bill, because its immediate application takes a boy and puts him into one of the three branches of the service and trains him for combat. It seeks to get him into a position where he will be adequately prepared to defend the Nation the moment an all-out war with Russia or any other country breaks out, if that dark hour should ever come.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The pending legislation specifically provides for universal military training. The Senator from Oregon was in the field of education, training youth, prior to coming to Congress, and therefore can think not only as a legislator but as an educator, and that is why I ask the question I am about to ask. In the Senator's opinion, as an educator, is it better to take a youth immediately from high school into the service, and thereby enable him to complete his military service at an earlier time, and then enter college, or to have a 6 months' lapse, during which period the youth would be marking time between graduation from high school and entrance upon military service?

We fervently pray that he will not be called for combat duty, and all of us propose to do what we can so to shape the affairs of the world that it will not be necessary for him to engage in actual combat; but should it become necessary for him to serve as a combat soldier, would the Senator want to have enacted legislation which would take him into military service directly from high school and place him in the line of combat, so to speak, before he is 19?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator raised the question. I repeat what I have said in the committee, that so far as a universal military training program is concerned, which contemplates a 4 to 6 months basic training course, I prefer to take the boy out of high school at 18 and put him into that training program. I think that is the time to take him. As for the kind of service he will immediately be put into under this bill, for 26 months in round figures, if the bill in its present form is passed, I think that it is better to register him at 18 and give him the privilege of presenting himself for induction at 18, if he wants to do that, but not compulsorily to take him into the service until he is 18½, because for the type of service for which he would be drafted under this bill it would be better in many cases, though not in all, to give him the opportunity for 6 months more maturity before he is inducted.

Mr. President, I am not at all a sentimentalist about this question. As I have said in committee, and repeat here, because sooner or later the question will arise in the debate, I have not been impressed by the emotional argument about the 18-year-olds. I have not been greatly impressed by the representations which have been made to me that it is going to be hard on the morals and character of these boys to take them at 18. Although I do not happen to be the parent of a boy, I am the parent of 3 teen-age girls, and consequently, I may say I am brought in very close contact with many teen-age boys.

Mr. THYE. I know the Senator's daughters, and I can vouch for their charm.

Mr. MORSE. So I can observe teen-age boys. As one who has taught teen-age boys for some 21 years, I think I have some understanding of their attitudes and emotional problems and character. I say that if parents have not done a job in character training on a boy by the time he is 18 so that he is not capable of resisting the temptations either of a college campus or of an army camp, it is very important for the benefit of such a boy that he get into a new environment away from the parents, because they will not do him any good after he is 18. If the parents have done a proper job, boys have pretty much got their principles and characters set by the time they are 18; and if they have not, I think it will be rather helpful to them to have the discipline of the Army at 18.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am still confused on the subject of the 18-year-olds, because it would seem it is not a question of a boy of that age being too young for military service. So, Mr. President, I ask for what purpose does the Senator from Oregon specifically want the 6 months' period of deferral? Is it for 6 months of college, or is it to let the boy mature for 6 months?

Mr. MORSE. It is for a variety of reasons. That is one of the things we must be very careful about.

Mr. THYE. I am trying to obtain information.

Mr. MORSE. There are many reasons for deferment until a boy is 18½, and they differ in their application with the difference in the character of boys. There can be set apart from any mass of 100,000 18-year-old boys a group whose welfare would be much better served if they were not taken until they are 18½, because they sorely need 6 months more of maturity. I have seen many 18-year-old boys who, emotionally, are really only 15 or 16 years old. I have seen many 18-year-old boys who, physically, are really only 16 or 17 years old. After all, there is only 3 months' difference between me and the Pentagon, so far as actual induction is concerned, because the military authorities testified before the Senate committee—and they have just got through testifying before the House committee—that it takes them 90 days anyway to get all the boys processed before they can induct them. Eighteen and one-half, as an average, will produce the best results when we take into account the variables among groups of boys. That is all I am saying.

That takes care of the boy who needs more maturity. That takes care of the boy who would like to spend more time in college before he goes into the armed services. I think it takes care of the Selective Service, because it gives the Service additional time—and I happen to be one who believes they should have more time—to process the boys so that more efficient use may be made of their abilities and aptitudes when they are assigned to duty. That is about the essence of my argument as to the reasons why I think 18 years and 6 months is to be preferred to 18 years.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the position is sustained that Congress should not provide that a youth may be taken before he is 18½, then we must go at the other end of the age bracket and commence to call on some who are in business and some who have family responsibilities, who should, for various reasons, be permitted to follow whatever vocation they have chosen?

Mr. MORSE. That is the argument. I shall reach that point, if the Senator will hear me through. He has raised a point which I desire to go into in some detail. I should like to speak of it in the order of my preparation for this speech, rather than to take it out of position now.

Mr. THYE. I shall wait to hear the Senator explain it later.

Mr. MORSE. I simply want to say that I challenge the argument on the part of the military as stated by the Senator from Minnesota. That argument will fall to the ground if the military will make a more efficient use of the manpower that is available to it within the age brackets, and stop wasting as much manpower as presently characterizes its operations. I think the Senator has raised a honey of a point when he raises that one. What we have to say to the Pentagon now is, "You are not going to select the figure and tell us that is what we must supply you, until you first improve your present use of manpower, and stop your unconscionable waste of it." I think we have an excellent chance in the consideration of the bill to perform a great service to the American people by bringing about some economy in the Military Establishment, because wasting manpower also costs money. We have an opportunity of improving the efficiency of the Military Establishment in the use of its manpower. I think we must say, "Gentlemen, we are going to give an order to halt so far as this matter is concerned. We are going to have you conduct a review to see what you have in the way of manpower that you are wasting, and then call upon you to begin to make an efficient use of the manpower you have."

When we do that, Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota, I think we shall arrive at a ceiling of 3,000,000 men, subject always, of course, to the power of the Congress to change it as conditions change. I am going to discuss this matter in detail in connection with another amendment which provides the period of the life of the measure. I should like to see the Pentagon required to organize itself on the basis of a ceiling of 3,000,000 men for the Military Establishment for a couple of years. In other words, we would simply say to the Pentagon, "Boys, this is all you are going to get, unless conditions become a great deal worse." Of course, we know that if conditions become much worse, Congress can be in session for 24 hours continuously, if necessary, in order to meet any situation which may arise.

However, what we really need to do is bring about efficiency in the Military Establishment by means of eliminating some of its present wasteful practices. In my opinion we shall succeed in doing that if we simply say to the Pentagon, "No, the ceiling is not going to be 3,462,000, but it is going to be 3,000,000. Now go ahead and bring about the needed reforms in your use of manpower, the reforms which you can very well bring about."

Mark you, Mr. President, I think we then would be doing a very great service not only in the interest of economy but also in the interest of the defenses of this country, because with more efficient use of the manpower in the military there will be better morale and fewer of the "gripes" and "beefs" which now characterize the comments of so many of those who serve in the Military Establishment, as we find when we talk to them—particularly the men in the lower echelons—and get their observations about the armed services. If we talk to those groups, Mr. President, man after man will state just what I am saying here today, namely, that the waste of manpower in the Military Establishment is unconscionable.

So I believe we have a great opportunity to do something about that matter in connection with this bill. I am offering an amendment which I think will do it, and I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Of course, those in charge of the Military Establishment will wiggle and "crab" about that amendment; but in the future, 9, 10, or 12 months from now, I believe they will be heard to say, "We thought you were awfully tough when you did it, and we thought you were rather unreasonable about it; but you forced us to do some things which otherwise would not have been done." I think that will be the practical result.

Mr. President, I know how dangerous this argument is, because I am aware how easy it is to misrepresent someone in American politics. It is very easy to say that I am proposing something which will weaken the Military Establishment, whereas what I wish to do is strengthen it and increase its efficiency. In my judgment the way to do that is for us to stop assuming that all that it is necessary to do is to pour sufficient money and discretionary power into the Pentagon Building and it will come out in the form of efficiency. That is not so, Mr. President; and I think I can offer the following as my exhibit A to prove that it is not so: To anyone who has a pair of eyes I say, "Go and look for yourself, and you can see the need for great efficiency in the military, both in respect to the use of manpower and in respect to the use of money."

Mr. President, I do not yield to any other Member of this body in my desire to strengthen the defenses of my country. I will go as far as anyone else in doing all the things that it is demonstrated to me are necessary to be done in order to strengthen my country's defenses. However, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have become convinced, not only in connection with this bill, but in connection with a great deal of the business which has come before the committee in the years I have been a member of it, that we have a responsibility to do a better job than we have been doing in the way of eliminating inefficiencies and wastes from the American Military Establishment. That is why I am making the fight I am making on the so-called over-all 3,000,000-man-ceiling amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If such an over-all ceiling is provided in the bill as enacted, will it jeopardize and place in danger the men who now are in the service, in that they will be compelled to continue in the service? For instance, I have in mind the men in the National Guard. Under such circumstances, will they be required to continue in the active service beyond the number of months which it is now anticipated they will be required to serve? It seems to me that may be the result, because under such an over-all ceiling it will be impossible for the military authorities to draw into the active service the number of men it would be necessary to have in order to make it possible for

the men now in the active service to obtain a discharge, a release, or an opportunity to take leave long enough to be able to visit their homes. If we place in this bill a statutory ceiling which will be mandatory, do not we then tie the hands of the recruiters or the Selective Service or the Administrator of Selective Service, and thereby compel the Department of Defense to continue to hold in the service the men in the National Guard who have earned either a release or retirement from active duty?

Mr. MORSE. No; I think just the opposite will be true, because my figure is a lesser figure than the one to which the military wish to recruit.

Mr. THYE. But if the defense establishment must have that number of men, what is the answer?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator misunderstands me. I am saying that we can do this job with 3,000,000 men; we do not need the 3,462,000 men on which this bill is bottomed. I think we can save almost all of those 462,000 men by having greater efficiency in the use of military manpower, by means of having greater use of civilians in paper-pushing jobs, which now are all to prevelant in the Military Establishment, by avoiding the duplication of work which characterizes a good many military offices, and by the elimination of a great deal of military red tape which ties up manpower. Certainly there is a need for great simplification of the procedures in the Military Establishment. When that is done, we shall save a great deal of manpower, and then it can be used in uniform, for combat, or for training service.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Oregon for having yielded so much time.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his interruptions, because they have been very helpful in drawing from me statements of my points of view which I might not otherwise have expressed in connection with the presentation of my explanation of my amendments. So I appreciate that very much.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. In discussing the Senator's amendment, it occurs to me that the average age of high-school graduates is slightly over 18. The bill provides that a boy shall not be drafted while he is still in high school, until he has reached the age of 19.

Mr. MORSE. My amendment does not change that.

Mr. HUNT. So, as I understand the Senator's amendment, it would not make very much difference in the case of a boy in that category, one way or the other.

Mr. MORSE. No; no difference at all.

Mr. HUNT. However, the average freshman in college graduates from high school at the age of 17½ years. There is a difference between the average age of high-school graduates and the average age of college freshmen.

Thus it would seem to me that a boy graduating from high school at the age of 17½, and then having 3 months vacation, and then an average of 9 months before he would reach the age of 18½, would hardly have sufficient time to get a good start in his college studies; neither would he have an opportunity to become well started in industry in that time.

My point is that only about one-half of those who are 17 or 18 years of age as they graduate from high school, enter college; and of the group who are over 18 years of age when they graduate from high school, only about one-fourth enter college.

So it seems to me that we are overlooking those who are in the fourth row, so to speak; in other words, we are speaking of the brighter half of those who graduate from high school—the ones who then enter college—rather than of those who graduate from high school but do not enter college.

What does the Senator think about that?

Mr. MORSE. Let us take the statistics the Senator from Wyoming has given; I am perfectly willing to accept them. The fact is that I do not know for a certainty what the average ages are; but I think there is in the committee's record, as I recall, testimony which bears out what the Senator from Wyoming has said. So let us take those figures.

Here are boys in a group, let us say, who meet the average of 17½ years on graduation from high school. Under my amendment, when they are out of school, they will have a chance to spend the greater part of a year in college. As I said a few moments ago, such a reorganization of college terms and college curricula will take place, that a boy will find himself in such a position that, if he really wants to attend college, he may start college within a few weeks of any given time.

The Senator made comment about summer vacations. It has been my observation that an increasing number of high school graduates are seeking some training during the first summer they are out of high school. With the passage of a military manpower bill providing for induction at 18½ years, many of the 17½-year-old high school graduates who, as the Senator has intimated, are really in the upper bracket so far as ability is concerned, will begin college during the summer, and under my amendment they will at least get 9 months, and most of them 12 months, of college training, before being inducted into the Army. So I should say to the Senator that, for the group of so-called superior students, my amendment is much to be desired, because it will assure them all at least an opportunity to spend some time in college before being drafted.

As I said, the evidence as presented to us seems clear, although I am sure it must have certain qualifications to it that if we take the boys who have spent a year in college there is a much greater likelihood that a larger percentage of them will return to college after their Army service than if they had not had that initial experience. So, as to those, I think my amendment is of benefit.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me first finish my analysis, and then I hope the Senator will question me further.

Let me say, as my answer to the second point made by the Senator, that we must be careful when we talk in terms of averages. There is no average person. In statistical discussions I think there is always a danger of misusing the word "average." We seem to think it relates to a specific group or person. Mention was made, I believe, of the average age at graduation from high school as being 18.

Mr. HUNT. I think it is slightly over 18.

Mr. MORSE. When we talk about that, we need to keep in mind that in making up that average a great many boys are considerably over 18 and a great many boys are considerably under 18.

Mr. President, I find myself in a very difficult situation, because of a memorandum which has been handed to me. I wonder whether the Senator from Washington is ready to proceed.

Mr. LANGER. I am ready.

Mr. HUNT. I am ready.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to yield the floor at this time, and continue my speech later in the afternoon.

(At this point Mr. LANGER addressed the Senate. At the request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD following Mr. MORSE's speech.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] most sincerely for being so cooperative and courteous as to take the floor and deliver his speech when in the course of my remarks this afternoon I received an emergency call which made it absolutely necessary for me to leave the floor immediately and postpone for the time being, at least, the completion of my speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I now make be inserted in the RECORD in continuity with the remarks I previously made, and that the speech of the Senator from North Dakota appear in the RECORD following my completed speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is that kind of courteous cooperation and friendly spirit which characterizes the Senate of the United States, and I want the Senator from North Dakota to know that I appreciate it very much.

I also want the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to know that I realize and appreciate the fact that if the Senator from North Dakota had not been in a position to deliver his speech immediately, the Senator from Washington would have accommodated me.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Earlier in the afternoon, in my colloquy with the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon, I referred to rumors which I had heard pertaining to the number of military personnel engaged in recruitment. At that time I stated that I had heard numerous rumors in that connection, some to the effect that as many as 40,000 military personnel were engaged in recruitment.

Shortly after the able Senator from Oregon left the floor, the figures pertaining to that matter were brought to me. I shall appreciate it very much if those figures may be inserted at this point in the RECORD, so that there will be a continuity in the presentation of the matter in connection with the Senator's speech. In that way, we shall not cast an unjust reflection upon the military, because the figures I now have are much smaller than those indicated by the rumors I heard as to the number of military personnel engaged in recruitment.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to have the figures printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. I shall not read the figures as they have been broken down in the compilation; but the total is 10,433; and that total number is broken down on the basis of the number for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force. Then there is a statement of the number of military personnel assigned to duty with the Selective Service.

I ask that the figures be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Colonel Collins, from the office of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, called and furnished the following information:

1. The number of military personnel, enlisted and officers assigned to recruiting services for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force is 10,433. This number is broken down as follows:

| | *Officers* | *Enlisted* |
|---|---|---|
| Army | 392 | 3,482 |
| Navy | 168 | 2,175 |
| Marine Corps | 93 | 1,516 |
| Air Force | 295 | 2,312 |
| Total | 948 | 9,485 |

2. The number of military personnel assigned to duty with selective service is 299. All of them are officers and are assigned as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army | 239 |
| Navy | 18 |
| Marine Corps | 8 |
| Air Force | 34 |

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Are the figures for the Coast Guard included in the compilation the Senator from Minnesota has submitted?

Mr. THYE. No; the figures for the Coast Guard are not included. I requested the information relative to the four branches: the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force; and in this compilation the total figure is broken down on the basis of that division. I have asked to have the figures appear at this point in the RECORD in order that we may not unjustly criticize, or refer to military personnel as being excessively used or misused for recruitment purposes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express regret or really an apology to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], because of the fact that the emergency call which I received, and which caused me to leave the floor, came in the middle of a colloquy which at that moment I was having with him. I am sure the RECORD will appear quite incomplete, tomorrow, when it shows that I was broken off in the middle of an answer to a question addressed to me by the Senator from Wyoming. However, at this time I shall try, according to the best of my recollection, to review the questions he asked me, as I recall them, and I shall try to pull together the ends of the colloquy, so that when this speech is read tomorrow, it will contain at least a statement of my viewpoint in regard to the ponts the Senator from Wyoming raised in his questions, as I understood them. If upon reading the RECORD tomorrow, I discover that it needs clarification, I shall at that time make a brief statement clarifying it.

As I recall, the Senator from Wyoming had pointed out to me statistics which showed that the average age of freshmen in college was 17½ years at the time of graduation from high school, but that the average age of all studdents graduating from high school, including those who went to college and those who did not go to college, was a little over 18 years. He raised the question, as I understood his remarks, whether my amendment, providing for induction at 18 years 6 months, would prove to be wasteful to the boy who graduated from high school at the age of 17½ years, and who then went to college. As I recall our colloquy, I had said before I left the floor that in my opinion my amendment clearly would be beneficial to the boy who graduated from high school at the age of 17½ years and who was the type of boy that went to college, because it would clearly give him 9 months to spend in college before being actually inducted. In view of the great change which is presently going on in American Education, insofar as altering college term timetables is concerned, I think many of those boys would probably finish almost a year of schooling, because an increasing number of boys during the critical period of the next few years, will be using their summer periods to attend school, as well as using the so-called regular-term periods. The trend very definitely in American education is toward the four-quarter system rather than the semester system, with the fourth quarter being given during the summer months, and with the curricula so arranged that boys may begin their college course at the opening of any term during the year. That is particularly true, of course, of the larger institutions, though not so true, as yet, I admit, of the smaller colleges. What I am pointing out is that my amendment with its 18 years 6 months induction figure will facilitate the education of a boy who will have a period of from 6 months to a year following high-school graduation before being inducted into service.

I again want to tie down at this point the observation I made earlier in the afternoon, that the objective data which have been made available to us to date indicate that, if what we want to do is to encourage the boys who go into service to complete a college education, we should see that they are enabled to go to college for at least some period of time before they enter the service. The data show that a large percentage of the boys who have first spent some time in college, even though it be but two terms, will return to college after their training in the armed services, whereas in the case of boys who went into the armed services without any previous college training at all the percentage who will go to college will be small. I think that is understandable and we should be surprised at that statistic. It is only natural that if a young man has started his college training, has then gone into the Army, and has the benefit of the GI education bill, he will want to finish his education, because he at least will have got his roots in the ground, and will have made the orientation, the adjustment to college life. So, from the standpoint of those boys, I would say to my good friend from Wyoming that I think my amendment will be very beneficial to them.

As I recall, when I left the floor we were discussing the point which I wanted to make, that in all such statistics as the Senator from Wyoming mentioned in his question, when one uses averages, he needs to analyze very carefully the word "average." Very fallacious reasoning often develops from the use of the so-called average statistics or statistics based on averages. Every average figure involved in the statistics which the Senator from Wyoming mentioned involves a great many boys whose age is in excess of 18 years, as well as a great many boys whose age is under 18. Of course, it is impossible to deal with the average boy, for there simply is no such person; it is merely a statistical label. Under this bill we must deal with boys of all the age groups within the bracket. We must deal with mature boys and with immature boys, when we are considering boys around the age of 18. As I said earlier this afternoon, there are many boys who physically are only 16 years of age, though chronologically they are 18. There are boys who are only 15 or 16 years of age emotionally and psychologically, when they are 18 years old as far as birthdays are concerned.

In preparing legislation of this kind we have a great responsibility in regard to American boys to see to it that we reduce to a minimum the injustices to individuals. We need to have a law which will permit of most intelligent administration and application in its effect upon individual boys—not upon averages, but upon individuals. It happens to be my sincere feeling that my amendment, which provides that compulsory induction shall not start until

the boy is 18 years 6 months of age, but that he shall have the same privilege which he has under the present law of presenting himself for induction at 18, and that registration under the Selective Service Act shall start at 18, permits of a more intelligent application of the effects of the law to individual boys than does the 18-year blanket provision of the committee bill. I am satisfied that if my amendment is adopted, that is the way it will work out.

I wish to repeat, even at the risk of creating boredom in the printed RECORD, that it needs to be stressed that the military and the junior Senator from Oregon are only 3 months apart on the matter of time, anyway. I shall not let anyone lose sight of that very important fact in this debate. The military says a period of 3 months is required in order to process the boys, anyway, when they are registered at 18, and that is what this bill calls for; so they could not be inducted before reaching the age of 18 years 3 months. I believe the additional 3 months provided in my amendment can produce a great increase of efficiency in the handling of boys. It will take a certain amount of administrative pressure from the Selective Service System, so that a more careful analysis of the aptitudes and characteristics and abilities of the boys may be made, with the result that the efficiency of the manpower of a particular branch of the service will be greatly improved, the inductees will be more appropriately placed, or at least it will make possible the avoidance of a maximum number and reducing to a minimum number the mistakes which might otherwise be made in placing boys within the military service.

I have already mentioned the importance of the fact that there is reserved to the boy the right to enter the service early if he desires to do so. It seems that does not leave much to the argument that the time of the boys between their courses in high school and college is being wasted. I believe it was the Senator from Wyoming who helped me emphasize the point that under my amendment the boy who has not graduated from high school at the time he is 18 can remain in high school until he is 19. I have no change at all to suggest as to that. So all the fuss and fretting so far as the induction period is concerned comes down to 3 months.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the Pentagon should clarify further the position taken by General Marshall and General Bradley before the House committee the other day, advise us of the clarification, and accept the suggestion as to 18 years and 6 months, because just as surely as that you and I are in this Chamber this afternoon, if the Senate adopts the amendment, and the bill goes all through in that form and the President signs it, the announcement that will come from the Pentagon regarding the amendment will be, "It is not so bad." Take judicial notice of that. They will say, "After all, we can make pretty good use of the 3 months' time in improving our processing in selective service." I know how those men work. I have been through the mill with military legislation before. Of course, I cannot say what is in another man's mind, but I can say that in my own mind I am satisfied that will be their attiude with regard to this kind of an amendment.

I desire to tell the military something else by way of the advisability of recognizing the fact that they should go along with this amendment. The military can well afford to have the maximum support of public opinion for its program. The military can well afford to do what it can to minimize the impression that it is constantly bucking large numbers of the American people in regard to the handling of human beings in the Military Establishment. Therefore, I make the friendly suggestion to the military—gratuitously, they may think—that good public relations should cause their leaders to say, "Although we would have preferred the 18-year provision, in view of the fact that it has been clearly demonstrated in both branches of the Congress that that is not desired, we will go along."

It is a fact it is not desired in Congress. The junior Senator from Oregon does not speak alone in this regard. The position of the junior Senator from Oregon is not singular, as subsequent events, I believe, will show. There are other Senators in this body who feel as I do in regard to the amendment. Discussions which have already taken place on the House side, at least as I have read of them in the press, show that there is strong psychological support in the country for the amendment, and that the Pentagon should pay a little more attention to good public relations. After all, it is well to talk about the morale of the people of Europe, and the need for building up their morale, but let us not overlook the importance of unity among our own people and of the high morale among our own people in support of the military program we adopt. I merely make that friendly suggestion to the military.

Earlier in my remarks this afternoon I talked about the ages at which men are drafted into the military in some other countries. I shall not read it all, but I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point in my speech a very brief one-page article which appeared in the January 26, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report, entitled "Draft Laws Abroad Are Milder."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT LAWS ABROAD ARE MILDER

(United States conscription plan goes further than most systems abroad, including that of Russia. A look around the world shows: Where conscription operates, deferments often are liberal. There is a lag between registration and call-ups, time for recruits to get their affairs in order. Youths are not called up as young as United States Defense Department planners propose. They aren't kept as long, either.)

Here is the way other countries are meeting their military needs as United States opens debate on universal military service for all 18-year-olds:

Britain, principal ally of United States, calls up draftees at the age of 18 years and 3 months. United States plan is to take them at 18. British youths serve 24 months. United States youths would serve 27 months under the suggested plan. Britain defers young merchant seamen, coal miners, and farmers. United States idea is to defer nobody.

Britain turns down the disabled youth, 15 out of 100, and makes no further claim on them. United States plan is to put them to work under some Government agency for 27 months, in hospitals, public-health activities, or home-guard duty. Britain's draftees start at $16 a month. United States draftees get $75 a month now, but the UMS plan calls for a cut to $30 during the first 4 months of training.

Russia is a little easier on youths than either United States or Britain, as far as direct military service goes. Russian draft does not start until 19.

Russia defers youths, too, rather liberally, if they are in essential civilian pursuits. According to the United States Army Information Diget, Russia follows "a generous and enlightened policy of deferment for scientists, teachers, technicians, such artists as movie actors, since these specialists are in chronic short supply in the Soviet Union."

The average Russian recruit spends 24 to 36 months in active service, then he goes into the Reserves with annual refresher training. He remains subject to recall any time until he is 50. Graduates of the United States program would serve 27 months at most, then enter the active Reserves for 3 years, or the inactive Reserves for 6 years.

In France, youths register at 19, enter service at 20. Service is for 18 months, two-thirds as long as the prospective United States service stint. Only 10 percent are rejected for military duty. Men with rather serious physical defects are drafted, earmarked for limited duty. But rejected men are not utilized in any way.

United States plan, by contrast, is to take only fairly good physical specimens into uniform, yet rehabilitate and use the rejectees in semimilitary jobs. French students can be deferred until they finish college. The United States system would allow no college deferments after 1954.

Elsewhere in Europe, this is the picture on manpower drafts:

Italy: Training starts at 21. Service is for 18 months. Italy's armed forces are limited by treaty to 275,000 men. United States will draft more than that in the first 3 months of 1951, regardless of what happens to the universal service plan.

West Germany. Youths in this former enemy country are not drafted at all. Hitler built his war machine with a military-service system that took youths at 20, for 24 months of service.

Belgium. Men are called up at 20 for 14 months of duty.

Netherlands. Citizens of the Netherlands enter service at 20, for 12 months. Only a fraction of each available class is called; deferments are available on many grounds.

Portugal calls men at 20, for 18 months of service.

Spain takes conscripts at 20, for 24 months of service. Miners and some factory workers are deferred. Farmers are furloughed at harvest time, and harvest leave counts as military service.

Norway drafts 20-year-olds, keeps them 9 to 12 months.

In the Western Hemisphere no other country appears to have adopted a system that will match the proposed United States youth draft.

Mexico drafts only one-third of its 18-year-olds every year. They serve 12 months.

Canada relies entirely on volunteers, has no compulsory-service law.

Most nations, in short, defer youths until they are 19 or 20. Liberal deferment opportunities are provided for college students, trade apprentices, other youth groups.

These facts are being cited by opponents of UMS in the United States. They say that, if other countries do not take men at 18, the United States does not need to. This review gives you the background of that argument. You will be hearing much more of it in months ahead as Congress debates a long-term conscription system for the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe this very condensed and concise article is worth the attention of Members of the Senate for the very reasons I brought out earlier in my remarks this afternoon. Let me read a paragraph or two:

Here is the way other countries are meeting their military needs as United States opens debate on universal military service for all 18-year-olds.

Britain, principal ally of United States, calls up draftees at the age of 18 years and 3 months. United States plan is to take them at 18. British youths serve 24 months.

I shall have something to say about that in the days ahead, when I come to my amendment regarding length of service, which I think should be 21 months. I digress from the discussion of the amendment now under consideration long enough to point out that 24 months is the length of service in Great Britain, and, although I shall make a strenuous fight for a 21-month provision, I serve notice now that if I lose in that, I shall offer an amendment providing for 24 months as the period, at least as a compromise between my position and the position of the majority of the committee. But I return to the article:

United States youths would serve 27 months under the suggested plan. Britain defers young merchant seamen, coal miners, and farmers. United States idea is to defer nobody.

Britain turns down the disabled youth—15 out of 100—and makes no further claim on them.

Then it discusses what the United States plan is. It contains a paragraph on Russia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Oregon does not agree that that article is accurate when it says the United States would defer no one, does he?

Mr. MORSE. I did not say anything about the accuracy of the article; but the article is accurate in regard to the figure of 18 years and 3 months for the drafting of British boys.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was not referring to that part of the article, although it was my impression that British boys were drafted at 18 years. But whatever the age at which the British may draft their boys, that is not what the Senator from Texas referred to. He did refer to what is in the bill, and the bill does not propose to make no deferments.

Mr. MORSE. I did not mean so to imply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The article does imply that.

Mr. MORSE. The article, as I have already pointed out, was dated January 26, 1951, and it was based on proposals then under discussion. The bill had not been completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will yield further, he is asking the attention of all his colleagues to an article he is putting into the RECORD, and he certainly would want to point out that the subcommittee did not consider any such bill, and, so far as the chairman of the subcommittee knows, no one made any proposal at any time that any legislation would be considered that that would allow no deferments.

Mr. MORSE. I have identified the article very carefully, and the date of the article. The article will speak for itself. I have been taking things out of context. The article refers to what was under discussion on January 26, 1951.

The figures which I particularly wish to stress are the figures set forth in the article as to the ages at which the men are drafted into the service in foreign countries. The article discusses the system in Russia. Before I mention Russia I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not interested in Russia as a precedent for anything. I merely state what the article says about the drafting policies of Russia.

The article says:

Russia is a little easier on youths than either the United States or Britain, as far as direct military service goes. Russian draft does not start until 19.

Russia defers youths, too, rather liberally, if they are in essential civilian pursuits. According to the United States Army Information Digest—

I chuckled when I read that reference to the United States Army Information Digest, because apparently the writer of the article thought it rather important that he quote from reliable authority for any comment upon the evaluation of the Russian drafting policies. He used as his authority the United States Army Information Digest.

According to the United States Army Information Digest, Russia follows "a generous and enlightened policy of deferment for scientists, teachers, technicians, such artists as movie actors, since these specialists are in chronic short supply in the Soviet Union."

The average Russian recruit spends 24 to 36 months in active service, then he goes into the reserves with annual refresher training. He remains subject to recall any time until he is 50. Graduates of the United States program which serves 27 months at most, then into the active Reserves for 3 years, or the inactive Reserves for 6 years.

In France youths register at 19 and enter service at 20.

I will not read all of the article.

In Italy training starts at 21.

West Germany. Youths in this former enemy country are not drafted at all. Hitler built his war machine with a military-service system that took youths at 20, for 24 months of service.

The Netherlands. Citizens of the Netherlands enter service at 20, for 12 months. Only a fraction of each available class is called; deferments are available on many grounds.

Portugal takes conscripts at 20, for 18 months of service.

Spain takes conscripts at 20, for 24 months of service.

Norway drafts 20-year-olds, keeps them 9 to 12 months.

Mexico drafts only one-third of its 18-year-olds every year. They serve 12 months.

Canada relies entirely on volunteers, has no compulsory-service law.

Mr. President, I shall not read any further from the article. I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon, that I would consider it non sequitur for me to argue, because these countries have different draft ages than the age proposed in the pending bill, that the age in the pending bill should be changed. That is not my argument at all. I merely make the observation that in the other countries the draft age is not so low as the age proposed in the pending bill, save and except for the specific instances set forth in the article.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not been able to follow the Senator in his reading of the information with respect to every country. I think the Senator would be better advised if he were to follow the information shown at page 11 of the record of the committee hearings. The information on page 11 was prepared by the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, Intelligence. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to include in the RECORD in connection with the magazine article which he has submitted for the RECORD, the tabulation which appears at page 11 of the record of hearings before the committee.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to join with the Senator in that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The information shown in the table at page 11 is at wide variance with the information given in the article from which the Senator has read.

Mr. MORSE. I join with the Senator in making the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Type and period of military service in foreign countries*

[Prepared Jan. 11, 1951, by Department of the Army, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, Intelligence, Washington, D. C.]

| Country | Type of service (conscription or volunteer) | Minimum age of service | Length of service (years) | Length of reenlistment period (years) | Length in months service has been extended, 1950 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Australia | Volunteer | 17 | [5] | 6 | |
| Belgium | Conscript | 20 | [1] 1 | | |
| Bulgaria | do | 19 | 2 | | |
| Canada | Volunteer | 18 | 3 | 3 | |
| Chinese: | | | | | |
| Communists | Conscript | 16 | (2) | (2) | |
| | Volunteer | 16 | (2) | (3) | |
| Nationalists | Conscript | 18 | (2) | (3) | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | (2) | (3) | |
| Czechoslovakia | Conscript | 21 | 2 | | |
| Denmark | do | 19 | 5/6 | | |
| Egypt | do | 18 | 3 | | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 12 | 12 | |
| Finland | Conscript | 20 | 2/3 | (3) | 2 |
| France | do | 19 | 1½ | | 6 |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 3–5 | ½–3¼ | |
| Greece | Conscript | 18 | 2 | | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 3 | 3 | |
| Hungary | Conscript | 19 | 2 | | |
| India | Volunteer | 17 | 7 | (4) | |
| Republic of Indonesia | do | [6] | [5] | | |
| Iran | Conscript | 18 | 2 | | |
| Italy | do | 21 | 1¼ | | 3 |
| The Netherlands | do | 18 | 2 | 6 | |
| New Zealand | do | 18 | ¼ | | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 5 | 5 | |
| Norway | Conscript | 19 | 1 | | |
| Pakistan | Volunteer | 17 | 7 | 12 | |
| Philippine Republic | Conscript | 20 | 5/6 | | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 3 | 3 | |
| Poland | Conscript | 19 | 2 | | |
| Portugal | do | 20 | 1 5/6 | | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 2 | 1 | |
| Rumania | Conscript | 19 | 2 | | |
| Saudi Arabia | Volunteer | 18 | 3/5 | 3 | |
| Spain | Conscript | 20 | 2 | 1–2 | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 3 | 2 | |
| Sweden | Conscript | 20 | 3/4 | | |
| Switzerland | do | 19 | 1/3 | | |
| Thailand | do | 20 | 2 | 3 | |
| | Volunteer | 18 | 4 | 3 | |
| Turkey | Conscript | 20 | 2 | | |
| United Kingdom | do | 18 | 2 | | 6 |
| | Volunteer | 17 | 5–12 | 1–10 | |
| U. S. S. R. | Conscript | [6] 19 | [7] 3 | | |
| Yugoslavia | do | 20 | 2 | | 3 |

[1] Extension to 2 years under consideration.
[2] Indefinite.
[3] Unknown.
[4] Variable.
[5] Not established.
[6] Secondary school graduates are liable to induction 1 year earlier.
[7] Not yet definitely established after postwar adjustments.

NOTE.—Above data refer to the bulk of ordinary Army conscripts; personnel for Navy, Air Force, security troop organizations, and officer, NCO, and specialist careers are often inducted earlier, sometimes as volunteers rather than conscripts, and serve longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. According to the information shown in the table a young man in the United Kingdom is conscripted at age 18.

Mr. MORSE. When are the young men inducted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This table contains the most recent information which was available to us, as of January 11, 1951.

Mr. MORSE. Are the young men in England actually inducted at 18?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The minimum age of service is 18. They serve 2 years. In 1950 the 2-year service was extended by 6 months. I did not follow the Senator's recital with respect to all countries. As I remember, he mentioned the Netherlands, and said that the men are taken into the service at age 19.

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not think I read anything about the Netherlands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator to refer to the Netherlands.

Mr. MORSE. Citizens of the Netherlands enter military service at age 20.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator to say 19. According to the information of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, Intelligence, they enter military service at 18. I wish to point out that there are other discrepancies between the information on page 11 of the report and the article from which the Senator has read.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am offering the article for what it may prove to be worth on checking. I have offered the table prepared by G–2 for whatever it may be worth on checking. I suggest it be checked. I believed it should be checked as to its accuracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, the chart which appears at page 20 of the January 26, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report. It is entitled "Why Congress Is To Go Slow on Drafting 18-Year-Olds: 19-Year-Olds Can Meet Manpower Needs." I ask that there be incorporated in the RECORD only the printed material, including the statistics shown in the chart.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CONGRESS IS TO GO SLOW ON DRAFTING 18-YEAR-OLDS; 19-YEAR-OLDS CAN MEET MANPOWER NEEDS—FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1951 THROUGH JUNE 1952

Men needed, 1,382,000: Includes 800,000 to bring Armed Forces, with recalled National Guard units and Reservists, up to strength of 3,462,000 by autumn, 1951; plus allowance for 50,000 casualties in Korea; plus allowance for loss of men due to expiration of enlistments and draft service.

Men available in 19-through-25-age bracket, 1,851,000: includes 800,000 able-bodied men in 1-A at beginning of 1951, plus 200,000 college students to be drafted next summer, plus 851,000 able-bodied men reaching age 19 in this 18-month period.

Four hundred and sixty-nine thousand margin of reserve. Defense Department considers a margin of 400,000 in the draft pipeline essential.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very anxious to emphasize the point that this amendment should be considered along with the amendment which I discussed earlier this afternoon, relating to saving manpower in the military establishment, by making greater use of civilians, including women, by means of the reduction of the percentage of the present rejects, and by seeing to it that we eliminate as much as possible military personnel from nonessential and routine, red-tape jobs, and having those jobs performed by men beyond the age brackets in civilian life or by rejects.

I wish to spend a few moments in a discussion of some of the statistics which were presented to us by the military authorities. A statistical analysis bears directly on one of the vital issues involved in the debate. The question is whether or not we need to go so far as the military want us to go in meeting the manpower needs of the country. The hearings show that the Department of Defense has on several occasions shifted its position with regard to the over-all goal of the Armed Forces. It would seem that such shifting of position indicates indecision and uncertainty as to the manpower goal, and it undermines the validity of the present proposal that there be provided a total force of 3,462,000 men. I am inclined to think that the shifting of position from time to time in the hearings indicates that the military authorities in the Pentagon were not quite certain as to exactly what figure they ought to aim at. I am inclined to think that it indicates that after they discussed the question back and forth they thought they might get by with a higher figure, and so they finally came out with a higher figure. I am for cutting it down. As I said earlier this afternoon, I am for cutting it down because I think it will give us a more efficient military establishment and will result in greater economy.

Of course, it is obvious that until we have a definite figure established as our ultimate goal, it is most important to decide whether men should be drafted at the age of 18, 18½, or 19 years. Early in the hearings Assistant Secretary Rosenberg stated that the goal of the

Department of Defense was 3,200,000, to be reached by June 30, 1951. In the course of the hearings, on January 10, Mrs. Rosenberg stated that the first military manpower problem is "to build up from our present strength, which is 2,500,000 as of November of last year, to an estimated strength of about 3,200,000 by June 30."

On the following day the Department of Defense stated that the build-up now projected for the fiscal year 1951 was based upon a figure of 3,200,000, which was hoped to be reached as of June 30, 1951.

I should like to digress to say to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on the floor, as I have stated previously in his absence, that I find it a matter of deep personal regret that he and I differ on certain phases of the bill, because I do not know how one could have served under a more fair and conscientious chairman of a subcommitee than was the Senator from Texas throughout the proceedings. Although it probably seems to our colleagues in the Senate, and perhaps to many persons in the country, that he and I are at opposite ends of the pole in connection with the bill, I do not believe that we are. He may think that he is further from me than I think he is, or vice versa. But of one thing I am certain, and that is that we have the common desire to do everything we can to adopt at the earliest date possible a manpower bill which will strengthen the security of the country. I completely agree that that is what we want, and I know that he shares that opinion. Such differences as have developed between us over certain sections of the bill are entirely impersonal and professional. Two men have sincerely reached contrary opinions as to how some particular section should be worded.

In order that there may be no room for doubt, let the record be perfectly clear, as I have previously stated, that the Senator from Texas and I have fought shoulder to shoulder in the Armed Services Committee for the early establishment of a universal military training system, for an adequate reserve system, and for an adequate, well-supported National Guard system, because our objectives are identical.

So far as universal military training is concerned, although I do not like the provisions of the bill in regard to universal military training because I do not think they go far enough, and because I believe that, in the main, all they represent is a promise of universal military training in the future, I am glad that at least we got that much in the bill. I believe that the Military Establishment could have done a much better job in the universal military training sections of the bill by making the blueprint a little more specific and concrete. But at least we have a commitment. It runs the danger, of course, of unforeseen conditions in the future, about which we must always be on guard. I forewarn the Senate to that effect. But at least we have the miiltary on record now as approving in a bill a title for universal military training. I shall continue to fight for universal military training. I am rather proud of the fact, as I have previously stated, that I was one who last summer voted against even any postponement of action on a universal military training program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The junior Senator from Oregon, in his usual gracious and generous manner, has been kinder to the Senator from Texas than he deserves. I wish to join the junior Senator from Oregon in saying that our differences are professional differences, differences of viewpoint, largely on induction age and term of service. I am sure that whichever viewpoint prevails, the country will not be too greatly endangered. However, I find strength in the statement of the Senator from Oregon that he expects to support the universal military training program, and although this bill does not go so far as he would like, I hope that whenever efforts are made by those who are opposed to any kind of universal military program to strike it from the bill, the Senator from Oregon will join with me in the effort to save that part of it, anyway.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not only join with the Senator on the universal military training issue, but I shall join with him in supporting the bill in whatever form it may finally be written. I simply hope that the Senate, in the exercise of its good judgment, and as a result of the debate, will at least agree with me on some points.

Let me say to the Senator from Texas that I think it would be a terrible mistake to give the military this bill without change. In my view, we must make more changes in the bill than were made in it in committee, because although there was some resistance from the military in committee on the changes which we did make, they do not feel too bad about any of those changes. I do not believe they felt that any of them were of any great consequence.

I believe, Mr. President, that some siginificant changes need to be made in the bill. I am very frank about it. In my opinion, we must check the military and let them know very clearly that they simply cannot write the ticket. I do not mean by that that the bill has not been subjected to the most careful analysis by my majority colleagues on the committee. By what I say I do not mean any negative implication as to what my colleagues did. I am speaking only for myself. We are now going into a period representing a long pull, a period in which the military will be coming to Congress asking for this, that, and the other. They are not going to be small items. We need to make it very clear to them at the very beginning that they are going to get only what we are clearly satisfied is justifiable and consonant with economy and adequate defense. I think it would be a great mistake not to adopt some of these amendments.

Now let me return to my comment on some of Mrs. Rosenberg's testimony. I have said that on page 42 she stated that our chief military manpower problem now "is to build up from our present strength, which is 2,500,000 as of November of last year, to an estimated strength of about 3,200,000 by June 30."

On the following day, as I previously stated, the Department of Defense stated that the build-up now projected for the fiscal year 1951 was based upon a figure of 3,200,000, which was hoped to be reached as of June 30, 1951.

The Senator from Texas expressed confusion about the figure, adverting to the fact that the President had recently stated that the total force was to be approximately 3,500,000, and not 3,200,000. Mrs. Rosenberg again stated that the latest figure approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and subsequently by the President, was 3,200,000.

Let us put a stop sign there, Mr. President, and take a look at the traffic for a moment. That was January 10, 1951. Let us peg that date. On January 10, 1951, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, purportedly speaking the views of the Pentagon, testifying that she presented the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, talked in terms of 3,200,000. That is what they wanted. That is not so far away from my 3,000,000 ceiling, is it? Oh yes, they raised it by something more than 200,000 later. But I point out that there was a time in the hearings when at least they were halfway near me, as shown by their own figures, because they testified that 3,200,000 men would be sufficient.

I wonder why they changed their minds? I will tell the Senate what I think is the reason. I believe that as the hearings progressed they got the idea that they could secure 3,462,000 just as easily as they could secure 3,200,000. That is what I think. I do not want to seem to overdwell on a point, but this is an important point. It supports the contention I make that there is nothing sacrosanct about the figures on which the bill is based. I am perfectly satisfied that if we said to the military, "It is 3,000,000, not 3,462,000," they would be forced to bring about reforms in procedures for handling manpower, long overdue, which would accomplish some much needed efficiencies within the military.

We can expect to hear in the course of the debate the argument made that 3,500,000 men must be had by the military. I am sure it will be made, because I heard it in committee, and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] now presiding over the Senate, was one of my colleagues whose ears and eyes were as good as mine in committee. He knows as well as I know that we heard stated in committee finally, "The figure 3,500,000 is the figure we must have. Any number less than that will endanger the security of our country." I wonder why it was not in danger on January 10 when Mrs. Rosenberg testified that 3,200,000 men would be adequate.

Why fool ourselves? Why let the military kid us? Why be kidded into the belief that there is anything sacrosanct about the 3,462,000 figure of the military? No, it can be modified downward. Senators can be sure of that. It can be modified downward, in my opinion, on the basis of Mrs. Rosenberg's testimony itself. We can be pretty sure, if it was 3,200,000 on January 10, they had, as we say in trading practices, a little cushion here and little cushion there to absorb a little loss on that figure. So I am satisfied that figure of 3,000,000 which I propose is just about the right figure to use in saying to the military, "For the time being let us see what we can do with 3,000,000 men?"

Especially do I think it is about the right figure now, Mr. President, when we keep in mind the fact that the military is in no position today, and it will not be for many months to come, to absorb the manpower it is asking for. Let us never let that point pass beyond our view throughout this debate. The Military Establishment of the United States today is in no position, either from the standpoint of facilities, equipment, or matériel, to absorb the manpower it is asking for. As I said the other day, I do not know how greater harm can be done to the morale of a military force than to have it oversupplied with manpower and undersupplied with facilities and matériel. That is what brings forth the gripes. That is what brings forth discouragement. That is what lowers morale in a Military Establishment. So if the military is granted everything they are asking for in the bill they could not for many many months to come possibly begin to use what would be given them. I think I am within the realm of accuracy if I say there will be at least a 2-year period before the military can begin even to approach making effective an efficient use of the manpower in the full amount they are asking for in the bill.

Congress is not going to pass out of existence, Mr. President. It is going to be in session. I emphasize the point that I think it is very important that we keep a check on the military, and that they be required, as conditions change, to come before us for additional grants of power or additional facilities, manpower, and equipment. I do not want now to pass a law containing too much blanket authority. I do not want now to give the military authority to undertake too broad a program, so it will not be necessary for the Congress to review and check the program by acting upon specific requests in the immediate years ahead. That is very important under our system of checks and balances. If we really want to keep representative government and the various departments of Government, including the military, functioning in the interest of the country, then let us not pass a piece of legislation that gives the military an opportunity to get away from the Congress for too long a period of time, because that is how abuses develop. I believe that frequent reviews and checks upon the requests made by the departments of Government afford the best safeguard and insurance against abuses. If it develops that the military can make use of a larger amount of manpower in a couple of years, or if conditions change so that the tensions become worse and the emergency requires modification of the law, who in this body would not vote it to them? I do not know of any one of us who would not. What Member of this body would not vote it to them very quickly? We would remain here for 24-hour sessions, if necessary.

So I am not at all impressed with the argument of the military or the argument of some of my colleagues that conditions at the present time are such that we must write such blanket authority as this bill contains and give the military a chance to go ahead with the kind of program that is called for in this measure, free of the kind of checks for which I am pleading. It is most important that we retain those checks.

So I would say to them, "Gentlemen, we are going to give you 3,000,000 men, and you are to go ahead now and work out an efficient program with those 3,000,000 men. In the future we shall take another look at it, after you have shown us what you have done with the 3,000,000 men."

Believe me, Mr. President, we would have a very powerful military force developed as the result of such a bill. That is why I am making the present fight for my 3,000,000-man ceiling, which is only 200,000 less than Mrs. Rosenberg herself testified for on January 10, and which she said in her testimony represented the points of view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

On Friday, January 12, Mrs. Rosenberg gave us for the first time the figure 3,462,205. In that connection, I refer to page 104 of the committee's record.

On the following Monday, January 15, the charts and planning data presented by Mrs. Rosenberg and Mr. Adams, assistant general counsel of the Department of Defense, were brought before the committee. They were most impressive. I do not know of any other agency of the Government which can prepare charts as impressive as those which are prepared by the Pentagon. However, we must analyze them very carefully. When we analyze the charts which were presented on January 15, what do we find? We find that they are based on a figure of 3,200,000, not 3,462,205, as proposed on January 12.

Mr. President, the gentlemen in the Pentagon had gone so far with the 3,205,000 figure that they had all their art work done before they changed the figure. All the pictures were drawn. I do not know what happened at that point, but something happened, so that they added almost 250,000 more men to their figure. However, at that time they did not change their charts. That is why I say that when I look at the art work of the military, as it is presented to the Armed Services Committee, while I am impressed with the technique, I always have the feeling that I had better analyze the substance rather carefully, because in round numbers 250,000 men are a great many men to lose on a chart; but they lost them.

So I say that apparently the expectation was that despite the increased goal of 3,462,205 men, the Department of Defense would not be able to absorb more than 3,325,000 by June 30, 1951. In support of that, I refer my colleagues to the testimony appearing on page 172 of the committee's record.

In speaking on this particular subject let me make the point again, because it needs to be in the RECORD several times, that there is no question about what is happening in the military establishment to date in regard to the enlistment policies of the Air Force and the Navy. They are not absorbing their manpower; they are enlisting men so fast that, in the Air Force, in particular, they are cutting down their indoctrination course from some 14 weeks to a relatively very short time. Mr. President, do you think that has been good for morale? It is another example of what I mean when I say that when we permit them to follow an inefficient procedure, we hurt morale and we do a great injustice to the men we are putting in uniform.

Recurring now to the statistical analysis the military presented to the committee, finally on January 22, Mrs. Rosenberg returned to the committee with a series of charts and estimates which were based on maintaining a force of 3,500,000 men, but at the same time raising to 600,000 the margin of safety required by Selective Service in the group of available inductees. They got the art department to work in the meantime, and, in effect, discarded the old charts, and gave us a new batch. However, they did not fool me by doing that. I thought it was perfectly obvious what they were up to. They saw a chance to get a larger number. However, I prefer to take them at their first word. As a lawyer I have had to be—or at least I have had to try to be—a student of witnesses and of testimony. It is the testimony of first impression that has a great deal more weight with me than the testimony which comes after consultation over the corpse. I like to hear what the witnesses say by way of first impression. We got the first impression on January 10. They told us then what their first plan was; and I am in favor of holding them to that as their top figure, and then taking the cushion out of it. That is where I obtain my figure of 3,000,000 men.

It is not at all clear to me, Mr. President, why the Department of Defense changed its position almost from day to day with regard to the size of the total force. Were those changes dictated by military necessity, by reappraisal of the actual needs; or was the final figure of 3,462,205 arrived at in order to reach as nearly as possible the estimate of 3,500,000 which had been projected by the President? Where did the President get his figure? I simply have a hunch, that during those days those in the Pentagon building simply were not clicking through all echelons. They finally drew their lines together and came out with the figure 3,500,000. But in my opinion they confessed themselves out of court, so to speak, before they ever reached the new figure. I think their

testimony of first impression is the testimony which ought to be given the greatest weight. That is the testimony to which I am going to give the greatest weight, because I believe, as a lawyer, as we analyze this case now in toto, that is the testimony which is the most reliable of all—the 3,200,000 figure.

Moreover, I am at a loss to understand the shifting estimates of the so-called safety margin required by the Selective Service. The original chart submitted by the military to the committee, chart G, which appears on page 1232 of the hearings, provides a safety margin of 250,000. Assistant Secretary Rosenberg stated at page 90 of the hearings, that General Hershey considered that an adequate safety margin required for the maintenance of a pool of eligibles available for call, as it was approximately four times the monthly calls for induction. Inasmuch as the calls of Selective Service at that time were 60,000 a month, a safety margin of 250,000 was established, and they built the charts on that basis. A subsequent chart, however, chart J, found at page 1233 of the hearings, provides a safety margin, not of 250,000, but of 400,000, which apparently was established on the basis of the increase in the monthly calls to 80,000, and the statement of General Hershey that the minimum lead time he needed was from 4 to 5 months. Assistant General Counsel Adams, speaking for the Defense Establishment, stated that General Hershey "feels that 400,000 was the very best minimum which he would like to have, and he would be happier with more." I refer to page 102 of the hearings.

Thus, overnight, we find the Department of Defense changing its position as to the size of the safety margin, increasing it from 250,000 to 400,000, thereby cutting the number of I–A availables by 150,000 men. That is a large number of men. We should not juggle them around that way on inconsistent charts. They should have got together in the first instance. But, after they became a little confused, apparently, and divided as to just what they were after, they then, at least, should have used their figures accurately and consistently. I question whether they did.

A later series of charts, based upon General Hershey's testimony of January 18, provides a safety margin of 600,000. I call attention to exhibit C, which appears on page 689 of the hearings. Apparently this 600,000 figure, a new one, was arrived at as a result of General Hershey's testimony that he desired a safety margin of six times a possible anticipated call of 100,000 a month. I refer to the testimony beginning at the bottom of page 523.

The net result of all this discussion about the size of the safety margin is that between the first day of the hearing and the last, the Department of Defense witnesses in effect used up some 350,000 men, the difference between a safety margin of 250,000 and a safety margin of 600,000, or the equivalent of 10 percent of our entire armed force goal. I say it is quite a casualty, statistically speaking. It is such statistical gyrations that the Defense Establishment has gone through in what I consider to be its rationalization process for justifying 3,462,000 men, which cause me to say, "Play it safe, put a 3,000,000 ceiling on them, and you will be doing the people of the country a great service, both economically and from the standpoint of forcing an improvement in the efficiency of operation of the Military Establishment."

Let us now take a look at another statistical anomaly. Let us go to the question of taking a larger number of rejects. I do not intend to speak at any great length again upon this amendment, so I shall take the time tonight to discus briefly the subject of taking rejects. It is one thing to get a determination from the Military Establishment that something ought to be done about it, but we got it, from witness after witness. I think probably the strongest and most emphatic testimony on this point was given by Mrs. Rosenberg, herself. I do not want anyone to get the idea that I do not have a very high regard for Mrs. Rosenberg. She is one of the most able persons in the field of manpower problems in the entire United States. I have great respect for her professional ability. I think I have already demonstrated, in my work on the Armed Services Committee at the time of the confirmation of her nomination that I have complete confidence in the great patriotic motivations of Mrs. Rosenberg.

I simply do not concur in certain of the recommendations which she has made to the Armed Services Committee, Yet I do not know where the Pentagon could have obtained a more able professional representative of the point of view of the military than Mrs. Rosenberg. If anyone could make a good case for them, she could, and I think she did a fine professional job. But it was not good enough for me. I have differences with her in regard to the total number of men to which she thinks we should commit ourselves at this time rather than 2 years hence. I repeat, however, that if the conditions change within the next 2 years, I think the Pentagon authorities have no need to fear that they will not get early and effective action from the Congress. But I want to see them move along, with frequent reviews by the Congress.

I may also say again in connection with the statistical analysis which I have related, that the figure of 3,200,000 at the beginning of the hearing included troops for Europe. I understand now that only an additional 100,000 men are to be sent to Europe in the immediate future. I do not know what their time period is.

We know what General Bradley's testimony was. I recall it now from recollection, and I think I am accurate about it, because I cross-examined him. He spoke of 3, 4, or 5 years—perhaps he said 2, 3, 4, or 5—stating that it was planned to use six divisions for that period of time.

That disturbed me very much, as I was also disturbed when General Marshall was on the stand, and, I thought, was also giving the American people the impression that there was some commitment for the additional four divisions for some considerable period of time. I was against any notification to the world of what the figure was going to be, anyway. I though it was a great mistake, and I still think it was. I have been advised in recent days that my fears were pretty well founded as to the effect of the statement in Europe. It certainly was not received, apparently, with the same enthusiasm with which an X figure would have been received, or with the same enthusiasm that a statement by General Marshall would have been received, had he said, as I think he should have said, that under the North Atlantic Pact we propose to do what is necessary to protect America's defenses in Europe, in cooperation with our allies in the North Atlantic Pact who we consider have a duty to do their proportionate share.

I think that is where we should have stopped. I do not believe we should have served notice on the world that for any period of time there were going to be four additional divisions. But, as I recall General Bradley's testimony, when he took the stand, he talked in terms of 2, 3, 4, or 5 years. The present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. STENNIS] will recall, because he was there, that when I cross-examined General Bradley, I asked a series of questions aimed at making it clear to the American people that the four-additional-division commitment was in no way a limitation upon the troops we would send to Europe if conditions changed within a few months. I elicited from him, as I think the record of the hearings will show, an admission that the four-division proposal was based upon the present conditions of tension, and not on any conditions of tension which may develop in the future. But, Mr. President, it would appear from the testimony of General Marshall and General Bradley—at least that is the interpretation I made—that they are not presently contemplating the need of sending to Europe more than 100,000 men in addition to those we already have there.

Mr. President, if that is a fair interpretation of their testimony, and I think it is, then I believe I can make them my witnesses on my major amendment, because if that statement is true, then I do not think they need the 3,462,000 they are talking about. I think they can get along with fewer men, and, of course, I think they can get along with a shorter period of service, because it will not take long to keep the pipeline flowing into Europe for the next 2, 3, 4, or 5 years, which is the period of time General Bradley testified about. So I think they helped me materially in support of my amendments, and particularly the amendment we are discussing today, my amendment providing for 21 months' service, and my amendment for a ceiling limitation of 3,000,000 men.

I know the argument is being used against me, "What about Korea?" Well

what about it? I am fully cognizant of the help we are receiving from our allies, and duly appreciative of it, as I am sure every other American is, but I am able to count, and in adding up the figures we have to face the fact that up to the present time it has, for the most part, been our war. It would appear that for some time in the future that is to be the case.

Then we do have to face the question, "What about Korea?" We have to make up our minds as to whether or not we are going to make the war in Korea an all-out war. If we are, then let that proposal come before us. But do not think for a moment, Mr. President, there is anything in the RECORD with respect to the pending bill in which the military asks for this bill on the basis of substantial replacements in Korea, because that is not the case. To the contrary, as the present Presiding Officer knows, as well as does the junior Senator from Oregon, the testimony, both in public and executive hearings of the Armed Services Committee, has been to the effect that up to now at least there has been no contemplation of making Korea a major military operation. If it is not going to be made a major military operation, then the induction age of 18½ years, on the basis of the explanation I have been making this afternoon, will be no handicap, and if it is to be made a major war, then this bill is a drop in the bucket.

One of the things I do not like about the pending bill is that it seems to me that it has been considered to be pretty much of a hybrid throughout the discussion. It is not a universal military training bill, because that feature is postponed to sometime in the future. It is not a bill which seeks to build up an adequate force now to bring to a conclusive end the war in Korea, because apparently it is not the intention of the military to send any large number of men to Korea, but only to hold there a line of defense which we can maintain until international diplomatic negotiations can proceed.

Mr. President, I have not changed my position since December 21 so far as Korea is concerned. It is exactly the same today as it was then. It is that unless we make up our minds what we are going to do in Korea about giving the American soldiers there the adequate support they need in order to prevent the kind of casualties they have been suffering, we had better withdraw to a line in the Pacific which we can defend without such great losses, and then proceed to use our bombing power on the bases of supplies of the Communists who have been waging war against us in Korea, and use the Navy and the bombing power and the blockade and the emargo to check the advance of communism over the rest of Asia. That was my position then, and it is my position now.

I believe that the policy of our Government in Korea is very much like the fable of the donkey between the two straw stacks. I believe that is exceptionally appropriate under the circumstances. I believe we had better make up our minds what our program in Korea is going to be. If the military want to come before the Armed Services Committee and say they are going to undertake a program of all-out war in Korea after we get through the discussion of the matter of policy involved, and assuming that we agree that that is what we ought to do, then we would have to have a manpower bill entirely different from that now pending.

While I am on the subject of Korea, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am still of the opinion I entertained on December 24, that we should not become involved in a land war in China. I am always a little bit nervous as to whether or not the Korean War is going to lead to a land war in China. I do not know of any greater victory Stalin could achieve over us than to get us involved in a land war in China, because I do not believe we would have a chance of winning it. Certainly we would never win it economically, because, as I have said so many times, we would have to occupy China, and to do so would mean bankruptcy.

I repeat that on the basis of the foreign military plans of the Pentagon, made known at least to the Committee on Armed Services to date, either in executive or public session, there is no basis, in my judgment, for the argument that the 3,000,000 ceiling would not give them the men they are planning to use, both in Europe and in Korea, and give them the opportunity of affording the men in basic training and putting their training into effect for from 8 to 15 months under the amendments which I am offering to the bill.

I should like to say one other word in regard to the opportunity of the military to save some waste in military manpower. I was discussing the point when I digressed on the Korean matter. I was pointing out that I think we got from Mrs. Rosenberg the best testimony in support of the observation of various members of the committee that the rate of rejection is too high. I certainly think it is too high. Of course, Mrs. Rosenberg pointed out, as did other witnesses for the Pentagon—and, in my opinion, very fairly and accurately—that we must be careful about lowering the standards, particularly mental standards, because the experience has been that an all-out-of-proportion percentage of the discipline problem in the Army, Air Force, and Navy arises from men who have the lowest I. Q. That is true of our population generally. Research on any crime survey will show the same facts. However, the jump in the logic that I could not quite follow was that if we lowered to some degree the standards now required under the mental tests there would be created a serious problem for the Military Establishment.

I am satisfied that it is possible to lower to some extent the score now required under mental tests and save a great deal of manpower. There again, however, it calls for the placing of men in the Military Establishment in accordance with their abilities. There are a great many jobs in the Military Establishment to perform which an exceptionally high I. Q. is not required. There are a great many jobs, generally classified as menial, which can be performed behind the lines. The argument cannot be used against me that I am proposing to place men of medicore mental ability in situations in which they could endanger the lives of a great many boys. I am as much oposed to that as anyone in the Military Establishment can be. However, their argument does not frighten me or impress me. If the procedure for placement were improved in accordance with the abilities and aptitudes of the men, thousands of jobs could be performed by men who are now being rejected on so-called mental grounds. Thus some relief would be afforded, and many men who are now performing minor jobs would be able to perform the more difficult combat jobs.

Let us take a little look at some of the statistical analyses submitted by the military in regard to the problem. Testifying concerning 18-year-olds, Mrs. Rosenberg said:

> The statisticians tell me that the best we can pick up is 100,000.

She was referring to a lowering of the mental standard. I do not think I am misinterpreting her testimony when I say that I interpret it to mean that the advice she obtained was that the most that could be picked up with safety was 100,000 men. I take judicial notice of the fact that she would not be suggesting that they would pick up a single man with such a low I. Q. that it would not be safe to assign him to a military job. I make that comment because I desire to be absolutely certain that I am being exceedingly fair to her.

This pool of 100,000 men was never mentioned later in any of the testimony of the military witnesses, including Mrs. Rosenberg. They had testified that they could make savings by some lowering of the test standards. I assume that if they could, they should. I do not know how anyone could fairly dispute that statement. If they can safely pick up 100,000 by some lowering of test standards, I say they should. If they would, they would reduce again somewhat the statistical problem which confronts us in the consideration of this bill. I am afraid it is another example of the tendency on the part of the military witnesses to agree in the general but to fail to apply in the specific.

I suppose they may think it makes a Senator feel good to reply to a question as to whether or not some savings could be made by agreeing with the Senator that it could be done, and not quarreling with him. I am sure that my colleagues on the committee had the same attitude that I had when I asked a question. I do not ask questions merely for the sake of asking them. I ask questions to find out whether or not savings can be made by following a certain course of action suggested in the question. When I am told the savings can be made, and no good reason is given by the witness why they should not be made, I think it follows that we have a right to expect that the savings would be made.

We had testimony that 100,000 men could be obtained by a lowering of the standards. However, thereafter, they never again included that admission in any of their figures. So we have a cushion of 100,000 men. They continued to say that 300,000 of the 1,050,000 18-year-olds would be unqualified mentally or physically for induction into the Army. This 100,000 would increase the number of "availables" from this age group by nearly 20 percent, or from 545,000 to 645,000. That is a great number of men, and we ought to use them. I think we ought to use them from the standpoint of the effect it would have upon the attitude and thinking of the people of the country. If we do not use them, we have another problem of national morale.

I believe that public opinion across the country is pretty much the same in regard to the attitude of communities toward what they think is an injustice or an unfairness in the operation of the selective service, when they see a perfectly fine physical specimen of a boy rejected in the draft because it is said that he did not do so well on some of the mental tests, although he is perfectly able to support himself in the community and hold a job and get along pretty well. The failure to take those boys is raising morale problems in the communities of America. So again I offer gratuitous advice to the military, that from the standpoint of public support and the important defense job which is ahead of us, we must make selective service work just as democratically as we can make it work. Many persons do not believe that it works very democratically, when we take the cream of manhood from a community and leave at home, deferred or rejected and freed from military service, some men who are physically perfectly able to do many jobs which need to be done in the Army.

So I say in all kindness that I think the military have made a great mistake in not speeding up the program of taking a greater number of rejectees. Again I mean no reflection either on Mrs. Rosenberg or on General Hershey. They were both very helpful witnesses to us on this problem.

I do not quote General Hershey verbatim, but I remember a story he told, because we all chuckled with him about it and agreed with him at the time. He appeared before the committee one day and told a story about a little check which he had made, and what had happened to some boys who lived in a certain section of the country which caused them to be classified as mountaineer boys. He stated that they were given a mental test, including an exercise in comparative analysis, pointing out likes and unlikes. The test showed a telephone, a telegrapher's key, and a radio transmitter. The boys were asked to check them for likes and unlikes. General Hershey stated that a large percentage of those boys flunked that part of the test. I do not suppose that very many of them had ever seen a telegrapher's key or had ever used a telephone. However, they were excellent riflemen. General Hershey said, "I would like to have a company of them in Korea now, because with their background those boys could shoot."

That is an extreme case, but it illustrates my point. I have checked into this subject enough, by way of personal investigation, to satisfy myself that the witnesses were right when they pointed out to us that there could be a saving of manpower at this point. However, the fact remains that the military have not made the savings which they could make.

One further point in this connection. Mr. Lehrer, of the Defense Establishment, stated that about 6 percent of those becoming 18 will fail to meet literacy tests, and 7 percent will fail to make a score of 70 in the so-called GCT. I refer to pages 193 and 194 of the hearings for that testimony. The fact is, as I understand, that even up to the present time the military are rejecting about 15 percent on the basis of physical requirements. In other words, they are still applying a pretty strict physical standard. I think that ought to be lowered, probably down to a figure such that the 15 percent could be reduced to about 7 percent, which would give us, roughly estimated, another 50,000. If we cut down on the mental tests we would probably get another 100,000. That makes a total of another 150,000. That is a great many men. I think this is the place, and the next few days will be the time, to adopt amendments to the bill which will have the effect of forcing the military to do some of those things.

Mr. President, there are a great many other facets to this amendment which I have not discussed. I may make some brief comments on it tomorrow in colloquy with other Senators or in answer to questions, but so far as I am concerned, I have made my case on the amendment.

I summarize it very briefly by saying that I think the age of 18 years and 6 months, with the privilege of the boy to present himself for induction at 18 if he wishes to do so, and with a registration at 18 so that the Selective Service will have adequate time to process him, is much to be preferred to the provision in the bill fixing the age at 18 years.

I emphasize that, statistically speaking, in my view, the majority are wrong in their position that the adoption of my amendment would make it necessary to bring in a large number of veterans to fill up the quota. I never was convinced of that during the hearings in committee. I mean no reflection on anyone when I say that, while it is a powerful political argument, it is not sound statistically. I believe this bill is so important to the welfare of the United States that we should not use even very persuasive arguments unless they can be substantiated in fact. I am satisfied that that argument cannot be substantiated in fact. If the savings in manpower for which I have been arguing this afternoon are put into effect by the military, and if we establish a ceiling of three million for the next couple of years, that will be only two hundred thousand less than the Military Establishment asked for in the first instance, at the beginning of the hearings.

Mr. President, I hope that at a very early date we can reach a vote on this amendment. I am perfectly willing to submit it to the Senate on the basis of the record I have made in support of it.

(On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the following remarks by Mr. LANGER, delivered during the course of Mr. MORSE's speech, were ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD:)

Mr. LANGER, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I regret that the distinguished Senator from Oregon finds it necessary to leave. Several times I have said I do not believe that the average Senator is earning his pay. I voted against the increase in salaries of Senators. I voted against the $2,500 expense account, and against allowing exemptions. I believe that if Senators were directors of a corporation which, when they assumed office, had an indebtedness of $25,000,000,000 or $30,000,000,000, and which, at the end of 10 years, owed $300,000,000,000, the stockholders certainly would manage to get rid of such a board of directors.

In all fairness and frankness, I do not blame the ordinary Senator. Perhaps it was because when I was in college I took certain courses which some of the other Senators did not take. I made a study of European law, medieval law, medieval history, European history, and Roman law, and I learned that, without exception, whenever a government became strong, it placed in effect universal military training. Only a few years ago, on the Senate floor, all we heard was "6 months—give us 6 months." The demand was then increased to a year, then they talked about a year and a half, and 2 years. They are now talking about taking 27 months from the life of every young man in America.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon says he is not worried about a boy 18 years of age being taken away from his father and mother. He is not worried about the temptations which might beset a boy 18 or 18½ years old. He is not worried, he says, about the emotional appeal. I do not know how much experience the distinguished Senator from Oregon has had, but let me say that while he may not worry, the average father and mother in America will do a great deal of worrying. They will worry if their boy is taken from the farm, a boy who has never been away from home before, except possibly to attend a Fourth of July celebration or some other celebration 50 or 100 miles from home. To take him away for a long period of time is a very serious matter.

I picked up a newspaper last night, and what did I find? I found that the head of the Washington baseball club, Mr. Griffith, and his manager, "Bucky" Harris, are not worrying about their baseball team. Why? Because they signed a number of Cuban boys. In Cuba, the draft is not in effect. So our

boys are taken—boys whose forefathers fought to free Cuba, whose forefathers went into the Spanish-American War to save Cuba and who died to save Cuba; but Cuba is not interested in Korea. Cuba's boys are going to play baseball here in the United States, even here in our National Capital. They are not drafted, though our boys are sent forth to die.

It seems to me that Senators are approaching this matter from an entirely improper angle. They are not debating and they have not since the so-called "great debate" started, whether universal military training is needed. They take that for granted. The question apparently is, how old or how young are these boys to be? I want every Senator to know that I am against any universal military training of any kind. I am against it whether it is for 6 months, or a year, or a year and a half, 21 months or 27 months.

What a sordid record the Democratic Party has made since 1932. In almost any other country on this globe that party would have been voted out of power long ago. The Republican administration did not recognize the Government of Russia. Year after year after year went by and the Republican Party said, "No, we are not recognizing the Soviet Government." But overnight it all changed. Our Government not only recognized them, but we let Russia hire our best engineers and our best scientists. Not only that, we loaned them money.

Let me refer for a moment to World War I. During that war I was attorney general of my State. How well I remember the press talking about the "Huns," the "barbarians," and saying that we had to fight them to make the world safe for democracy.

A few days ago I picked up the manual of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and I hold it in my hand now. It is the manual they give to every alien when he becomes a citizen under the naturalization laws.

Mr. President, let me read the first paragraph of a book issued by the Daughters of the American Revolution. It is entitled "The Growth of Freedom." I read from it as follows:

> The idea of freedom is very old. Hundreds of years ago there lived in the forests of northern Europe a people called Teutons.

They were Germans of Teutonic origin, and hundreds of years ago they lived in the forests of northern Europe, say the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I read further:

> They were free and independent. They elected their chiefs by voting by voice. They respected women and believed in homes.

Ah, these were the Huns, these were the barbarians. This shows the power of the press to make black look white and white look black.

After World War I was over, as one can find by merely reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator after Senator rose on the floor of the Senate and said, "We made a mistake in becoming involved in this war at all." William Jennings Bryan, three times the candidate of the Democratic Party for President, then Secretary of State under a Democratic administration, resigned as Secretary of State rather than give his approval to our getting into World War I. Oh, we were going to help Europe.

When World War I was over, Mr. Woodrow Wilson went to Europe—and I say it with regret—and tore down the empire of Austria-Hungary, which contained 19 nations, an older empire than England's royal house is today. With one stroke of the pen he tore down those countries which for over a thousand years had comprised a great empire.

What do we find next? We find an Attorney General of the United States saying that the President of the United States had authority to give away 50 ships, 50 destroyers, when every good lawyer in the country knew he had no such authority. Then one Secretary of State after another, among them Stettinius, of the House of Morgan, went to Europe. When former Secretary Hull returned he received a great ovation. They all said, "We are for peace." Then came the Connally resolution, which, it was said, was for peace, too. The Senate adopted it, but I voted against it, thank God. American boys were not going to be involved, oh, no. Mr. Churchill said over the radio, "We do not want men. Give us the guns, give us the tools. We do not need men." But when the invasion took place, out of 116,000 casualties 86,000 were American boys.

At Bretton Woods various countries were going to stabilize their currencies, too. When the president of the First National Bank of New York, Mr. Leon Fraser, who for 3 years had been the president of the International Bank in Switzerland, called the Republican Senators together, he said, "For heaven sake, don't do it. You are ruining America." But he was outvoted, and what followed? He was so discouraged he returned to New York and on a fine Sunday afternoon took a revolver and blew out his brains. Before he left us the night he was here he told a few of us that the arrangement would never work, that it could not be successful.

Then came the United Nations. Mind you, Mr. President, Senators actually rose on this floor and in all seriousness said, "It is only a repetition of what the Thirteen Colonies did when they joined together to make the United States of America. We are going to have all these countries join together in a United States of the World—one world." How beautiful they made it sound. The newspapers, including those of Washington, said that any Senator who votes against the United Nations is voting for war, and any Senator who votes in favor of it is voting for peace. I shall read two paragraphs of what I said at the time I voted against it. I read from page 8188 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 28, 1945:

> Practically all Members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the Charter. Under my oath, Mr. President, and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar that we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement it—will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.
>
> Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

What have we today, Mr. President? Congress asked for it. So did the Democratic administration.

Mr. President, I realize that whatever I say here will not change very many votes, if any. But may I not suggest that if our leadership has been wrong for a long, long time, as it has been, it is still wrong today? All they have to do is to read the history of the last 2,000 years.

I take it that under the oath which all of us take on becoming United States Senators, our first duty is to take care of the people of the United States, regardless of race, color, or creed. The Democratic Party said they were going to take care of the poor people. They said they would take care of the poor people and the underprivileged people. They said, "We will take care of them, if you put us into office."

Mr. President, today, only 3 blocks from the Capitol, after 20 years of Democratic rule, there are slums. Some of the people living there cannot even afford to have electric lights. They have unsanitary plumbing or none at all. They are packed into tiny quarters. All that goes on within 3 blocks of the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. President, I could conceive of a situation which would make some sense. If we give another country billions of dollars, there should be some sense manifested in using it. We have not used any sense about it at all. Country after country, in which only a few men own the land, have been given billions of dollars. In some countries a poor man cannot even earn enough money to own his own home. Before we give billions of dollars to another country we should say to it, "Before we give you these billions of dollars your parliament or your governing body must pass a law distributing the big estates in your country."

Oh, Mr. President, communism is to be wiped out. The best way to wipe out communism is to see to it that every poor man everywhere on earth owns his own home and his own property. I suggest to every Senator, as compulsory reading, what was said by Mr. Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court when he returned from a trip all over the world this summer. We voted something like $80,000,000 for Spain. There are not any people in the world who are poorer

than the people of Spain. Some of the people there must live in caves. They are too poor to live anywhere else. We have not attached any conditions to the billions of dollars we have given away. We take a scoop shovel and shovel out the money. The Democrats and Republicans who voted to give away all this money should not have an elephant or a donkey for an emblem; they should have as an emblem a scoop shovel, showing money being shoveled out all over the world, without trying to control it at all.

Today, with our boys dying in Korea, the newspapers tell about thousands of tons of steel and other war material being shipped to Hong Kong, so that it can be sent to the Communists in China. What a wonderful administration we have. That kind of thing is permitted to go on. Steel is being sent there so that great profits can be made. That steel, Mr. President, will return in the bodies of our boys. All that anyone need do is to pick up last night's newspaper, and he can read it for himself.

We come to the United Nations, the blue print for which was drawn up by Alger Hiss.

Then we come to India. It is said now, "It is necessary to bribe India. Give her 2,000,000 tons of grain." A bill is introduced to give India 2,000,000 tons of grain. We are told that if we give the grain to India, perhaps Nehru will vote for us in the United Nations. Why do we not say to India, "Go and buy the wheat in Pakistan? At the hearings before the committee some witnesses said that India could not get the wheat in Pakistan. Mr. President, I suggest that if a search were made every bushel of wheat that is needed would be found to be available in Pakistan.

I spent Sunday in New York with the Pakistanians. They would not furnish the grain because India did not have a trade agreement with Pakistan, whom India did not like. Last Sunday morning India signed some kind of trade agreement, after being assured that she would get 2,000,000 tons of wheat at the expense of the American taxpayers.

I have the statistics. I did not know that I was to speak today, or I would have had them with me. They are in my office. The statistics show how India has been diverting land to the raising of jute and cotton, so that she would not have to raise so much food. I have statistics by the acre, Mr. President.

So now we try to bribe the members of the United Nations with gold. Give them billions of dollars, and give them food. What are we going to do when the gold and the food give out?

Mr. President, we have existed as a nation ever since we gained our independence; and as we have gone along new forms of armament have been introduced. The day of the bow and arrow is gone. I need not mention all the various steps. All of a sudden the ocean is wiped out, we are told, and we must change our system entirely. During World War II we were told that Hitler was going to attack us through Mexico. Senator after Senator made that statement on this floor in all seriousness. Read the Nuremberg trials and find out how foolish those arguments were.

My distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] criticized the Pentagon. In my opinion, he criticized them only 1 percent as much as he should have done. He should have criticized them 100 times more severely than he did. At every single conference which President Roosevelt or President Truman attended, they had at their right hand the military of the United States. They had them at Potsdam, at Yalta, and at Tehran; at all of which places serious mistakes were made. Today, if the testimony is correct, the military is apparently running the show. The hearings constitute such a big book that I have not read them all yet, but I have read a good portion of them. Anyone who thinks the military is not running this Government is crazy.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon says that he would like to see the Pentagon be compelled to get along with 3,000,000 men. I certainly agree with him though I would not give them even three million.

We have had a good selective-service law on the statute books. We can make it attractive, as we have in the past, for men voluntarily to enlist in time of peace. We do not have to draft them or pass a universal military training law in time of peace.

Perhaps my views are somewhat colored by what I have seen in Europe. I went there on my own. I did not go with any military men or any State Department men. I wandered around by myself. I spoke the language. I visited with the people. They did not know who I was. I say to you today, Mr. President, on my honor as a Senator, that I do not know of a single mistake which our Department of State could have made in Germany and Austria that it did not make. It made every single one of them. Is it any wonder that in the Wall Street Journal for January 19 last, on the front page, it is said that Mr. McCloy's poll showed that only 5 percent of the German people would voluntarily enlist and only 10 percent would serve if drafted? Is it any wonder that when General Eisenhower returned to the United States he very carefully omitted any reference to rearmament in Germany?

This is the same Germany with respect to which General Bradley stated only a few months ago that it was absolutely essential that it be included among the western democracies, with an army, if we were going to keep possession of Europe.

We are sending 2,000,000 tons of food to India, free, although 10,000,000 families in the United States are trying to live on less than $2,000 a year, and veterans' hospitals are being closed because it is too expensive to maintain them. The one at Ellis Island was closed the other day because it costs too much to maintain it.

Mr. President, our allies had a wonderful opportunity when we went into Korea to say, "The United States liberated us a few short years ago. We are going to help them." How many of them came to our aid?

But great progress is being made in the United Nations, believe it or not. The United Nations have a stamp which they are going to use in this country on letters. They are making progress. They are to have a flag to fly alongside the flag of the United States. It has all been done very cleverly, by skillful propaganda. Men and women in the various States have been persuaded to sew on the flag. Great progress is being made.

All that it would have been necessary to do, if Alger Hiss had not been at San Francisco, would be to carry out the Atlantic Charter. In spite of all that Evatt, the great statesman from Australia, could do, and in spite of all his pleading, the delegations from the United States and from England led the fight for the veto. How many of the original Thirteen Colonies would have joined the United States of America if there had been a veto? Would South Carolina have joined if New York had the veto? Would proud Virginia have joined if Massachusetts had the veto? We have had such examples before us. If a world war should come about, the Senate could be blamed for approving the United Nations Charter in the form in which it was approved.

One thing which is as certain as 2 and 2 are 4 is that if there should be a third world war, after that war the next United Nations Charter will not contain a veto provision. It will contain the right of every small country to have self-determination on the part of its people just as the Thirteen American Colonies provided when they joined in a Federal Union.

To me, Mr. President, it is a tragedy when I think that we are debating today whether a boy must be 18 or 18 years and 3 months, or 18 years and 6 months, before he can be taken into military service, when the real question we ought to be debating is whether we are going to have universal military training at all. As one Senator, I can say that I see no need for it. The best evidence of that is the very bill we are debating. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] hit the nail on the head when he submitted his amendment day before yesterday. One of the best amendments I have ever heard presented on the floor is the amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, and I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

I do not know how it impresses the average Senator, but I wonder how it impresses a man on a lonely farm in Missouri or Montana when he picks up a newspaper and reads that some maharaja in India, as a birthday present, has received diamonds in such a great amount that they equal, on the other side of the scale, his own weight. I do not know how Senators may feel about it, but I know how farmers in Montana or in the State of Washington or in other States feel when they read that some great landowner has died leaving an estate of hundreds of thousands of acres of land, and that families of peasants have served him for 400 years.

Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Douglas, who so well said in his article discussing the billions we are giving to other countries that in doing so we must say to them, "You have got to inaugurate some reform in your own country. You have got to see that the people of your country have a chance to buy little homes for themselves."

Mr. President, it did my heart good to hear the Senator from Oregon today pay his respects to the military. I think a speech of that nature has been too long delayed. I honor the Senator from Oregon for his frankness, courage, and honesty in rising on the floor of the Senate and throwing down the gauntlet to the military. I only wish he had done it a hundred times more strongly than he did. As a member of one of the very powerful committees of the Senate, he has the opportunity to bring before the committee officers serving at the Pentagon, to make investigations, and get at the truth. I envy him the opportunity he has. I should like to sit alongside of him in the committee to help him in the great work he is doing.

Mr. President, George Marshall could not remember where he was at the time the attack on Pearl Harbor took place. That is what he stated. Do Senators suppose he could have got by with such a statement if the distinguished Senator from Oregon had been sitting in committee when the statement was made? Somehow the Senator from Oregon would have refreshed George Marshall's memory of where he was at least at the time the attack on Pearl Harbor took place.

Mr. President, I think I have made my position clear. If there is any doubt in any Senator's mind about my position, I want to say once more that I certainly am not going to vote for universal military training, in spite of the fact that there has been a well-organized campaign in its behalf and my office has been flooded with telegrams from every section of my State. It is a peculiar thing that of the hundreds and hundreds of telegrams which have come to my office, dozens and dozens of them are exactly alike. Whether they come from the southeast corner of North Dakota or the northwest corner, by some peculiar coincidence many of the telegrams are worded exactly alike.

Mr. President, a Senator has a great privilege to be able to sit in this Chamber and listen to the debate which takes place on the floor and then make up his mind regarding questions that are debated. If the people of the United States, instead of merely listening to radio commentators who are paid, they do not know by whom, or reading some of the stuff printed in some newspapers, could sit in the galleries and listen to the debate now taking place, I am confident they would be proud we have representative government in this country, proud of the fact that a Senator can sit here, and after listening to the debate, make up his own mind.

Mr. President, whether I was right or wrong in my United Nations vote, the people of North Dakota must have approved it, because when an issue was made of it in North Dakota I carried every county in the State. I am perfectly willing in the campaign which starts a few months from now to go upon the hustings in my State and tell the people of North Dakota that I stood on the Senate floor backing up the distinguished Senator from the State of Colorado, fighting against universal military training, or at least to get the provision of the bill dealing with universal military training separated from the remainder of the bill. Frankly I do not know how the Senator from Colorado will vote, if he succeeds in obtaining such separation. He may still favor universal military training. He has a right to be for it just as I have a right to be against it. I, at least, want it to be known that there is one voice in the Senate, my own, even though I may be alone, that will be raised against permitting a unanimous vote for the bill, and in opposition to the kind of legislation now pending.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Legislative Clerk read the nomination of C. Dickerman Williams, of New York, to be Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

## RECESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the distinct honor of moving that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

*To be majors*

CHAPLAINS

Sullivan, Jeremiah Edward, 18775A.
Williams, Alfred Alexander, 18774A.

*To be captains*

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Arnold, Gene Gervase, 15569A.
Bailey, Robert Allen, 15574A.
Barrett, Burton Stewart, 15589A.
Barry, Learned Walter, 15627A.
Bassett, Charles Arthur, 15549A.
Berggren, John Sydney, 15675A.
Borodkin, Marvin, 15626A.
Boyd, Clifton Linwood, 15635A.
Breslin, Francis James, 15538A.
Broe, Thomas Phillip, 15613A.
Brothers, Herbert Henry, 15628A.
Burleson, Aaron Crowe, 15581A.
Carrington, Louis Higgins, Jr., 15662A.
Caton, Edward Harper, 15681A.
Chell, Paul Laurance, 15597A.
Cicarelli, James Richard, 15656A.
Clifford, Paul Vincent, 15678A.
Cole, Ray Martin, 15568A.
× Collins, Alvin James, 15539A.
Cormier, Joseph Roderic Alyre, 15679A.
Cotterill, Wray Pierson, 15602A.
Covey, Frank Stuart, 15606A.
Cox, Hannibal Maceo, 15621A.
Dean, Cecil Oree, 15548A.
DeLonga, Peter Raymond, 15567A.
DeMont, John Vernon, 15636A.
Denning, Kemp Hoy, Jr., 15541A.
× Dennis, David Stanley, 15649A.
DeWitt, Charles Walter, 15680A.
× Dickey, Earl Roger, 15682A.
Donnelly, George Charles, 15599A.
Duffield, Albert Vernon, 15535A.
× Echeverria, James Vidal, 15632A.
Ellis, Dale Eldon, 15579A.
Enming, Lawrence Joseph, 15652A.
Englerth, Joseph Raymond, 15601A.
Fiebig, Julius Walter, 15630A.
Fiske, William Eldon, 15544A.
Flanders, Charles Wesley, 15610A.
Fluhr, Julius Cleveland, Jr., 15575A.
Fodermaier, Fredric Christian, 15622A.
Franklin, Truman Lee, 15631A.
Frazee, Malcolm Cleverdon, 15564A.
Gareri, Dan James, 15651A.
Geyer, William Edward, 15607A.
× Grimm, Alfred Ray, Jr., 15638A.
Grisham, Leon Magill, 15595A.
Gross, Fred Alfred, Jr., 15545A.
Gross, Robert Anthony, 15559A.
Gstrein, Francis Joseph, 15558A.
Hall, Charles Robinson, 15583A.
Hansen, Harley Linnet, 15666A.
Harse, William Howard, 15620A.
Hasek, Francis Joseph, 15555A.
Haughey, William Ray, 15671A.
× Heard, Edward Clark, Jr., 15582A.
Heimstead, Douglas Aloysious, 15667A.
Heran, Donald Frederick, 15637A.
Hewlett, Cecil James, 15654A.
Hicks, John Ellison, 15565A.
Higgins, Jack LaVern, 15615A.
Hill, James Howard, 15650A.
Holliday, Ben Lamb, 15655A.
× Hopkins, Hubert Vincent, Jr., 15672A.
Hornbarger, William Henry, Jr., 15643A.
× Houghten, Richard Allen, 15553A.
Hunnicutt, Samuel Zayne, 15639A.
Hynes, John Alden, 15623A.
Irvin, David William, Jr., 15551A.
Istvan, Edwin John, 15653A.
Jackson, Charles Worrell, 15647A.
Jeffrey, Rayford Warren, 15550A.
Jenkinson, Frank Frederick, 15536A.
× John, Frank Evan, 15593A.
× Johnson, George Ware, 15552A.
Johnson, Karl Robert, 15563A.
Johnson, Lewis Tasker, 15614A.
Kaiser, Donald Leo, 15677A.
Kalvelage, George Raymond, 15683A.
Keeney, John Gerard, 15557A.
King, William Benjamin, 15645A.
Kotter, Marvin Anderson, 15537A.
Laird, Robert Waldo, 15646A.
Lamb, Forrest York, 15576A.
Lane, Roland Eugene, Jr., 15617A.
LeRoy, Malden Junior, 15608A.
Mannen, Daniel Joseph, 15596A.
Maret, Paul Lemuel, 15661A.
Marsh, Robert Edward, 15570A.
Martin, Clarence Riggs, 15629A.
McFadden, Kirk Laverne, 15658A.
McHargue, Manson William, Jr., 15616A.
McKay, William Linton, 15604A.
McKee, George Henry, 15663A.
Messerli, Louis Gottlieb, Jr., 15605A.

Meyer, Edwin Frederick, Jr., 15588A.
Mimler, Arthur Mathew, 15644A.
Moody, Reuben Benjamin, 15543A.
Moore, Max Leonidas, 15554A.
Neel, Edwin Elmer, 15659A.
Nelson, James Arthur, 15668A.
Nickels, Albert Benno, 15625A.
Nolton, Lee Blackstone, 15573A.
O'Barr, William Connie, 15664A.
O'Reagan, Jack, 15641A.
Parker, John Bennie, 15648A.
Patchen, Clifton Alfred, 15580A.
Perry, Donald Harvey, 15578A.
Peters, Donald Frank, 15676A.
Povalski, James Albert, 15660A.
Pyle, Lowell Dale, 15619A.
Rafferty, Charles Donald, 15634A.
Ragsdale, Herbert Lee, 15665A.
Reilly, Maurice Robert, 15624A.
Richards, Hilburn Frazer, 15585A.
Romans, Basil Webster, 15561A.
Russell, Claude Evans, Jr., 15618A.
Saubers, Jerome Ivan, 15600A.
Savage, Gene Thomas, 15598A.
Schifferer, John Samuel, 15633A.
Schultes, William Albert, 15673A.
Seadler, Walter Scott, 15603A.
Smiley, Frederick Franklin, 15562A.
Smith, James Spencer, Jr., 15584A.
Smith, Landgrave Thomas, Jr., 15594A.
Spencer, Paul Newman, 15542A.
Steffes, Sylvester Philip, 15547A.
Stone, Addison William, 15586A.
Struble, Rex Daniel, 15571A.
Stumpe, Albert Frederick, 15609A.
Sutton, James George, 15540A.
Taylor, Samuel Gatewood, Jr., 15546A.
Thomas, John Leonard, 15590A.
Thornton, Lee Roy, 15674A.
Trammell, William Howard, 15566A.
Wagoner, Robert Charles, 15670A.
Weathermon, Gerald E., 15560A.
Webb, Hardie Glenn, 15572A.
Weber, John Anthony, 15587A.
Wells, Jack Ames, 15577A.
Wickes, Edward George, Jr., 15534A.
Wilson, Robert Benjamin, 15556A.
Windsor, David Warren, 15657A.
Wright, Charles Francis, 15612A.

*To be first lieutenants*

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Hubbard, George Maurice, 21457A.
Jacobson, Richard Kalman, 20689A.
Lange, Roy Allert, 20690A.
Perdew, Denning Miles, 20688A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress.

*To be captains*

AIR FORCE NURSES

Pfeiffer, Rita M., 21175W.
Russell, Georgeann Eileen, 21132W.
Walters, Alice Marie, 21084W.

*Women's medical specialist*

Thompson, Lois Ruth, 21193W.

NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of April 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

---

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

C. Dickerman Williams, New York, to be Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Mar. 5, 1951
For actions of Mar. 2, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 38

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....5
Appropriations.....7
Budget.....12
Census.....14
Electrification.....3,7,13
Fertilizer.....6
Flood control.....10
Foreign affairs, aid..7,11
Forests and forestry.....7
Lands, reclamation.....3
Lobbying.....4
Military training.....1,15
Monopolies.....7
Personnel.....7,9
Prices, support.....2
Research.....7
Selective service.....15
Territories and possessions.....7
Transportation.....8,13

HIGHLIGHT: Senate debated military-training bill.

SENATE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military-training selective-service bill (pp. 1820-49). Agreed to vote today on the Morse amendment authorizing induction at 18½ with provision for voluntary induction at 18 (pp. 1814-15).

2. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Aiken inserted a Vermont Poultry and Egg Producers Association resolution favoring removal of support prices from all farm products (p. 1808).

3. ELECTRIFICATION. Received from the S. Dak. Legislature a request that the Bureau of Reclamation be more careful of the rights of farmers in constructing an electric line in S. Dak. (pp. 1807-8).

4. LOBBYING. Received registrations, pursuant to the Lobbying Act, for the fourth calendar quarter 1950 (pp. 1851-1953).

5. RECESSED until Mon., Mar. 5 (p. 1849).

HOUSE

6. FERTILIZER. The Special Subcommittee on Fertilizer and Farm Machinery, of the Committee on Agriculture, recommended:

"1. That those in charge of the defense program recognize and act upon the elementary fact that agriculture is an essential defense industry and should be given that status in any allocation of critical materials.

"2. That advisers and consultants under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture qualified and authorized to present the requirements of agriculture, be appointed to participate with the policy-making officials at the highest levels of defense-program administrations, agencies, and authorities.

"3. That the export program be critically reviewed with the objective of finding out how much American sulfur the industries of other countries can do without--not how much they would like to have.

"4. That the present users of sulfur and sulfuric acid be carefully surveyed to discover how much of this material now being wasted or discarded can be recaptured or reused and that positive steps be taken to see to it that this material is saved and utilized.

"5. That all possible long-range sources of sulfur and sulfuric acid be examined and analyzed by competent and appropriate governmental agencies, and that sulfur recovery, production, or reconstitution facilities be required, where appropriate, as a condition of the approval of any facility for accelerated amortization or any other such governmental assistance.

"6. That research be intensified to discover whether there is a practical and economic method of producing phosphate fertilizer without sulfuric acid or with proportionately reduced qualtities of that material."

7. APPROPRIATIONS. In addition to the items listed in Digest 37, H. Doc. 66 contains the following Budget amendments for fiscal year 1952: $500,000 for FTC, for enforcement of amendment to the Clayton Antitrust Act to prohibit the acquisition of assets of corporations in restraint of trade; $100,000, FSA, for research on residual toxicology of insecticides used on foods; $690,000 for Virgin Islands Corporation to purchase and rehabilitate power and transmission facilities; $120,000 for State Department, International Commission - U. S. and Canada, to determine the nature and design of remedial works in the Niagara River in connection with power development plans.

The following are additional items in H. Doc. 67, fiscal year 1951: $12,500,000 for International Children's Welfare Work; $12,000,000 for GSA, for reactivation of industrial plants; $3,500,000 for Bureau of Public Roads, Commerce Department, for highways in or adjacent to the Tongass National Forest, Alaska; $5,000,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads, to survey, construct, and maintain highways through public lands and Federal reservations; authorization for Army Engineers to use $450,000 of flood-control funds for investigations of power projects on the Niagara River; $3,000,000 for Labor Department, employees compensation fund; and authority for State Department to use $36,500 for the U. S.-Canada Joint International Commission to make investigations for remedial works on the Niagara River for power development.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

8. TRANSPORTATION. S. 1018, by Sen. Case, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act for the purpose of alleviating shortages in railroad equipment; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 1808). Remarks of Sen. Case and text of the bill (p. 1809).

9. PERSONNEL. S. 1019, by Sen. Ecton, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service rendered States or instrumentalities of States; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 1808).

10. FLOOD CONTROL. S. 1020, by Sen. Malone, to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity; to Public Works Committee. (pp. 1808-9). Remarks of Sen. Malone (p. 1809).

11. FOREIGN AID. H. R. 3017 (see Digest 37) authorizes an appropriation of $140,000,000 to provide two million long tons of food grains, or equivalent, as emergency food relief to meet famine conditions in India. In addition to the appropriation authorization, authorizes the use of $50,000,000 of ECA funds, with one-half of the total authorization ($190,000,000) to be available during fiscal year 1951 and the balance in fiscal year 1952. Requires USDA to certify that the procurement of any agricultural products for this purpose will not impair the fulfillment of vital needs of the U. S. Provides also for an agreement between the U. S. and India for use and distribution of the grain,

But the North Korean Communist aggressors were destroyed. And when, in replacement, the Chinese Communist hordes came in, they have been checked with losses which, in terms of dead, wounded, prisoners, and disabled, may now mount to several hundred thousand men.

United Nations forces in Korea have forged a fiery furnace into which nearly 1,000,000 Communist troops have now been fed by their ambitious and despotic rulers. That operation represents in a real sense a defense of our own homeland and it provides the opportunity to win peace in the Pacific. For that we must be eternally grateful not only to General MacArthur, General Ridgway, and the high command, but particularly to the rank and file of the troops of the United States and the other United Nations who sacrificially responded to the call of duty, often at the price of life itself.

Finally, as another foundation stone, we have the present effort of the American people to create a great force-in-being, so as to make it apparent that Russia could not quickly, or at all, win a general war.

I have often said that there would never be lasting peace until nations were prepared, in time of peace, to make sacrifices for peace such as they make, in time of war, for victory. For the first time in all history there is such an effort. The United States is making sacrifices such as no free nation has ever made except in a war for survival. We can hope we are not making that effort too late. We can know, on the basis of our mission's contact with peoples of other lands, that these others are moved to respond in kind, and that they feel a new confidence in the capacity of the United States to lead the free world out of the present morass of peril and confusion.

All in all, General MacArthur in Japan, our fighting men in Korea and the American people here at home have laid a good foundation upon which to build a lasting peace in the Pacific. Our recent mission has put up the scaffolding for that building. The work of filling in with bricks and mortar is now to be done. If that is well done there will be in Japan and related areas a new sense of security and well-being. That will help to thwart the Stalin strategy of conquering the West via the East, and indeed it can so spectacularly demonstrate the worth and capacity of freedom that the example will loosen the present hold of Communist despotism upon its captive world.

Liberation is a goal we must never relinquish. This Nation of ours was founded by men who believed that their conduct and example could be a great force for political liberty throughout the world. They looked outward, not inward. As President Lincoln said, their Declaration of Independence offered "liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time." In their time much of Europe and of this American hemisphere was held by despotic power supported by the Russian empire and its Holy Alliance. That grip was pried loose. In that process, our Nation played a powerful, yet peaceful, part. That can be done again. It will be done again if in the free world men use freedom so well that they set up an influence that is contagious. That is the great goal to have in mind as we and our friends build peace in the Pacific. It is the goal which, if we are resolute, we shall attain.

## THE STRIKE IN THE WOOL TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have before me a statement made by Maj. Gen. Irving J. Phillipson, director of Industrial Relations of Botany Mills, Inc., in which the general presents the position of Botany Mills in respect to the present unfortunate, and I feel entirely useless, strike which is being conducted by the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, against a very large segment of American wool textile mills.

Because the statement so forcefully discloses that the labor leaders in this instance are not striking against the employers, but rather are striking to compel the Government to accept dictation from them, I feel the communication is one which should be of interest to all American citizens.

For that reason, I think the statement should be a matter of permanent record, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT STRIKE IN WOOL TEXTILE INDUSTRY TOTALLY UNNECESSARY: MEANS LOSS OF ESSENTIAL PRODUCTION FOR ARMED FORCES AND NEEDLESS LOSSES OF EMPLOYEES' WAGES—STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. IRVING J. PHILLIPSON (U. S. A. RETIRED), DIRECTOR OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, BOTANY MILLS, INC., PASSAIC, N. J., FEBRUARY 20, 1951

The present strike that has been called against Botany Mills, Inc., and other worsted and woolen companies is entirely unnecessary and can accomplish nothing except the loss to employees of the wages they and their families need to live on, and the loss of essential production for the Armed Forces and civilian population at this time when their country is in dire need of the cooperation and 100 percent effort of everyone of its citizens.

The labor leaders who called this strike are not striking against the employers; they are striking to compel their Government to accept dictation from them.

Last November, we were served with notice by the Textile Workers Union that they were terminating their contract with us on February 1, but were anxious to start negotiations for a new contract. Despite this great "anxiety to start negotiations," we were unable to meet with the union until January 10, only 3 weeks before the expiration of the contract.

DEMAND WOULD COST FIVE MILLIONS ANNUALLY

At that time, we were presented with demands that, if they were granted, it would ultimately cost Botany in the neighborhood of $5,000,000 per year, or about five times its current earnings.

Obviously, such demands were preposterous, and were even characterized by the head of the union negotiating committee as fantastic.

Nevertheless, we met with the union negotiating committee as often as they could find time to sit down with us and were making usual progress toward a settlement when we were served on January 30 with an ultimatum that unless we signed a contract with them by the 31st they would strike on February 1.

This was obviously impossible, and we so informed the union. At the union's request, we then extended the existing contract until February 15 and continued to negotiate.

BOTANY OFFERED HIGHER WAGES; PENSIONS

As a result of these negotiations, Botany advised the union that they were willing to consider the granting of a pension plan whereby employees at age 65, with 25 years of service, would receive a pension of $100 a month, including primary social-security benefits, and also a quarterly wage adjustment based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index, so that the standard of living of no Botany employee would be impaired during these critical times because of rapid increases in the cost of living. These offers were made in addition to a wage increase of 12 cents per hour that had been voluntarily granted on October 9, 1950, although we were not required by our contract to do so. This was an increase of 8¾ percent, and will cost Bontany approximately $1,250,000 per year.

BOTANY AGREED TO CONTINUE NEGOTIATIONS

We explained to the union's negotiating committee that our earnings, which have made it impossible to declare a common-stock dividend for over a year, would not possibly permit any additional wage adjustment at this time, particularly, as one reason our earnings are depressed is that our average wage structure is already 8 cents per hour in excess of the average wage paid under contracts with other companies in the industry.

Despite this, we advised them we would be willing to sit down at any future time and discuss a wage increase when conditions might make it more possible, either because the company's profits had improved, or the industry generally had given a wage increase, or the Wage Stabilization Board had announced some general formula permitting an increase, or some other condition might make it possible to consider an increase. Our last meeting with the union was held on February 13 and ended with the union announcing that unless the company would immediately grant them, in addition, their requested wage increase, negotiations were concluded and they would strike on Friday.

In answer to Mr. Rieve's letter of February 7, 1951, advising us that the union would not extend their contract beyond February 15 under any circumstances, we advised Mr. Rieve: "We are currently meeting with your committee to try to arrive at a mutual settlement. We will continue to meet, as we believe strike action is entirely unnecessary and will neither speed up negotiations nor enhance prospects of a satisfactory settlement." This still remains true.

SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES OPPOSE STRIKE

At least 75 percent of Botany employees are opposed to this strike. Approximately 300 members, or less than 10 percent of the 4,500 employees in Botany, authorized the strike. Botany's average wage rate of $1.50 per hour is above the national average for manufacture of nondurable goods. The average Botany employee today receives a weekly pay check of $66.98, as compared with $50.28 last June before Korea, an increase of 33 percent in 8 months.

Those facts speak for themselves. All of our employees could have been happily at work earning good wages and doing their part to support their country's defense in this time of crisis, while negotiations continued underway. The final settlement of contract negotiations would not have been delayed one day, nor would the employees have lost one cent of benefits they might otherwise acquire.

This did not, however, suit the purposes of labor leaders, apparently more concerned with imposing their will on the Government of the United States than they were in protecting the welfare of their membership. As a result, we have this needless strike.

EMPLOYEES SHOULD WORK WHILE NEGOTIATING

We, in Botany, sincerely hope that our employees will reconsider the rash action taken by such a small minority, and will continue to work while contract negotiations are concluded as the employees of other mills are doing. In its turn, Botany pledges its employees that it will continue its best efforts to arrive at a mutually satisfactory settlement of all disputes over wages and working conditions with their negotiation committee.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if consideration of routine business has been concluded, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request. Before doing so, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hayden | Millikin |
| Bennett | Hendrickson | Monroney |
| Benton | Hennings | Morse |
| Brewster | Hickenlooper | Mundt |
| Bricker | Hill | Neely |
| Bridges | Hoey | Nixon |
| Butler, Md. | Holland | O'Conor |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hunt | O'Mahoney |
| Byrd | Ives | Pastore |
| Cain | Jenner | Robertson |
| Capehart | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Case | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kem | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Connally | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Dirksen | Langer | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Lehman | Stennis |
| Duff | Lodge | Taft |
| Dworshak | Long | Thye |
| Eastland | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ecton | McClellan | Watkins |
| Ellender | McFarland | Welker |
| Ferguson | McKellar | Wherry |
| Frear | McMahon | Wiley |
| Fulbright | Magnuson | Williams |
| George | Malone | Young |
| Gillette | Martin | |
| Green | Maybank | |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). A quorum is present.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, inquiry has been made of me by Senators from both sides of the aisle as to whether there would be a vote upon the pending amendment today. I understand from the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he is willing that a vote be had at any time upon his amendment. However, several speeches are to be made. In order to try to accommodate Senators, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that between 12 o'clock noon and 2 o'clock on Monday next the time on the pending amendment of the Senator from Oregon be equally divided between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; that at 2 o'clock the Senate proceed to vote upon the amendment, provided no amendment or amendments to the pending amendment have, in the meanwhile, been offered and are pending; that if an amendment or amendments to the pending amendment have been offered, the time for debate on such amendment or amendments be limited to 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and that no amendment or substitute may be offered to the pending amendment which is not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want it to be very clear in the RECORD that the junior Senator from Oregon is ready to vote on his first amendment at any time today or Monday or any other time, but, in order to cooperate in expediting what appears to be the earliest possible vote on the amendment, I shall be very glad to join with the majority leader in the unanimous-consent request. For future reference, however, because my colleagues know my general position respecting unanimous-consent agreements fixing a time to vote which, as a general matter of policy, I think are not advisable, I wish to make a statement.

I should much prefer that the Senate proceed in the regular course and vote when debate ends on a particular issue, and not fix the time to vote by a unanimous-consent agreement. But in view of the fact that my amendments are involved, I conceive it would be very uncooperative and unfair of me to let my general attitude toward unanimous-consent agreements prevail as against my own amendments. Therefore, I will go along with the unanimous-consent request, although I had hoped the Senate could vote on my first amendment this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so there will be no misunderstanding with respect to which amendment is involved, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will specify for the RECORD that the request relates to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon offered on February 27, 1951, designated by the letter "D." I make that suggestion so there will be no question respecting which amendment is involved. I wonder if the majority leader will accept that modification.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I accept that modification.

Mr. WHERRY. I make that suggestion, because the Senator from Oregon has offered other amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say the RECORD shows that the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "D," offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. If that is so, my point is taken care of. I simply wanted to make absolutely certain that every Senator was aware of what amendment was to be voted upon.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, as I hope it will be, rule XVIII of the Senate will not be affected; that is, it will still continue in effect, will it not? Under the rule any Senator who desires to move to separate the various parts of amendment designated "D" may do so, in order that a vote may be taken on the various parts individually? Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that adoption of the request will not affect that rule.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment designated "D" is really a bloc of amendments, and if any Senator desires to move to have a vote on individual parts of the amendment he can do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The rule will be preserved.

Mr. WHERRY. That can be done under rule XVIII, in spite of the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate enter into the proposed agreement? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

*Ordered*, That on the calender day of Monday, March 5, 1951, between the hours of 12 o'clock noon and 2 p. m., debate on the pending amendments (lettered "D") proposed by Mr. MORSE on March 1 to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, shall be divided equally and controlled, respectively, by Mr. MORSE and Mr. RUSSELL; that at the hour of 2 p. m. the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the said amendments, provided that no amendment or amendments thereto have been proposed in the meantime; that in the event an amendment or amendments have been proposed thereto, debate on any such amendment or amendments shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment and Mr. RUSSEL: *Provided*, That no amendment shall be received that is not germane to the subject matter of the said amendment.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. As I understand, Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] desires to make a statement. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to him for a period of approximately 20 minutes, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Utah is recognized for 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as I understood, the request was that I be rec-

ognized for approximately 20 minutes. I hope I shall not be cut off simply because the Chair misunderstood the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was in error, and the correction will be made.

PROPOSED RENUNCIATION BY THE UNITED STATES OF THE 1947 ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the 1947 Treaty of Peace with Italy is a trap. It should be scrapped.

The Italian Peace Treaty of 1947 stripped Italy of the means of self-defense. It prevents effective Italian participation in the program for defense against aggression.

We were told in 1947 that prompt ratification of the Italian Peace Treaty would open the door for the quick admission of Italy to the United Nations. Those who held out that hope for the future had their eyes closed to reality. The door for Italy's admission to the United Nations has been blocked by a Russian veto. Four times Italy has applied for UN membership; four times Russia has vetoed that application.

The proponents of the Italian Peace Treaty admitted when the treaty was under debate in this body that it was not a good treaty. They insisted, however, that it was the best we could hope to get. The President himself announced that it would be a great misfortune and a heavy blow to our country's leadership in world affairs if the Senate were to withhold approval of the treaty.

The developments of recent years are such that it is now detrimental to our country's leadership in world affairs not to denounce the Italian Peace Treaty.

Three years ago, when the Italian Peace Treaty was brought before the Senate for ratification, I was one of a little group of Senators who opposed the administration and its bipartisan foreign policy friends in their drive for quick approval of the Italian treaty and also the treaties with Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. When the matter was brought to a vote, I was one of ten who voted against ratification.

In a speech on the floor of the Senate on June 5, 1947, I spoke out against ratification. The reasons I urged then against ratification of the treaty apply with equal force today in a move to vacate and denounce the treaty.

With the indulgence of the Senate I shall read a part of that argument, as recorded on page 6398 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 5, 1947, volume 93, part 5:

REASONS FOR VOTE

In conclusion, Mr. President, I summarize some of the reasons, among many others which might be urged, why I shall vote against ratification:

First. The treaties are premature. The European situation is so complex and confused that it is practically impossible to do justice and adhere to reason in a piecemeal fashion. What will be done in the German and Austrian Peace Treaties will have a profound effect on all the Axis satellites as well as the Allied countries. The significance of the deliberations and negotiations respecting treaties with Germany and Austria will overshadow all that is done now. Postponement of action on the treaties now being considered will strengthen our hand in these later negotiations. The events in Hungary are strong and urgent reasons why the peace with Italy and the satellite countries should not be ratified at this time.

VIOLATES ATLANTIC CHARTER

Second. The Italian treaty violates every principle of the Atlantic Charter. The fact that all the representatives of the Allied Nations had a hand in drafting the treaty does not give it any special virtue. The action only reveals how far the Allied Nations have departed from the high ideals with which they are supposed to have fought the war.

INCONSISTENT WITH AID PROGRAM

Third. The Italian treaty is totally inconsistent with the announced purpose of the United States in extending aid to Greece and Turkey when in furtherance thereof we send $400,000,000 to aid those countries in strengthening their economic and military forces to prevent Communist aggression from within and without. In the Italian treaty we render Italy helpless to repel outside aggression, and saddle her with economic servitude. It is doubtful that the military forces we have allowed her are sufficient even to maintain order in case of a Communist uprising. The very terms of the treaty requiring the leveling of fortifications, the limit on modern weapons, and the size of the forces allowed, are ample proof that this is true.

Figuratively speaking, we expect Italy to defend herself with bows and arrows against rockets and atomic bombs and weapons undreamed of which the cunning of man will yet invent.

DENIES SELF-PRESERVATION

Mr. President, the first right of every human being born into this world is the right of self-preservation. Who gave the prerogative to the Allies to deprive the Italian people of this God-given right?

ITALIANS IN DESPERATE SITUATION

That liberty-loving Italians face a desperate situation, with Tito and Stalin glaring at them across an undefended border only a few short miles away, should be apparent to Americans, but it seems to make very little impression here. We say, "Let them rely on the United Nations," an organization we know, to our regret, is now totally impotent.

It might help us to recall that in order to defend ourselves against the only potential enemy in sight—an enemy separated from us by two oceans and some 3,000 miles away from the heart of our homeland—we are asked to appropriate over $11,000,000,000, and a commission of able men are urging us to adopt a universal military training program to cost $1,750,000,000 annually. Who is that potential enemy, may I ask? It is the same one that faces undefended Italy.

I have been quoting from the speech I made in June 1947. Of course, we are all aware of the fact that there has been a vast change for the worse since that time, and that the appropriations are immensely greater than they were then. I continue the quotation:

Mr. President, I feel impelled to say that we shall live to regret a ratification of these treaties.

It appears from recent press reports that at least one of the 79 Senators who voted in favor of ratification of the Italian Peace Treaty in 1947 now thinks the Italian treaty should be denounced. According to press reports he has written a letter to the Secretary of State suggesting that the United States either withdraw from or denounce the treaty.

It gives me great pleasure to welcome my friend and colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., to the ranks of the ten who originally had misgivings about the 1947 Treaty of Peace with Italy.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed by the Senator from Massachusetts to the Secretary of State be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. In connection with the letter addressed by the Senator from Massachusetts to the Secretary of State, I also ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article regarding the Senator's letter, taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 19, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the list of those who opposed the treaty also included in the insertion?

Mr. WATKINS. That is not included in the insertion, but I could give the Senator the names.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have them.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senators who voted "nay," according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, were Bridges, Dworshak, Eastland, Langer, McCarran, Malone, O'Daniel, Watkins, Wherry, and Brooks.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY HAS MADE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR ITALY TO TAKE STEPS TO EFFECTIVELY DEFEND HERSELF—IT NOW PREVENTS ITALY FROM CONTRIBUTING TO THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. WATKINS. I may interpolate here in my prepared statement that is the very thing we are now discussing—the number of troops we should have, the size of the Army we should authorize. Incidental to that we would have to know what help we are going to receive from our allies. So the question of the Italian treaty and of whether we are going to allow it to stand is important in the very discussion now taking place in the Senate on the pending measure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to make the argument indelibly clear will the distinguished Senator say now for the RECORD what Italy can do to make a contribution, and what she is restricted from doing because of the treaty?

Mr. WATKINS. I can answer only in round figures. If the Senator will wait, I think I shall bring that out in my statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. Section 4 of the treaty of peace with Italy demilitarized her borders and placed a severe limitation on the size of her armed forces. Italy's Army and frontier guard together were limited to 185,000. In the case of a country needing so much defense as Italy needs, and being in the position she is in, on the borders of a Communist state with other Communist states close by, it seems to me that that was a limitation which now places Italy in a practically helpless position before a Russian Communist onslaught. There were also other limitations.

Article 63 of the treaty, together with annex XIII–B, provides that military training shall not be given to more than the 250,000 Italians in the army, frontier guard, and constabulary.

Section 5 of the treaty with Italy places severe limitations on the Italian Air Force. It limits the number of planes to 350 and air force personnel to 25,000 effectives.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. One of the arguments to which I have listened for the past 2 weeks is that, if we are to have a defense in Western Europe, we must build the morale of the Western European countries. In view of the restrictions contained in the treaty, does the Senator feel that we are building the morale of the Italian people to any great extent, so that they would come to the defense of the North Atlantic Pact countries, or even to their own defense, in the event an invasion were made by a powerful enemy?

Mr. WATKINS. I would say the morale would be at the lowest possible point, because, by reason of the treaty, to which many of them objected but which they were practically forced to sign, they would know that they could never make any effective defense themselves, so long as the treaty stands. The fact of the matter is—I have this information on very good authority, although I cannot absolutely vouch for its accuracy—that they have not even armed to the extent to which the treaty permits them, because their morale is so low; and because today conditions are such that they are not in a position to do very much. There is no doubt in my mind that the United States of America will have to carry Italy's share of the defense burden, unless the treaty is abrogated and set aside. Even now we cannot even put men in Italy, we can do nothing, at least within the mainland of Italy, unless the treaty is set aside. We had our troops there at the time the treaty was ratified, and within 90 days we withdrew them, in accordance with the terms of the treaty. So the Italians themselves have not very much incentive to become active in their own defense, although they have a million men of combat age who could constitute a large military force. If they could thus utilize their own men, there could be a corresponding reduction in the number of men from the United States who would have to be sent there to take their place, provided the present policy of the administration were carried out. I hope it will not be. I hope we shall face this matter realistically, and that we will succeed in getting the Europeans, including the Italians, to do everything they can to defend themselves. It should be remembered that Italy had more than a million men under arms in World War II and can probably do as well or better in the future.

I have always felt that the treaty was never fair to Italy. Neither is it fair to us; and the same reasons we are urging now against it were valid at the time it was made. The arguments made then have the same validity now.

Section 3 of the peace treaty severely limits the Italian Navy. Total personnel is fixed at 25,000 officers and men. The training of additional Navy personnel is prohibited. Italy is prohibited from constructing, acquiring, or replacing battleships, aircraft carriers, submarines, and various other types of naval craft to replace those of which she was stripped by the terms of the treaty.

As will be recalled, Russia got most of the Italian battleships, the fighting force which Italy had on the seas. They went to Russia, with many other things, including reparations, as I shall point out.

Article 46 of the treaty of peace provides that the treaty's naval, military, and air clauses are to remain in effect until modified by agreement between the Allied and associated powers and Italy or by agreement between the United Nations Security Council and Italy, after Italy becomes a member of the United Nations.

Articles 51, 52, and 53 place severe limitations on the kinds of arms Italy may acquire, manufacture, and possess. Article 54 limits Italy to 200 heavy and medium tanks.

I should like to ask those who are considering the terms of the pending bill, and are familiar with the appropriations we have already made and the additional ones which are to be made, how far 200 heavy and medium tanks would go in the defense, under modern conditions.

Soviet Russia was one of the allied and associated powers. Is there anyone so foolish as to believe that Russia will agree to any modification which will allow Italy to increase her military strength?

Soviet Russia sits on the Security Council of the UN. In that capacity she enjoys the so-called veto power. Even if Italy were to be admitted to the United Nations, is there anyone so foolish as to believe Russia would not block any move to increase the size of the armed forces of Italy?

THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY HAS WEAKENED THE ECONOMY OF ITALY AND HAS STRENGTHENED THE ECONOMY OF THE FORCES OF COMMUNISM

Part VI of the treaty forced Italy to pay $365,000,000 in reparations. Of this $100,000,000 went to the Soviet Union in the form of industrial production and raw materials.

I am quite sure Russia is collecting those reparations, and they are all being used to build up her war potential. The Italians have some wonderful industries, great industries. They know how to build planes, tanks, guns, ships, and other munitions of war, and we may be sure that Russia is collecting in full under the clauses of the treaty to which I have referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care to interrupt the distinguished Senator's address, since he is making a very forceful statement, but I should like to ask one question. The Senator suggested that the Italian people have many industries and are doing a great work in promoting others. Have not the United States taxpayers helped those industries to do the kind of things the Senator has been referring to, and are not the products of the different plants in many instances going to Russia to build up Russia's potential, and will they not at some time in the future be used against the United States of America?

Mr. WATKINS. In response to the Senator's question I may say that not only is Italy paying the reparations according to the terms of the treaty, but apparently she entered into a trade pact with Russia in 1949 under which she has been sending Russia numerous manufactured articles, commodities, and what not, which could be used and probably would be used as war potentials.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Were not some of the factories which are producing war materials going to Russia financed by the ECA under the Marshall plan?

Mr. WATKINS. I am informed that they were. In fact, in the Washington Evening Star of February 28, 1951, there appeared a news story from Rome giving an account of what is being done. I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Star be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, with a brief introductory statement by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in connection with this matter I took the precaution to contact the State Department, and to have the ECA called, and while I do not have the reply in writing, the answer from the State Department was that the story contained in the Star relates to an ECA matter. They simply brushed it off.

The reply from the ECA desk was, "Of course Italians are sending these things over under the Russian-Italian trade agreement, and it is a good thing for Italy. Italy gets back metals which they need in their economy."

Anyone who took the time to read the article I am having printed in the REC-

build up its domestic security and carry its fair share of the load in defense of Western Europe and the free nations of the world.

I join with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in saying that the Italian people are ready and willing, and no doubt will come forward with additional divisions if the restrictions upon them are removed and they can honorably do so. The Italian-Americans in this country have shown what they can do by their progress in the arts and sciences, in education and in industry, and by fighting with us as Americans when we have had to fight. I have great respect for them and their loyalty to the cause for which we are all working.

THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY WAS A CONTRADICTION OF OUR SOLEMN PROMISES TO THE ITALIAN PEOPLE—IT VIOLATED THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Time and again our leaders appealed to the Italian people to overthrow their Fascist leaders and join the fight against the Axis Powers. We all remember with what high hopes those appeals were made, and how eleated we and the other free peoples of the world were when the Italians responded. In return we promised them a just and fair peace.

The Italian people responded by overthrowing Mussolini and his pro-Nazi Fascists, and on October 13, 1943, Italy declared war on Germany.

On July 14, 1945, Italy announced that she was at war with Japan. That was 1 month before our so-called ally, Soviet Russia, declared herself at war with Japan.

The treaty of peace with Italy ordered territorial concessions and changed Italy's boundaries without consulting the people concerned. This was a direct contradiction of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The provisions of the Italian Peace Treaty are characterized by an attitude of harshness which we were led into by those who were overwhelmed by a desire to "cooperate" with Soviet Russia. The treaty was negotiated in the balmy days when our leadership was under the impression that Soviet Russia was a peace-loving democracy. With that policy I never could bring myself into agreement.

I suggest that the United States together with the other nations of the free world immediately withdraw from and denounce the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947. This should be accompanied by a call for a new conference to draft a new treaty more nearly in accord with the realties of the world situation.

The Italian treaty was premature. It was a serious mistake in the beginning and now is the proper time to have it set aside.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In his remarks the Senator from Utah referred to the fact that several naval craft were given to Russia under the terms of the treaty. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that 20 naval craft, including the largest warship which Italy had, were transferred to the Russians at that time. That was in June of 1947, when there should have been a proper recognition of the international situation which existed at the time.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
*Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty the Italian Army is limited to 185,000, and stringent limitations are put on military training and on the development of the Italian Navy and Air Force.

These limitations will certainly hamper Italy's capacity to contribute to the armed forces being set up under the Atlantic Pact. This is bad for Italy and bad for the other nations who are members of the Atlantic Pact, including the United States. Surely, it is in the interests of the United States for American manpower not to have to carry an undue load of combat, and in the narrowest sense, therefore, we have an interest in enabling Italy to participate as completely as possible.

Obviously, the conditions which existed at the time the Italian Peace Treaty was concluded no longer apply. The idea that Italy could possibly be a threat to the peace—which is implicit in the treaty—is today clearly absurd. On the contrary, Italy would be a great help toward the maintenance of peace. The provision in article 46 envisaging Italian membership in the United Nations has been completely nullified by the abuse of the veto power by the Soviet Union.

Thus, the question of withdrawing from or denouncing the Italian Peace Treaty becomes extremely pressing. Will you please advise me, therefore, what steps can be taken in order to end the present highly unfortunate and unjust situation caused by the existence of the so-called Italian Peace Treaty?

Very sincerely yours,
HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
*United States Senator.*

---

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of February 19, 1951]

LODGE ASKS SCRAPPING OF ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

WASHINGTON, February 18.—Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, urged today that the United States take steps to scrap the Italian peace treaty and permit Italy to build up her armed forces against the threat of Red aggression.

QUESTION STUDIED

In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, LODGE said it had become extremely pressing for this country to consider withdrawing from or denouncing the treaty, cosigned with Russia, which limits Italy's army to 185,000 men.

There were some indications diplomatic officials already were studying the question and that his letter had been written with their knowledge and encouragement.

Acheson charged last week that the Communist satellites of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria had violated peace-treaty limitations on the size of their armed forces.

This charge is closely linked with the Italian treaty question because all four of the countries were former Axis Nations and their treaties were drafted simultaneously in 1946 by the United States, Russia, Britain, and France.

CALLED NULLIFIED

LODGE said Russia had already completely nullified the Italian treaty by refusing to go through with a promise to admit Italy to the United Nations. Moreover, he said, the conditions which existed when the treaty was signed no longer apply.

"The idea that Italy could possibly be a threat to the peace—which is implicit in the treaty—is today clearly absurd," he said.

LODGE said the stringent limitations on Italian armed forces "will certainly hamper Italy's capacity to contribute" to the unified Atlantic Pact defense force being created under Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

UNITED STATES INTEREST CITED

"This is bad for Italy and bad for other nations who are members of the Atlantic Pact, including the United States," he said. "Surely it is in the interests of the United States for American manpower not to have to carry an undue load of combat and in the narrowest sense, therefore, we have an interest in enabling Italy to participate as completely as possible."

The Italian treaty provides for an army of 185,000, a navy of 25,000 men, and an air force of 200 fighter planes, but no bombers.

These limitations have been observed, despite Italy's entry into the Atlantic Pact.

On the other hand, United States officials estimate that Rumania has 275,000 men under arms instead of the 138,000 authorized in her treaty, and Bulgaria 190,000 instead of the authorized 65,500.

The United States is particularly concerned about military build-up in the Russian satellites because of the fear that it may foreshadow an attack on neighboring Yugoslavia.

---

EXHIBIT 3

ECA AID TO ITALY GOING DIRECTLY TO RUSSIA

I am advised informally that the recent stories in the press regarding the delivery of electric cranes, electric kilowatt stations, and tugboats to Russia by Italian factories are true.

These deliveries are being made pursuant to an Italian-Russian trade agreement of 1949 which was made with the knowledge of the United States Government.

Under this agreement Italy will receive in exchange for the manufactured items referred to, certain supplies of minerals and ores, badly needed in Italy. Among these are manganese and copper.

The facts of the story pointing out that ECA-aided factories are sending manufactured products to Russia therefore are true. The question in this exchange of material with Russia is: Was Russia the only practicable source of supply for the materials needed by Italy?

---

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 28, 1951]

ECA-AIDED FACTORIES IN ITALY SPEEDING PRODUCTS FOR RUSSIA—SOVIET PARTY ARRIVES TO PRESS FOR CRANES AND POWER STATIONS

(By George Weller)

ROME, February 28.—Russia wants its new tools, subsidized by the American taxpayer, delivered right now.

A Soviet economic party has arrived in Genoa to speed up deliveries from Ansaldo and Ansaldo Fossati, two factories that the Marshall plan has helped to the tune of $1,625,000. The former got economic cooperation administration dollar aid of $750,000, the latter $875,000.

The Russian orders—on 24-month contracts signed in 1949—would ordinarily not be delivered until August or September of this year. But the Russians want them faster—in case of war or blockade this summer.

The Russian orders to be delivered by Ansaldo are for electric cranes and thermal power stations. One electric crane, delivered as a sample, apparently was satisfactory. The ECA-aided plants are supposed to deliver $1,275,000 worth of 5-ton electric cranes,

a total of 25 at $51,000 each. They are also supposed to produce for Russia a still unsettled number of larger 7.5-ton cranes at $76,800 each.

The largest order is for thermal power stations to ease Russia's fuel position. This is a field in which Italy, with ECA aid, has made great strides and the Russians are ready to capitalize on it.

The Soviets have ordered $6,500,000 worth of these 500-kilowatt stations—50 stations at $130,000 each. The first is to be shipped off in a few days.

Another rushed Italian order for the U. S. S. R. is 10 deep-sea tugboats constructed at the Viareggio shipyards of the Dante Itoryz plant. The tugs whose keels were laid last June will be loaded aboard Soviet freighters and shipped east this month.

The Chicago Daily News revealed exclusively last July that Italy was building nine locomotives for Russia at the Marshall plan-aided Savigliano plant near Turin.

This plant having received $980,000 from the ECA, was building 60 electric locomotives weighing 35 tons each.

American dollar aid to ECA-outfitted plants working on Russian orders is repaid by them to the Italian Government in long-term payments. Italy then expends the American aid in its final lira form on public works, easing the burden of the Italian taxpayers.

In a letter dated July 20, 1950, commenting on this locomotive story Frank Gervasi, chief of ECA public relations in Italy, wrote the Chicago Daily News Bureau in Rome as follows:

"The locomotives were not 'partially subsidized by ERP' although I suppose this implication could be drawn from our aid to the Savigliano plant, but it seems to be stretching the point a bit.

"The locomotives were built under a trade agreement with Russia with raw materials furnished by Russia, and are similar to locomotives sold by the United States to a Soviet satellite country.

"All my inquiries lead me to the conclusion that they could not possibly have any important bearing on the east-west struggle. The matter in any case falls within the province of the Department of Commerce and not ECA."

A Washington dispatch dated February 18, asserted that Italy had asked the United States to speed up delivery of thermo-electric plants for Rome, Milan, and Turin. Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorp was said to have promised fast delivery.

Thus Russia is asking quick delivery of thermo-electric plants from Italy at the same time Italy is asking similar delivery from the United States.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I rise to address a few remarks to the series of amendments which were discussed Tuesday afternoon on the floor of the Senate by my good friend and distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I am availing myself of this opportunity because I feel that I have an unbiased point of view in this matter.

I was unavoidably absent from the committee session during which the junior Senator from Oregon presented and discussed a similar series of amendments. Therefore, I can say frankly that I have no preconceived views in this matter, nor do I have a position which I previously have taken, and which I might feel obligated to maintain.

In view of my very great respect for the views of the junior Senator from Oregon, it is with the greatest reluctance that I say I find myself in complete disagreement with practically everything he had to say during the course of his remarks Tuesday afternoon.

I might say that the Senator's remarks on Tuesday afternoon carried me back to about this time of the year in 1948 when the Senate of the United States was debating the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

Actually, Mr. President, it might be fruitful if we were to take a few moments to leaf back through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and perhaps refresh our memories, or perhaps be sure that we are all being reasonably consistent.

Time and events have moved rapidly in recent years. Since June 1948, when the Selective Service Act was before the Senate, time has passed with the speed of light and events of tragic and disturbing proportions, which we did not fully anticipate two short years ago, now press upon us from every side.

To establish this observation as being true, at least in part, and because I seek to destroy, if I can, the validity of some of the amendments now pending, I wish to refer to some contemporary history, as authored by the junior Senator from Oregon. This will be done without any personal prejudice to a very warm friend. I do it because an intelligent and constructive solution of America's manpower question is of exceeding importance to every citizen and to the future welfare, strength, and security of the United States of America. My desire is to provide the Senator from Oregon, other Senators, and citizens generally with some realities to think about. My greatest hope is that we soon shall come to terms on a manpower plan of action which will give positive consideration to and relief for the requirements of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, his field commander, Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, and every one of their magnificent fighting men.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon now has offered an amendment, among his other amendments, to continue to limit the period of inductee service to 21 months, which was approved by the Selective Service Act of 1948. This amendment would deny the recommendation of the Armed Services Committee to extend the period of training and service from 21 to 26 months.

In 1948 the same question was before the Senate. Then, as now, the Senator from Oregon was in opposition to the position of the Armed Services Committee. He was then, as now, a member of that committee.

Mr. President, I am going to read rather briefly from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, June 7, 1948. During the course of this reading, I ask all serious persons only to bear in mind that the amendment we are discussing at this moment relates to the advisability of restricting the term of service to 21 months.

From page 7541 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1948, I read as follows:

Mr. MORSE. The next amendment I offer, Mr. President, refers to page 6, line 23, where I propose to strike the number "twenty-four"—

Parenthetically, Mr. President, let me say that was the number of months recommended by the Armed Services Committee—

and insert in lieu thereof the number "twelve." In other words, I propose that the draft shall take men into the armed services for a period of 12 months instead of 24.

I am satisfied that if the amendment is thoroughly studied and all its implications are considered, it, too, when we come to a vote on it, will be adopted.

* * * * *

In support of this amendment I desire the RECORD to show these brief remarks tonight. I think it is a very serious thing to take young men in peacetime, and, I repeat we still are at peace, and I think the chances are very good that we can remain at peace if we use our heads and demonstrate a willingness as one of the United Nations to make the necessary sacrifices for peace—I say, being at peace, it is a very serious thing to take young men from civilian life and disrupt their lives for a 2-year period by placing them in the Army under a peacetime draft.

But I want the RECORD to emphasize tonight that I believe 12 months' training will provide the basic training necessary for a future Army in case of an international incident—

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I point out that that debate occurred about 2 years before Korea—

which might cause us to mobilize all of our manpower at a very rapid rate.

Mr. President, those were views which, as of that time, certainly could be defended by any man who wished to support them. It was a matter of opinion. To my mind, it was a good thing that the recommendation of the junior Senator from Oregon on the 7th day of June 1948 was not accepted. However—and I do not say this facetiously—the junior Senator from Oregon gave a considerable amount of study to the question of training and service immediately after he spoke with such conviction in favor of a 12-month limitation. I have before me now the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1948, two short days after June 7. As I recall, June 7 was on Monday, and June 9 was on Wednesday.

Earlier this afternoon I said, and I meant it, that within the limit of my own capacity—I seek, with everything I have, to support this bill because of its moderation, because of its soundness, because of what I think it will do for our men now struggling in a difficult situation in Korea.

My reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9 will consume only a few minutes of additional time, and I read it because I think the junior Senator from Oregon in his presentation on that day offered some philosophy to think about; and by no means am I in disagreement with everything he said.

From page 7815 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 9, 1948, I read the following:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up for consideration at this time my amendment lettered "I," and ask to have the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "twenty-four" and insert in lieu thereof "twelve."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the clerk to the fact that I have perfected that amendment, and the word is "eighteen" not "twelve."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be noted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me state the amendment so that there will be no doubt as to what it is about. The amendment proposes, on page 6, line 23, to strike out "twenty-four" and insert in lieu thereof "eighteen."

Mr. President, I think this amendment is of exceeding importance, and I hope the Senate will hear me through on it, because it is my opinion that if individual Senators will carefully weigh the merits of the amendment a majority of the Senate will share my point of view as to its preference over the present 24-month provision in the bill.

Mr. President, I am no lawyer. If I were a lawyer and if I were therefore qualified to try a case before a jury or a judge, I think I would immediately be struck with a contradiction concerning the importance of a considered view in support of 12 months on Monday, and an equally firm and considered view in support of 18 months on Wednesday. However, not being an attorney, sir, I shall not labor that point.

I should like to read, as follows, for a moment, if I may:

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime.

In 1948 the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and most other Senators were distressed to do it, but we voted with conviction in support of a peacetime draft law. We thought it was imperative to meet the requirements of the future which was just a few months away. I wonder where we would be now, in terms of Korea, had we neglected to support and pass that measure in 1948.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] continued by way of saying, as shown on page 7816 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 9, 1948:

If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill. I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are "enjoying" a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possibly strengthen them.

Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since VJ-day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

From page 7817 of the same RECORD I wish to quote these passages:

Mr. President, as we sit here tonight—

Parenthetically, I may say I can remember that night, when we sat and worried, all of us together, the Senator from Oregon as seriously and sincerely and patriotically as the rest of us, were trying to determine the very best answer to the needs of tomorrow. Though a majority of the Senate two short years ago went further than the Senator from Oregon was willing to go, none of us collectively went far enough. That is the only reason this bill is before the Senate today, and it is the basis of my justification, as I see it, for saying that, if I can help prevent it, we are not going to incur the risk of making more mistakes than are necessary in this fateful year of 1951. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] continued:

Mr. President, as we sit here tonight, called upon to vote my amendment up or down, one of the facts, or shall I say one of the factors, which we should consider and weigh before we vote, is the question, What is the will of the American people in regard to the length of service for which a boy should be drafted and placed in the Army?

Reasonable men can differ as to the interpretation of the will of the American people on that question. My vote, so far as the weight of that factor is concerned, is going to be resolved in favor of the judgment on my part that the American people generally will that the service should not be in excess of 18 months.

I have some evidence in support of that judgment on my part, and that evidence takes a variety of forms. It is based upon many conversations as I have gone about this land. It is based upon audience reactions in open-forum discussions on military manpower legislation; it is based on a great mass of correspondence and telegrams I have received on the subject.

I do not wish to belabor this point too much, Mr. President, but again, if I can help it, we are not going backward in terms of training and service to permit a man to have a chance to live, who otherwise, because of carelessness at home, might be called upon to die. I am, I suppose, indignant, but not at my friend. I am indignant at a presentation which to my mind, in 1948, was not valid, and which is no more valid today. I say without prejudice of any kind, intended, remote, direct, or otherwise, that there is a contradiction included between these two days, a contradiction which the Senator from Oregon necessarily will answer when he wishes so to do. But I am asserting, Mr. President, to you and to the people of this great country, that in terms of logic one cannot possibly have many conversations as he travels about the land, he cannot receive audience reactions throughout the country regarding military manpower legislation, and he cannot get too large a mass of correspondence and too large a number of telegrams between Monday and Wednesday. It simply cannot be done. I remember occupying the chair which the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma now occupies on the day 2 years ago in June, the 7th, I think, when the Senator from Oregon rose and offered this 12 months' amendment. He spoke with a depth of conviction, obviously comparable to mine. It is beside the point that, sitting in the chair the junior Senator from Oklahoma now occupies, I snorted and said, "That just won't work." But I was impressed by the fact that he said it would work, and "if this country knows what is good for it, it will adopt 12 months."

For the last moment or two I have been talking about a comparable view, presented on Wednesday, 48 hours later. At page 7817 of the RECORD the Senator from Oregon said:

Mr. President, I would ask my colleagues to think ahead to 2 years from now.

Parenthetically, that, I think, is the glory of this debate. We are able to go back 2 years and see how unwisely we acted upon things for the then ensuing 2 years. But time has given us another chance. We are standing here this afternoon trying to anticipate conditions for a period of 2 years in the future. The Senator from Oregon geared his remarks to the most pregnant item of all—"Let us look ahead"—and this is what he said about it:

A few minutes ago, before he went out to dinner, one of my colleagues came to me and said, "Wayne, this is the first one of the issues, so far as your stand on this legislation is concerned, with which I cannot go along with you." I said, "I respect your point of view. I do not think the merits support that point of view, but I venture a little bet with you that, 2 years from now, when the Senate of the United States comes to consider whether or not to continue the draft, you will then say to me, 'Wayne, it would be easier for us to continue the draft if we had voted for 18 months of service 2 years ago.'"

From the third and last column on page 7817, I quote my friend and colleague from Oregon as follows:

I believe we have to be political realists about this problem, too. We should recognize that we have a responsibility of leading the people to a better understanding of the importance of strengthening our national security, and taking them out of the dream world in which they are now living.

Perhaps the views I have as a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the views held by a large majority of the entire membership of that committee will not take America out of its dream world. I am not qualified to say whether the ideas and recommendations and amendments of the Senator from Oregon, a member of that committee, will or will not take us out of the dream world to which he made refer-

ence, but certainly I think it is good to have both sides represented, in order that Americans generally may support the views which they think are the most likely to take us out of a dream world and to put this great universe in which we live again in proper order.

Mr. President, I should like now to comment briefly on some of the special points made by the Senator from Oregon this afternoon. To begin with, he stressed most emphatically his contention that the pending bill, S. 1, is the Marshall-Rosenberg bill, that it is the Pentagon bill. I do not know what I ought to say, other than that, so far as he knows, the junior Senator from Washington wears no man's hat other than his own. The Senator from Washington had something to do with this bill, in a minor sort of way. He does not consider that he is a part of any Marshall-Rosenberg clique. He is reminded that he voted, for what he considered good cause, against the appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall to be Secretary of Defense. I did that, not because I did not wholly respect General Marshall's ability, capacity, and integrity as a soldier—which I do—but because it was my feeling then, and it continues to be so, that the needs of the Nation will best be met by having at the head of the Defense Establishment a civilian.

The Senator from Oregon further hints that perhaps the statistics which were presented to the committee were slanted, or perhaps interpreted in their preparation, by the Department of Defense. I do not believe this to be so, Mr. President. If it is so, I hope the Senator from Oregon, and others working with him, will provide the Senate with the facts. For my own part, I wish to make it perfectly clear that, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] clearly pointed out, the bill before the Senate is not the Pentagon's bill; it is not the administration's bill; the bill which the Senate is now taking cognizance of and thinking about represents the combined efforts of a great number of persons from practically every responsible segment of our Government and of our public life.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CAIN. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that I would rather not, for the reason——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is very agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington declines to yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is attempting to build a defense line from which he and other like-minded Senators can sally forth and attack, and behind which they can repel any assault and outlive any siege. One reason why the Senator from Washington wishes to move rapidly in concluding—and it will take about 20 minutes, I believe—is that the Senator from Oregon, of whose presentation on Tuesday I have taken such critical notice, ought to have in one package every word which has been said by someone who dissents as forcibly and out of such deep conviction as does the Senator from Washington this afternoon.

As was clearly pointed out by the Senator from Texas, the statistics were compiled by the Selective Service System, the Department of Labor through its Census Bureau and its Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the United States Office of Education, and were concurred in by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, and all other agencies of the Federal Government, including the National Security Resources Board.

The Department of Defense was charged by the administration with the responsibility of organizing the presentation of the administration's case to the Senate. It did not create the arithmetic.

The statistics which were presented represent the best information, based on information, available to the Congress. The men who made these tabulations have had highly specialized experience in their fields, and in many cases have had the experience of two wars behind them.

Let me suggest, therefore, Mr. President, that it is not realistic to fasten upon the statistical data which appears in these hearings the label of "Pentagon propaganda."

I feel certain that the junior Senator from Oregon is perfectly aware of the fact that the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and a representative from the Federal Security Agency, appeared before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and testified in support of the bill now before the Senate, and in validation of the data upon which it is based. The Senator from Oregon and any other Senator will do a great favor, will help this country immeasurably, if they can take these statistics——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CAIN. They will do a great favor if they can take these statistics and prove that they are wrong.

Next, Mr. President, let us take a passing glance at the proposal of the junior Senator from Oregon that the 3,500,000 figure—3,462,000 to be exact—is too high; that it is based upon a tremendous program of wastefulness in all three of the armed services; that by simply putting on the screws and arbitrarily forcing the armed services to settle for 3,000,000 or 3,100,000, we will cut out the fat—we will get women doing the jobs in the Army—we will have civilians where we now have uniformed men.

By some vague system of rationalization, it is suggested that the step proposed would result in the creation of additional men and women; by some feat of magic the men or women in civilian clothes would not be charged against our net manpower pool; they would be something additional gained from the outside.

The Senator from Oregon recommends in effect that we require the armed services to settle for a flat 15 or 20 percent cut, and make them get along as best they can with that figure, so that the Congress can take another look at the situation in a few months, a new look, perhaps, and see how the armed services are getting along.

Mr. President, the impossibility of attempting to raise, and organize and operate, anything as complicated as a navy, an air force, a marine corps, or an army, on such a hit-or-miss, day-to-day basis is so obvious that I do not feel that anyone could take this suggestion seriously.

The threat held over the Armed Forces that the Congress would reexamine our strategy, reexamine our deployment of troops, reexamine the question of the number of men authorized, our combat strength, every 6 months, or once a year, would make it impossible for our Military Establishment to function.

As I understand, there is only one reason why we have a Military Establishment, namely, to get ready to fight if fight we must. Nothing else makes any difference. We must find a way in which to make that organization effective, or, in the future, Americans will needlessly go on dying too rapidly, and without too much cause, in many instances.

An armed force cannot be built up overnight, nor can its strength be reduced overnight. A very considerable amount of planning, a very considerable amount of procurement, and a vast amount of personnel management, comes into the picture of the mobilizing or demobilizing of a military force.

Mr. President, I, for one, have recently completed a very extensive tour in which I visited numerous military installations, and I agree that we utilize manpower too wastefully in the Armed Forces.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although I do not agree with my friend the Senator from Washington, I do insist that he be given a hearing in the Senate, and that we may be permitted to hear him; and I can hardly hear him, although I am sitting next to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Chair will ask the Senators to cease conversation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in passing, I shall address myself to the very courteous suggestion made by my friend the Senator from Oregon. I am the last to complain. I believe Senators are not only listening, but they are sitting next to each other talking about what I am discussing, and I would not for a single second suggest that the Senator from Oregon was trying to leave the impression in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that what makes a great deal of sense when said by somebody—and it is going to be said by more—was not being listened to by every Senator. I thank the Senator, but I wish to suggest that after this the Senator from Washington will take care of himself at any and all times.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit—and then we will strike it out—I wonder if the Senator by the most elastic stretch of his imagination can give such an interpretation to my attempt to get order as he has just uttered. I merely sought to get the attention of the Senate so that we would not be interrupted by the conferences going on. I was only performing an act of courtesy

for my friend, and I ask unanimous consent that my interruption and the comments thereo be stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Oregon said that conferences on the bill were taking place on the floor. Certainly I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to remind my friend from Nebraska that I had previously suggested I would prefer to proceed with my remarks without interruption. Were I to yield to the Senator from Nebraska, as I would very much wish to do, I would be duty-bound to yield to other Senators. I would prefer to proceed without interruption.

Mr. President, I agree that in the Armed Forces manpower is utilized wastefully. Manpower it utilized wastefully throughout the Government. Manpower is utilized wastefully in our shipyards. Manpower is utilized wastefully in our great industrial establishments, which mushroom so quickly during a mobilization phase. Mr. President, although the military are great wasters of manpower—and I wish they were not—they are amateurs in the field when compared with our over-all national wastefulness wherever manpower is concerned. However, if I must vote in favor of manpower somewhere, I shall vote in favor of it for the Armed Forces, because they are the only ones who are going to give me and my family a chance to live in the future.

Let us not generalize in this matter. We are talking about men who are being drafted. If it is permitted, I should like to have those words underscored in the RECORD. We are talking about men who are being drafted. The great bulk of the men who are being drafted go into the infantry. From there they go to Korea. The Senator from Washington hopes that that is where the bulk of the men are going to go. I can assure you, Mr. President, that we are not wasting any manpower in Korea. In that area we need every man we can get. Unfortunately and pitifully, we do not have a sufficient number of men in Korea. I think it is completely beside the point to sit here in the Senate and speculate on the generalities of manpower waste when the need for the moment is to induct men to help carry on the campaign in Korea.

It should be said in passing that the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate has a subcommittee on preparedness, which is headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. If I am not mistaken, one of its members is the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Certainly it was only yesterday that I complimented the junior Senator from Oregon on what he and two of his colleagues had done in reporting on the deficiencies of our military establishment and defense in Alaska. Although it is not a part of my statement at this time, I should certainly like to encourage the Senator from Texas and his most valuable coworker, the Senator from Oregon, as well as other Senators on the committee, to keep on with their continuous efforts to check and minimize waste in the Armed Services.

Mr. President, let us stick to the point. Today in Korea there are men who have been fighting continuously for 8 months. I wonder whether it shocks other Members as it shocks me every day to become more and more conscious that the war in Korea, which never was and never could be called a police action, has practically gone to page 10. The fact seems to be entirely overlooked that men younger by far than I and younger than the Senator who sits now in distinguished fashion in the Vice President's chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are continuing to fight 7 days a week in Korea without due notice from America. Mr. President, we are trying to find the answer. We are trying to help them. We think the answer lies in the pending bill.

Are the men who have been fighting for 8 months being wastefully used? Are we going to keep them there for another 8 months, or perhaps another year, or even another 2 years? Will they have to be kept there in what has been characterized as a police action, but which is really a bloody, rotten war? Will they look to us, who sit in political positions, for the answer to the cessation of the war? The answer lies somewhere in the proceedings at Lake Success, with or without the assistance of some of our own political leaders. Are we going to fill up all the billets here in the continental United States with women and IV–F's so as to virtually freeze our combat men overseas in combat assignments?

Mr. President, I submit that we are talking about only one thing in this bill at the moment. We are talking about drafting men for the Army. Men drafted for the Army go to Korea, or to other overseas assignments. I take it to be a difficult thing for us, sitting here in comparative comfort and luxury, to know what it means to be drafted and to be sent to a battlefield. I know most of my colleagues very well, and I would say that if they had the opportunity, if some of them were younger than they are, and if all of them were stronger than they are, they would like to have a chance to volunteer and find out, among other things, what this rotten, bloody mess called war is all about.

We are not wasting men in Korea, so let us get on with the job of making it possible to rotate—this is the first time we have used the word—so that assignments back in continental United States may be found for the gallant troopers who have for 8 months been fighting one of the bitterest campaigns in the history of our country.

The junior Senator from Oregon also made much of the point that 21 months is a long enough period for induction. Perhaps he is right. I think he is wrong. In no uncertain terms I wish to tell him why. He states that not all men go overseas. Such a statement completely oversimplifies the problem, as I have pointed out. The Senator nevertheless states that the overseas time and the time spent in travel overseas is not really an issue. He says that a few specialists—let us remember the use of that word—may require more than 21 months, but generally speaking 21 months is more than a sufficient term of service for an individual inducted into the Army. Perhaps the junior Senator from Oregon is right. The junior Senator from Washington believes him to be wrong. If the junior Senator from Washington should be called back into the armed services, which is by no means unlikely, he will, in support of the men under his command and those men whom he will so willingly serve, hope that he is working under an instrument of law that provides a length of training and service in excess of 21 months.

Mr. President, I notice that some of our young pages are curious about my recitation and about the debate on this question. I congratulate them on their curiosity. We are actually going to make it possible for them to get along a little better in the years which lie ahead. If any of them find an answer which they think we have overlooked, I suggest that they talk to us at their convenience in the cloak room. They will find that we are ready to listen. No one among us is certain that he is right.

Let us keep strictly on the track. We are not talking about Air Force men, and we are not talking about Navy men. The Air Force and the Navy get all their men through voluntary enlistment. I suppose every Senator knows that to be the fact. However, since I am not certain of it, I believe it should be stated. The Navy men and the Air Force men average a term of service of more than 5 years, counting reenlistment—I doubt that the junior Senator from Nebraska knows it—so that the 21 months-26 months controversy is purely academic insofar as they are concerned.

Mr. President, we are talking about the men who serve on the ground. We are talking about the draftees. What we are talking about in the bill is drafting men for the United States Army. The Army is bearing the brunt of the bitter campaign in Korea, thousands of miles from the comforts of the homeland. That statement includes plenty of compliments for the indispensible men who fly in the air and who man and navigate the ships of the Navy. It takes a balanced team of fighting men of all branches to fight the war in Korea. However, the brunt of the battle must be borne by the doughfoot.

Mr. President, I served during the last war. I have served on active duty since the last war. I speak out of that experience, and believe that my conviction is based upon sound reason and fact.

I agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that 21 months is long enough for training. In fact, under many circumstances, that period can be shortened. But what we are talking about today

is not training. We are inducting these men into the Army for service—the bitter service of the Korean campaign.

To say that not all men go overseas is to oversimplify the problem to an astonishing degree. The great majority of the men drafted into the Army—and for my own benefit I always underline the word "drafted"—do go overseas under present conditions. The requirements of the overseas combat divisions, combat engineer battalions, artillery battalions, tank battalions, and the other units so vital to the Korean operation, will be met primarily by men drafted into the Army through Selective Service. We cannot indefinitely hold the present volunteer personnel in Korea.

Men who voluntarily enlist in the Army have their choice of the branch in which to serve. We should not forget that. To put it the other way around, men who enlist in the Army do not have to go into the infantry. Volunteers may choose the Ordnance Corps, the Signal Corps, the Quartermaster Corps, or some other branch of the service. Therefore, the burden on our front line combat units is being shouldered today by men who are being inducted—and I underline the word "inducted"—into the Army at the rate, I am told, of 80,000 a month.

The Senator from Oregon has said that in the case of a few specialists perhaps more than 21 months of training might be needed. Who are those specialists? Where do they work? What is their assignment? Where does the average inductee—we are voting for him or against him—go for assignment? He goes into the Infantry which has suffered the great and overwhelming burden of the casualties in Korea.

Is this man not a specialist? Is a man who has fought for the past 8 months in Korea on the ground not a specialist? Is this the man who does not require the so-called specialist training to which the junior Senator from Oregon made reference last Tuesday? Is this the man for whom 21 months is an adequate induction period? Is this doughfoot, without whose services we would be as nothing, the man who is not a specialist?

Aside from trying to be constructive in this speech, I get a tremendous thrill out of the opportunity of standing here and talking about the doughfoot, the American GI. I should like to focus some attention on him. He has not been getting as much attention as he has deserved in the press, because I am afraid that we have our minds on many other things, and have a tendency to forget the war in Korea. We do that partly, I think, because we do not know how the war is ever going to end. So, being human beings, we try to hide from pain and misery and uncertainty. I wish those much better qualified than I would take the floor of the Senate and explore the question, How shall we conclude the war in Korea without permitting attrition to force us to come here a year from now and further broaden the groups from whom we take Americans into the armed services?

I say to the Members of this body that in my humble judgment the one man who requires all that this great Nation can give in the way of physical stamina, mental alertness, intelligence, training, and equipment, is the young GI who fights on the ground as an infantry soldier. This is not a young man whom we can hastily and haphazardly train, and whom we can hope to utilize humanely through a hurried, short-term program. Of course we cannot. We have done it in the wars of our past. Let us decide if we wish to vote to continue to do so in the future.

I speak so strongly today because I think we should have learned from our mistakes of the past, and should give our young men an adequate preparation through which they will have a better percentage chance of being among those who come home alive and unwounded.

I find myself in complete disagreement with any proposal that would cut down the amount of training these young men get, on the theory, as offered by the Senator from Oregon, if I understood him correctly, that they are not specialists; on the theory that anyone can be a doughboy.

To me there is no greater compliment than to say that a young man is qualified to be a doughfoot. I love and admire and respect every one of them. That is obvious. We all do. We are all trying in our different ways to help them as best we can.

Mr. President, I find myself somewhat confused by a series of rather inconsistent—or at least they appear to me to be somewhat inconsistent—recommendations offered by the junior Senator from Oregon. In order to let the Senate know as best I can where I stand, I am reading from a double-spaced typewritten manuscript. I am reading now from page 6. It will be completed on page 10. That is but a few minutes away.

The junior Senator from Oregon feels that by inducting men 24 and 25 years old we place too great a burden on them. They are the men who own stores, or own small businesses, or have small families. I gather this from his remarks as they appear on page 1646 of Tuesday's RECORD.

The Senator from Oregon spoke on Tuesday, and on Wednesday morning we passed each other in the hall. He asked if I would do something of a personal nature, namely, to read every word he had said, because he was convinced that I would obviously agree with him if I read it. I said, "Senator, I will do so." There is evidence this afternoon that I have read it, because otherwise I could not have so completely disagreed with it.

The Senator from Oregon has suggested that these men be inducted for a shorter period of time—perhaps for their basic training period plus 10 or 12 month's service.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon has also stated that the UMT provisions in the bill are too conditional. He states that they are surrounded by a great many vague conditions. I believe he used the expression "in futuro." Let me point out that the only condition about UMT, if we wish to discuss that subject at the moment, is a concurrent resolution of the Congress. I, for one do not call that a vague condition. I am willing to settle for it.

Next, the Senator from Oregon feels very strongly that it is wrong for men to enlist in the Air Force when the Army needs them; that it is wrong to draft men into the Army until they reach the age of at least 18½ years. Yet he proposes a system, if I understand him correctly, whereby the same young men can volunteer for induction even below age 18, or certainly below age 18½.

Mr. President, I must confess that I am unable to follow the Senator's philosophy in this matter. Does the Senator from Oregon contend that it is wrong to fight for one's country unless one does so voluntarily? Does he contend that it makes it right for the young man below 18½ to fight for his country if he has not been drafted? Is there something which makes it right in one instance and wrong in the other instance for the young man to fulfill his obligation to this great Nation of ours?

Like many other Senators, I have seen too many white crosses on many battlefields; but to this day it has never occurred to me that a complicated pattern of philosophical gymnastics really entered into the picture. This Nation must and will endure. We must have the men needed to defend it. There is nothing which makes it right to accept the young men who voluntarily enlist, and wrong to draft them against their will, if the security of the Nation is concerned.

The Senator from Oregon would also reduce the period of service of all Reservists who are veterans. This is a splendid and worthy objective.

Next, my distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee suggests that no one below age 18½ should be drafted. He suggests that we should not take such men, whether we need them or not. That is extremely important. The Senator from Oregon has said that, however grave the crisis, we will, to meet our security requirements, take men down to the age of 18½, but not below. The committee bill is written so that such young men will not be taken unless the local board must utilize their services to meet an acute situation.

I seek to do the Senator from Oregon no wrong—certainly I do not wish to misquote him—but if I understand what he is driving at, this is what he has said. Perhaps most Senators will think it is a proper course to follow. The junior Senator from Oregon resists the procedure recommended by the Armed Services Committee. The Senator from Oregon would make it possible to take men down to 18½, whether the local board needs them or not, whether older men are available or not.

For seven long weeks the Senate Armed Services Committee considered this 18-year-old question. I think it came to a reasonable solution of an admittedly difficult problem. In a word, the committee's decision is that the draft boards shall take all of their 19 to 26 availables before they take anybody of the age of 18.

The committee has likewise said that if the manpower needs so require, 18-

year-olds may be taken, but in quarter periods, beginning at the top; the first 18-year-olds to be taken would be those 18 years and 9 to 12 months of age; the next from 6 to 9 months. The Senator from Oregon is saying, "Let us get rid of that restriction, and let us from the beginning make available all those 18 years and 6 months old." Speaking only for myself, though I support the committee's position very strongly, I would be inclined to be in agreement with the Senator from Oregon if he were to recommend making available for the draft all 18-year-olds. But I do not think it can work both ways. I believe we should either use 18-year-olds, or make them available for the needs of the country. We ought to stand up and say, "No more of this hocus pocus; we are going to start drafting men at 18."

Mr. President, next the junior Senator from Oregon suggests that enlistments be reduced to a period of 30 months. I am going to conclude in a very few minutes, and if I have served no other purpose insofar as the Junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, he should be convinced that I read every word of and gave due consideration to his remarks of Tuesday. The Senator from Oregon suggests that enlistments be reduced to a period of 30 months. Do Senators know what they are now? In the Army they are for 36 months. In the Navy and in the Air Corps they are for 4 years, or 48 monhts. But within the somewhat recent past all enlistments in the Army have been extended for another year. That makes 48 months. That is quite a long period of time. The junior Senator from Oregon would cut the period down to 30 months.

Finally, he feels that the induction period ought to be kept at 21 months. Mr. President, if I have a case, here is where it is developed for the Senate. What does this all add up to? I have not mentioned simply one amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I have endeavored to take each one of them and put them together. What do all the amendments add up to? Let us settle for 80 percent, as the junior Senator from Oregon suggests, and fix the ceiling at 3,000,000, or thereabouts, instead of 3,500,000. If all the amendments offered on Tuesday, or talked about by the junior Senator from Oregon, were adopted, we should not lost sight of the fact, demonstrated by the simple process of grade-school arithemtic, that there is an annual turnover of approximately 1,200,000 men. It might be more.

Now, Mr. President, Members of the Senate, and Americans, too, because all are vitally affected by this legislation, where in the name of the so-called Pentagon statistics, or the Morse statistics, or anybody else's statistics, are we going to get the 1,000,000 and a quarter young men annually to make up for this turnover? I have not been able to find them. How impracticable and how unrealitsic can we become in our efforts to sugar-coat this very hard-headed bill. I think the amendments evade the issue, though no one intentionally evades any issue, of course.

If we took every citizen entering into the manpower pool, including the blind, the one-legged, and the institutional cases, if we allowed no deferments of any kind whatsoever, we could still produce, in my view anyway less than 1,000,000 men for this turnover, let alone a million and a quarter deficit which would result from the recommendation by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I am simply trying to be realistic. If we set induction quotas, or periods of service, we must relate them to something. That something ought to be concrete and definite. We cannot simply adopt a series of vague amendments. Not that the Senator from Oregon had such a thing in mind, but my feeling on this subject is so deep as to cause me to suggest that, taken in the mass and considered as a whole, these amendments, while they seek to please practically everybody in the country, to my mind completely ignore the realities of a force even so small as 3,000,000 men. It is a sad thing that we have to refer to three million as being "small," but I am afraid a pretty good case can be made in support of that viewpoint.

The junior Senator from Oregon has also made the point that the "Pentagon," as he sometimes refers, probably just for fun, to anyone who appears to favor the bill, does not appreciate the value of our industrial manpower. He feels that the bill would cripple industry. He will attempt to prove to us that it will do that, and if he is right we certainly ought to follow him. I find it difficult, however, to see how anyone who has followed the hearings and the debates on the bill with the assiduous attention which always has characterized the effort of the junior Senator from Oregon, could arrive at such an astonishingly erroneous conclusion.

Surely he must be aware of the fact that the Secretary of Labor appeared in support of the bill; that the Secretary of Labor was accompanied on the stand by the Chief of the Office of Defense Manpower. The mission of the committee was to take testimony from the best qualified persons who could be called from the various sections of the country. When it came to the consideration of the manpower needs of the mobilization effort, we turned to those who are said to be authorities on the subject. Perhaps the junior Senator from Oregon is right. He has said in substance, "I do not care what these persons said. They know not whereof they speak." I trust that he can prove that to us, because we do not want to cripple industry. We must not permit that to be done.

The Senator from Oregon is aware of the fact that a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture appeared in support of the bill, and I am not surprised that the Secretary of Agriculture was represented by a representative. In days gone by, on occasions in the past, a good many Senators, particularly from the Pacific Northwest, have found it very difficult ever to contact or see in person the present Secretary of Agriculture. He is recognized, I think, as being the most traveled and traveling Secretary of Agriculture the Nation has ever had. So when we have to sit still and consider a grave question of manpower before the committee we necessarily have to be satisfied with a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Surely, sir, not all these distinguished individuals are denizens of the Pentagon Building. If they are we had better find out about it and do something about it. Surely their minds are not paralyzed by the atmosphere which the junior Senator from Oregon feels pervades all military installations. These nonmilitary authorities not only were in support of the bill, but stated that without it the very calamity which the junior Senator from Oregon views with such alarm would very probably be a positive possibility. At least, that is what the record shows. That is what I have gleaned from the contributions made by the testimony of the officials of the executive branch to whom I have made reference.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that during the course of Tuesday afternoon the junior Senator from Oregon may have recommended other schemes which I have not commented upon. He has laid great stress upon the way in which the United States has fumbled its Reserve program.

I personally happen to be a member of the Reserve. I think the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], is an active member of the Reserve. When the Senator from Oregon says we have no suitable Reserve program, I would go so far as to say—so as to include the Chair's comment with mine—"truer words were never spoken."

Every member of the Reserve knows that since the war there has not been a Reserve program worthy of the name; but what we have had has been a Reserve program which, as a system, maintained within it hundreds of thousands of veterans of the last war who, when the country got into trouble last June in Korea, were immediately called to the service. There has not been any Reserve program of adequate proportions since the war, in terms of training and new techniques and better weapons; but the manpower was there. As I recall, approximately 400,000 of those reservists, mostly inactive, have already been called to the service of their country, because there was behind them no manpower pool from which those who previously had not made a contribution could be called.

The point of the matter, Mr. President, is that we shall never have a Reserve program until we build up an enlisted Reserve which contains large numbers of trained men, not only officers. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who sits on my right, has been, and presumably still is, an officer in the Reserve; but I am making the distinction as between the officers and the enlisted men, for if we must fight, we not only need good leadership by the officer corps, but without trained enlisted men the result is certain to be futile and perhaps disastrous.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I shall conclude in not more than 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to ask the Senator a question before he concludes.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be delighted to have an opportunity to try to answer the Senator's question, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that the National Guard and Organized Reserves—the two civilian components of our plan of national defense—could be very much stronger and very much more efficient if they had turned over to them men who were basically trained in military work?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Pennsylvana could not be more logically correct. The intention of this bill, in real part, is in the future to return to the National Guard and Reserve Corps units both trained officers and enlisted men.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that if the two civilian components of the Army—the National Guard and the Organized Reserves—were required to do unit maneuvers, they then could reach such a state of efficiency that it would require only a few days after they were called to active duty before they would be ready to be moved into the zone of action?

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat only one sentence, namely, that the point of the matter, and the whole crux of this part of the argument, as I see it, is that we shall never have a reserve program until we build up an enlisted Reserve—I repeat and emphasize the word "enlisted"—which contains large numbers of trained men, not only officers.

This cannot be done, as I see it, without the enactment of Senate bill 1 and its provisions for feeding into the Reserve annually a large number of trained enlisted men.

Until we do this, Mr. President, the very circumstances which are so alarming to the junior Senator from Oregon will persist for years. I seek to convince him of this fact because of what I know to be his desire, equal to that of mine, to work out a solution for a bad manpower problem existing in America at this time. That is to say, Mr. President, we shall always be recalling the veterans of the last war to fight the next war, because the simple fact remains that, other than the veterans, we have no enlisted Reservists who have had any training. I have found it most difficult on many occasions in recent months to respond to some of the veterans who are doing again Korea what they slogged their way through in doing for 2 or 3 or 4 years in Europe during the last war. All I say to them—because I try to be realistic and honest with them—is this: "Until your Congress stands up and faces life, you are going to have to be required to do what other Americans ought to be required to do. We will try to get you out of the Army as soon as possible, but not before we have trained men to take your place."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to permit me to complete this portion of my speech, please.

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

So, Mr. President, with respect to the Reserve program, let us not become involved, if we can avoid it, in a discussion as to which comes first—the chicken or the egg. Let us get on with a system whereby we can create and maintain a good Reserve in the future. I can practically guarantee you, sir, that once it has been created, there will be no problem in regard to its utilization.

In concluding these remarks, Mr. President, I simply wish to say that, to my mind—and obviously I stand ready to be corrected—the pending bill is sound, and has been well prepared. It has had the benefit of the greatest amount of coordination between all agencies of the Government, as well as among most leading civilian groups.

As I stated before, I participated in the debates on the Selective Service Act of 1948, and I attended the hearings on that measure. I thought the Selective Service Act of 1948 was essential and necessary for the national security, and I voted for it. From hindsight, I thank God today that I did so.

Mr. President, much of the discussion today reminds me that this is about where I and other Senators came in, 2 years ago, because we are talking about the very same questions.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that this proposed legislation will be enacted that it will be improved upon, if possible, but that it will not be circumscribed or crippled by amendments of the type of those recommended by my distinguished colleague and my very goor friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. President, this is a last, but proper, word: The Senate Armed Services Committee consists of 13 Members of the United States Senate. Five of those extraordinarily unusual men have been governors of their States. Three of them have served for varying periods in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress. I can think of one of them who has been a distinguished judge in civil life. Another has been an outstanding industrialist. I am, so to speak, the only undistinguished person in that group, and I consider it a most distinguished honor to serve with such men. The Armed Services Committee, consisting of 13 great Americans, worked a long time upon this bill. They may have been wrong in their conclusions, but their intention and their considered view, when it came time to vote, was that what they were recommending to the Senate of the United States and to the United States of America was in the national interest, and as a junior among most of them, I give my personal view that I think they have done a competent and conscientious job.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding. I also thank him for a very fine explanation and his interpretation of the proposed legislation. There are one or two questions I should like to ask, because the answers are not clear in my mind. Does the armed-services program have recommendations of the Military Establishment justifying the figure of 3,500,000 men in the military forces?

Mr. CAIN. The only way I can honestly answer that question is to say that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have certified to us that the national security would be more adequately and safely taken care of with a total in the armed-force strength of 3,500,000 men. I may add, as I feel sure the Senator would like to know, that as I recall, the figure is broken down in this fashion: 1,500,000 men are to be employed by the Army, 1,000,000 by the Navy, and 1,000,000 by the Air Force.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has spoken very forcefully about the need in Korea, based upon the strength of 1,500,000 men for the Army, with, I think, 1,000,000 plus a few thousand for the Air Corps, and a few thousand less than 1,000,000 for the Navy.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What I am asking is, Has the committee been given recommendations by the executive branch or by the military, in connection with this breakdown, explaining where the men are to go, or giving some justification upon which the Senator would impose a ceiling of 3,500,000 men, based upon authorizations or determinations of a national defense policy? Has that been done?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is talking to me as an individual member of the committee, is he not?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. I shall answer the first question as best I can, and without any restrictions or qualifications of any kind. As a result of the Korean situation, the Senator from Nebraska knows that we removed the ceiling which had been imposed by legislation some years previously upon the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. There are now no ceilings upon our armed services. The Congress therefore is to impose the ceiling by its support of appropriations. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have indicated to us that by reason of their commitments throughout the world, including their commitments in Korea and including a wide area which may only be defined as being in an uncertain situation, it is their professional view that 3,500,000 men will best accommodate the needs of the United States. I should like to add, after which I shall let the Senator elaborate upon it, if he feels so inclined, that a man speaks from his own knowledge, his convictions, and his prejudice. I have an abiding faith in and respect for the integrity and the military capacity of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We are not

here to talk politics. If we were, I should say that they are naive in the extreme, and that I would have no faith in their political judgment, as a whole. But I have seen them in operation, and I have compared them with Joint Chiefs of Staff of other nations. So doing, I think they benefit from an amazingly fine training which they have received throughout their lives, and I am willing to support their determination that, at this time, we can utilize 3,500,000 men.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, does the Senator feel that the only way by which the Congress could write a national defense policy would be through its approval or disapproval of appropriations?

Mr. CAIN. No. With respect to the certification to us by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that 3,500,000 men are available, I should answer in the affirmative. I presume that in due time the Senator will ask me about the other side of the question, which has to do with the deployment of our forces somewhere outside continental United States. To that, the answer would be no.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I am not now interested in deployment of troops. I was disappointed to hear the Senator say a moment ago, because I have so much confidence in him——

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. I was disappointed to hear the Senator say that the only way by which we could determine what the manpower should be is either to accept the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or to determine it by our action on appropriations. So far as the latter is concerned, I tell the distinguished Senator that it is an impossibility. We must appropriate, and the difficulty which has existed in the Senate during the time I have been here is that things have been worked out, commitments have been made, and the Appropriations Committee is merely a rubber stamp, confronted by faites accomplis on the part of the agencies in the case of questions upon which there was not a previous determination made by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CAIN. I do not think the Senator is entirely correct. It is my view that if the Senate and House pass the pending measure and the President signs it, in its present form, we shall have acknowledged the need of an armed force strength of 3,500,000 men, and we shall thereafter be committed to pay for it. Other Senators on the Armed Services Committee who are present might wish to add to my answer, which was that in large part I have accepted as valid the certification by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that 3,500,000 men are needed. I have done so partly for this reason: Neither the Senator from Nebraska nor anyone else knows what is going to happen as a result of the Korean situation; but, for the sake of the argument, let me concede that the Senator from Nebraska might know, though I do not. I do know that Korea is but one step away from world war III. I hope we shall take many steps back from Korea, but Korea could explode overnight into the catastrophe we seek to prepare ourselves to prevent. That is my best view on the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, that touches the point about which I desire to ask the Senator. It has to do with the first recommendation. I think the Congress ought to make a determination. I think the Armed Services Committee ought to have before it specific recommendations regarding the need of manpower, rather than merely to take a blanket endorsement by the military of the need for 3,500,000 men. That brings me to this question. Forget Korea, because we are in Korea, and we must protect the boys there, and I shall vote for whatever appropriations and for whatever amount of manpower may be needed in order to protect them.

Mr. CAIN. I know the Senator will.

Mr. WHERRY. But we do not need to get into trouble in other places, and if we do so it will be with our eyes open. I should like to ask, does the 3,500,000 figure include armed forces that are to be assigned to an international army in Western Europe?

Mr. CAIN. The answer to the Senator's question is very easy. It includes men who could be assigned to an international army in Europe, if and when decision is made as to who is to determine the policy, whether the President or the Congress, and what the policy is to be.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is accepting the ceiling of 3,500,000, is he not?

Mr. CAIN. I am.

Mr. WHERRY. That ceiling includes the divisions for Europe, and in accepting that he is recommending it to the Senate, is he?

Mr. CAIN. Oh, permit me. The Senator is asking me a question, and the answer is "No."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not recommending it?

Mr. CAIN. I am committing myself to support a military strength for this country in the total of three and one-half million men.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no quarrel with that.

Mr. CAIN. I have reason to believe the Senator does not quarrel with that.

I have by no means made up my mind, for certainly the evidence before us is not even adequate as to how a portion of that strength, with reference to the proposed international army, shall be used. I am voting for the bill and its three and one-half million because, first, I am an American who believes, on the basis of the best testimony he can get, that this proposal is designed to provide the greatest amount of the protection we require at this time. My position is entirely unrelated to anything which might develop in the future about a so-called European army.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to correct an observation I made when I said I was in agreement with the Senator. I am agreed as to the purpose of raising an army to protect the security of the United States, but I certainly think that if the figure 3,500,000 is intended to provide sufficient manpower so that so many divisons can be assigned to an international army, if that is the purpose of it, and we pass the bill with that in it, we actually are authorizing that very thing. It is my opinion that if that is the interpretation, or if it is capable of being interpreted in that way, I believe the first thing to do before we draft 18-year-olds is to determine whether or not divisions can be assigned, under the proposed legislation, for purposes of implementing the North Atlantic Treaty before the Congress determines the policy. Would the Senator agree with that?

Mr. CAIN. Perhaps my answer will help a little, again giving my own view. I would be in support at this time of a strength of 3,500,000 in the armed services if the international European army had not even been thought of or discussed by anyone. As an American I want to work with our allies in making war unlikely, but I want to be certain that the United States of America is prepared to protect itself if we are cut off from anybody and everybody, to take the very worst view.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator for the bill if it does provide for forces for an international army, and if it does, does the Senator feel that Congress should determine the policy before we approve a ceiling of 3,500,000 troops?

Mr. CAIN. I can answer that question to my own satisfaction. I am for the bill with its provision for 3,500,000 men, which includes sufficient manpower so that the 4 divisions to which the Senator has addressed himself, by indirection, could be made available to General Eisenhower's command in the European international army.

First, the junior Senator from Washington supports the 3,500,000. The junior Senator from Washington will never, so long as he has a voice and the right to use it on the floor of the United States Senate, permit the Executive, without authorization by the Congress of the United States, to commit in peacetime even one soldier to an international European rmy or to an army anywhere throughout the world.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator does not feel that although the ceiling in the bill covers the four divisions, we are in any way authorizing the proposal to send the four divisions until the question is determined by the Congress?

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator is taking something for granted.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope not; I do not intend to.

Mr. CAIN. I know the Senator does not. Whether or not Congress is going to have a chance to say anything about sending troops overseas is something else again.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think we are going to have that opportunity? The Senator is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CAIN. I am only one who is fighting for that opportunity.

Mr. WHERRY. So in reality, to assure those who feel that we should not use our manpower as a part of an international army until the Congress determines the policy, we should see to it that the manpower provided does not include the four divisions which might be assigned to that duty.

Mr. CAIN. I could not possibly agree with the Senator in that, because I believe the defense needs of the United States require three and a half million men.

Mr. WHERRY. If the defense needs of the United States need 3,500,000 personnel, clearly distinct from the 4 divisions, there is no one in the Senate, in my opinion, who will object. If it should require scraping the bottom of the barrel in order to protect and safeguard the United States, and the committee should be satisfied that that was needed, that is one thing. But what I am asking is, Are we including in this manpower bill four divisions which we might otherwise get along without and thereby lower the three and a half million ceiling? Are four divisions to be allocated to an international army, and is that going to be done before Congress determines the policy? That is what worries me.

Mr. CAIN. I believe we should consider this question for a moment until we understand each other——

Mr. WHERRY. I hope we may.

Mr. CAIN. And so that other members of the Armed Services Committee who are present may have an opportunity to correct me if my interpretation is wrong.

America's range of interest goes beyond our geographic and continental boundaries. Certainly I might be wrong, but I am of the opinion that we need three and one-half million men in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force in order to protect America's interests. If we assume that three and one-half million men will be authorized at a later date the Congress may very well agree that the national interest can best be served by deploying four divisions, more or less, to General Eisenhower, or to some other area of the world. Is not that true, I ask the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not questioning the power of the Commander in Chief to deploy troops anywhere after Congress has made the determination, but I am in serious opposition to the deployment of troops for one purpose or another, as a part of an international army, unless Congress determines the policy before they are sent. That is my position.

No Member of the Senate has a higher regard for the Senator from Washington than I have. I know his experiences in the military service, and I think I know something of his philosophy, and if there is one man who could persuade me as to this ceiling, it is the Senator from Washington. I pay him that compliment.

I also desire to say that the Senator is a member of a very splendid committee. I have a high respect for the chairman of the committee, and he knows it. I am not asking these questions in any way to hurt the bill, but there is one thing about which I desire to be convinced. I want an Army, a Navy and an Air Force sufficiently large to be able to perform the great service the Senator has mentioned. But if the ceiling, which the Senator refers to as 3,500,000, includes four divisions which can be sent to an international army, I feel that the ceiling of 3,500,000 should not be approved until Congress determines the policy. That is what I asked the Senator about a minute or two ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to respond to the Senator from Nebraska. The answer might help quench his thirst for knowledge.

The Senator from Washington is prepared to vote in support of the bill with its three and a half million figure. He thinks that is proper. The Senator from Washington, however, will resist, as long and as best he can, any attempt by the Executive to commit any of the troops included within the three and a half million total to a peacetime international European or any other area command, without direct authority from the Congress. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. WHERRY. I have one more question to ask of the distinguished Senator from Washington. If we never have an opportunity to make the choice which he mentioned, and if the bill is passed, is there any doubt that the very thing with reference to which the Senator was interrogated can be accomplished and the troops sent to an international army without Congress having anything further to say about it?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I must answer the Senator's question in a little different way, but I think it will be constructively helpful to him. Let us assume that we cut the bill down to 3,000,000 men. I believe the Senator from Oregon favors such a number. If we do that, the men will make up X number of divisions. The troops would not make up as many divisions as could be made up with three and a half million men. If the Executive has the right to determine that he can use four divisions in a certain area, he can do so just as easily with a ceiling of 3,000,000 as with a ceiling of 3,500,000. That is being realistic.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator be willing to cut the ceiling of 3,500,000 men until Congress determines the policy of whether or not men should be sent to Western Europe? That is a simple question.

Mr. CAIN. The answer is simple.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the answer?

Mr. CAIN. The answer is "No." I would not agree to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. CAIN. I say that because I think our country needs the three and a half million men. In my own capacity and in a limited way, with reference to the Committee on Armed Services, I think we are trying to prove the point that Congress must authorize a peacetime international army.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator be in favor, if it takes three and a half million men to do what he says, to increase the ceiling to 4,000,000 men, in order to be able to send four divisions to Europe for an international army before Congress determines a policy with respect to it?

Mr. CAIN. That is quite a question.

Mr. WHERRY. It is. I want to get away from one fact.

Mr. CAIN. No; we will stay with the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to get away from the question of how many men it would take. I think we are agreed that justification could be had for an army of three and a half million men. That is one thing. Another thing is adding four divisions for a purpose entirely different from what the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. CAIN. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will permit me to say that I do not think and do not believe that I can give him a satisfactory answer to the last question. I cannot do so for the primary reason that if we assume, again by way of argument, that three and a half million men will adequately protect America's national interest at this time, it is still impossible to prejudge the future. I am not at all certain but what, without any reference to Europe, a military force of three and a half million men might have to be expanded to 4,000,000 men, and perhaps even to four and a half million men within only a very short time.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his answer. I want to say, though, that after asking all these questions I am more in doubt than before.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator tell me why?

Mr. WHERRY. I am more in doubt than ever before as to whether or not the four divisions are to be sent into the international army without approval of Congress. I should like to vote for a manpower bill. I should like to find out what is necessary for the defense of the country. Up to this moment I have not received the answer. I had hoped that the doubt could be resolved. I think the determination ought to be made first. In other words, I believe my resolution ought to be considered by the Senate and a determination made first. If Congress decided that we should provide divisions for an international army, we would be in the position of having decided the question. We could then match manpower requirements in accordance with our commitments. We are doing it the other way. We are passing a manpower bill first. From that manpower bill can come four divisions, which I do not think should be included in a manpower bill until Congress determines the policy with respect to the question.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator and I are in agreement, as concerns an international army commitment. There is not the slightest doubt about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one more question. An argument was made to me in private by the chairman of the subcommittee. It was a persuasive argument. He is a very persuasive gentleman, as we all know.

Mr. CAIN. He is very persuasive.

Mr. WHERRY. Men from Texas are wonderful fellows. They are masters of oratory, possess good looks, and have charming personalities. He told me, "Under the Morse formula you will be taking 18-year-olds before you would under the committee bill." Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator wish me to answer his question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator from Washington answer the question.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I promised the chairman of the subcommittee that I would listen to the Senator from Washington. I have listened to him, and I have received much enlightenment from a comparison of the formulae. I have listened to a statement of the formula by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If we strike out 18 and insert 18½, would we not be playing havoc with the Senator's formula? Under the Senator's formula would we not be scraping the bottom of the barrel in order to make up an army of three and a half million men?

Mr. CAIN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to read an article from a newspaper. It will take only 10 seconds to do so.

General Marshall insisted that the drafting of youths of 18 is essential to permit a possible increase in fighting strength to 4,000,000 men.

Do we have a ceiling of three and a half million men?

Mr. CAIN. Just a moment, please. The Senator did not ask that question.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask it now.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to answer questions one at a time. The question the Senator asked was whether or not all the 18-year-old youths would be required to satisfy a three and a half million ceiling. I said no. Thereafter the Senator read to me a statement in which General Marshall indicated that we are going to have 4,000,000 men. The answer would be yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. That is why I come to the next question. What is the difference whether it is 18 or 18½? Why hold out any assurance that we will not draft 18-year-olds when we have a new ceiling of 4,000,000 men?

Mr. CAIN. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what General Marshall said.

Mr. CAIN. I think General Marshall is endeavoring, as best he can, to anticipate the needs of the future, and is suggesting that we may have to go from three and a half million men to four million men. The determination of whether we shall go from three and a half to four million men will not be made by General Marshall. It will be made by Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. We are taking his recommendations now.

Mr. CAIN. For three and a half million men. We are making the decision, however.

Mr. WHERRY. All we are doing is either rubber stamping or disapproving his recommendations. If we give him three and a half million men without justification, he can use them for a foreign army. Then he can say, "We want the 18-year-old boys, anyway, because we are going to raise 4,000,000 men." When are we going to get a ceiling? When are we going to know what the military needs? No recommendations are being made under article 9 of the treaty as to what the plan is for Europe. Has any such recommendation been made?

Mr. CAIN. Not so far as I know.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Let us not talk about article 9.

Mr. WHERRY. It is involved.

Mr. CAIN. I do not believe it is involved. I should like to say, representing my own view—and the Senator may ask other Senators and search his own conscience for a better answer—that the three and a half million men which this bill would provide are not related to any international contribution of troops by America. I believe that to be so. It is a striking force, in a properly balanced Army, Navy, and Air Force, for America's security. The deployment of a force of three and a half million men is an entirely different question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his answer. I cannot agree with him at all.

Mr. CAIN. What is it that the Senator wants?

Mr. WHERRY. If the President has the sole right to deploy troops in Europe he can take four divisions and send them wherever he pleases. If Congress has nothing to do with it, he can send them into an international army. Congress, in other words, can be bypassed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. CAIN. I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska for a question. The Senator from Nebraska is entitled to the floor as much as any Senator, but I have the floor now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nebraska is assuming that his case has been wrecked and shattered.

Mr. WHERRY. What case?

Mr. CAIN. The case which the Senator has just made, to the effect that Congress is going to permit the President of the United States to deploy forces to an international army. I deny that he has done it. I deny, also, that he is going to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. May I respond?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. If divisions are provided for that purpose, and the Commander in Chief sends them overseas, what are we going to do about it?

Mr. CAIN. The only purpose for which they are provided is the security of the United States. If the Congress decides that the national security can best be met by committing to Europe four divisions, more or less, certainly the Senator would assume that that was a proper course of action to take.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Congress so decides; but I do not want the President of the United States to decide it alone. If we adopt this ceiling, with four divisions included for that purpose, it seems to me that we give him that authority.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator's case is weak, and I should like to emphasize its weakness in the hope of being helpful. The weakness is that if we had a total strength of 3,000,000 instead of 3,500,000 there would still be X number of divisions from which, on the basis of the Senator's own fear, the President could commit four divisions to Europe without half trying.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY.. The Senator stated that my case was weak, and that I did not quite understand this question. In order to clarify the situation in my mind——

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator has fears which will not be realized.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator accept an amendment along that line, or can he give me assurance that none of these troops will be deployed for an international army in Europe until the Congress determines the policy? If my case is so weak, give me that assurance. If the Senator from Washington and the chairman will give me such assurance, I will not argue the point any further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, but I must answer the Senator from Nebraska.

There is before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate what is known as the Wherry resolution. The Wherry resolution would have the Congress determine the policy as to whether or not American troops shall be committed, in peacetime, to an international European army. In answer to the Senator's comment, I cannot speak for the committee. I can speak only for the junior Senator from Washington; but so far as he is concerned no single squad, company, regiment, or division will, in the absence of congressional authority to the President, be committed. I am not speaking about troops for purposes of occupation. That is a different question.

Mr. WHERRY. We agree on that question.

Mr. CAIN. I am speaking about a peace-time international army, whether it be in Europe or elsewhere. I can go no further than that.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his statement. I must leave the Chamber. I wonder if the distinguished Senator will permit me to ask one further question, inasmuch as he has answered the previous question in the way he has.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. No Member of the Senate has been a more forceful pro-

ponent of taking a look at Western Europe and its manpower than has the distinguished Senator from Washington. He has made a trip over there. He has talked with the officials. He has talked with the people in those countries. Time and time again he has made statements about bringing in Spain. Time after time he has talked about bringing in Turkey. He has stated that we must have Turkey on the right flank and Spain on the left flank, so that we can hold the Mediterranean. If we are successfully to defend Western Europe, there can be no doubt that we must have manpower. If I remember correctly, there are 35 divisions in Yugoslavia, twenty-odd divisions in Turkey, 10 divisions in Greece, and between 30 and 35 divisions in Spain, anxious to fight.

It is said that they are anxious to fight, if we will only put rifles in their hands. I think General Eisenhower said, "Put rifles in their hands, and they will fight."

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a total of nearly 90 divisions, it is estimated. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to ask another question.

Mr. CAIN. Please do.

Mr. WHERRY. For 5 years I have been making that fight. Each time we are told, "We are a little closer than ever before. Give us another year and Spain will be in. Give us another year and they will all be in." They are not in yet.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If we are that close, the manpower situation in the United States being as desperate as it is, does not the Senator feel that we should iron out political differences and acquire the benefit of the available manpower before we scrape the bottom of the barrel in the United States?

Mr. CAIN. This is the way I feel as an individual Senator: I would not be willing to have my country contribute any forces to the proposed Atlantic Pact army until we had been given assurances upon which we could rely, as to when all the nations in the North Atlantic community who are desirous of working for the maintenance of freedom are to be included within what will become—it is not yet available—General Eisenhower's plan of defense and of operation. It is with some reluctance that I am saying this, because it indicates what a man is going to assume by way of a position in the future. However, this American has gone far enough. This American is interested in this bill because he thinks it would give great strength to his own homeland.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. But this American is no longer going to be satisfied with repeated assurances that have never been fulfilled, to the effect that we should get on with our friends in the closed corporation called a part of Europe, while continuing to exclude from it the resources and the determination to fight which would be made available to us by the Turks, if you please, by the Greeks, and by the Spaniards.

In a joint meeting of the committees the other day I made only one request. I said, "Please, Mr. Chairman, before these committees are through, will you invite the Secretary of State or some qualified representative of the Department of State to appear before us?"

I had in mind that I must say to him, "Mr. Acheson, if it is so imperatively necessary for us to contribute troops to the land army in Europe, in view of the fact that every responsible witness, one after another, Republicans and Democrats, military men, and all others, testified before us that with the continued exclusion of these countries our job would be too difficult in the future, what are you going to do about getting them in?"

The Senator from Nebraska and I differ to some extent with respect to the land army in Europe, because I believe in a reasonable contribution to supplement the land army, for a number of reasons not under discussion here. I should like to say to Mr. Acheson, "Mr. Acheson, I am for you, and for four divisions in Europe if you will tell us that we are going to have the Pyrenees and 400,000 Spaniards, backed up by the finest men, women, and children, on the average, that I have ever known, living in that part of the Iberian Peninsula."

We should have the help of Spain and Turkey. While I recognize that the question is complicated, and that much rationalizing can be done about it, the situation is sad. I am convinced, although I cannot prove it, that there is some reason to believe that the Governments of France and Great Britain might fall if the United States rose, not in its wrath, but in its common sense, and said, through the State Department, to the French and British Governments, "We are all going to get ready to protect ourselves, and that means everybody. The American people want to help. Goodness knows, we have been doing it for years. However, the American people want to be assured that there is the best possible chance of winning if war should occur. Therefore, get Spain in. Turkey has approximately 400,000 men under arms. Take them in." Twice, to my knowledge, Turkey has made a request for admission.

Do Senators realize that when Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State, appeared before our committees in open session, in spite of all the great turmoil, urgency, and desperation, in his able presentation through a prepared statement, he never mentioned a single word about Spain, Turkey, Greece, or Yugoslavia? However, in answer to questions from both Democrats and Republicans—and I wish I had his answers here—all he said was, "There is some reason to believe that we could make some progress." With reference to Spain, I remember that this is in part what he said:

> We ought to know more in the future, because we now have an able ambassador going there.

We are agreed that he is an able man, whoever he is. But what an unusual thing to say—that we cannot get information until we have an ambassador there. I wish to point out to the Senate that if we had an ambassador there, I care not how able he may be, if behind him, his source of authority, the State Department, does not permit him to obtain information, he will be practically useless. The day has come for us as Americans to stand up and say, "Mr. Acheson, fish or cut bait," and we are not going an inch further until everyone is given a chance to do what he can to obtain information.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Armed Services Committee do what the Senator has suggested? Did the committee ask Mr. Acheson, or will the committee ask Mr. Acheson to do what the Senator has suggested? It seems to me the Senate of the United States is entitled to an answer to that question. All we receive by way of answer is, "Give us another year and we will iron the matter out." Or it will be said to us, "One of the European countries will veto the proposal to invite certain other countries to come into the Atlantic Pact."

Mr. President, we are sending our boys to defend Western Europe, and certainly we have something to say about the political questions involved in connection with countries coming into the North Atlantic Treaty if they are willing to defend Western Europe. If the proposal for their entry is to be vetoed, the United States should have something to say about it. Morale building is a two-way street. It is about time we build up the morale of the American people by doing something constructive in Europe. Information that our boys will receive help from nations who are willing to fight will result in building up their morale.

Mr. CAIN. That is the virtue of debates on the Senate floor. I have indicated what one Member of the Senate believes. By way of argument, if 96 Members felt that way, we would solve the Spanish and Turkish questions, particularly, in no time at all. But up to date there have been no Members who have felt so strongly about Franco and the Mediterranean as the Senator from Nebraska and I feel.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I may say to the distinguished minority leader and also to the distinguished Senator from Washington that I, too, hold to their point of view. Ever since I have had the honor of being a Member of this body, time after time I have heard our military men of the highest rank say very definitely and positively how important Spain is to Western Europe in event of a Russian attack. I have held the same point of view. The question in my mind has been: "Why do we not bring Spain in?" Up to as late as 3 days ago I had not received any kind of answer. I took it upon myself to go to the highest authority in the city of Washington and said to him, "Tell me the answer, if you have one." Very much to my surprise this was the answer I received: "Spain does not want to come in. Franco does not want to come in." Senators re-

member the old saying, "You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink." We cannot make Franco "drink."

There is another point to the situation. The second largest party in France is opposed to Spain coming in under the Atlantic Pact. We have that difficulty and we must be careful. The dominant party, the Labor Party, in England, does not want Franco in at this time. That results in another difficulty.

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that I believe the State Department is doing everything it can in an orderly manner, approaching it with a considerable amount of judgment, to bring Spain in. But I think it is wrong tactics for us to stand on the floor of the Senate and criticize the Department and say it is doing nothing.

I will say that my comments have been made in the most friendly spirit.

Mr. CAIN. I know they have been. I think the Senator from Wyoming has shown the two sides of the picture with respect to Spain, for example. He is of the opinion, and feels strongly about it, that we ought to let time, within reason, take its own course. There are others among us who think that time has outrun its course, and that the time has come to press for action.

The Senator from Wyoming said something that to me was fascinating. He said that the highest authority in Washington told him that Spain did not want to come in. I must say in answer to that statement—though I did not anticipate it would be brought into the discussion this afternoon—that I doubt if the highest authority in Washington has ever talked to the head of the Spanish state. The junior Senator from Washington, however, talked for more than an hour with the head of state of Spain a few months ago, and this, in effect, is what that head of state said, which is to be found in my statement presented to the Senate last September: "Spain does not have very much confidence in a large segment of Western Europe with which you Americans are so closely allied."

Mr. HUNT. That is just what I have said.

Mr. CAIN. He proceeded to say what the highest authority in Washington did not tell the Senator. Franco said, "The Atlantic Pact to us is unimportant one way or another. What we think is important is Spain and the United States of America. If you Americans wish adequately to protect the left flank, or the western flank of the Mediterranean, we Spaniards would like to do business with you."

It naturally follows that if we strengthen our relationship with Spain we have improved our chances of success in the Atlantic Pact. The highest authority in Washington, from my point of view has totally neglected the reality, because there has been no established single case where the Department of State in recent years has even bothered to think about Spain.

Mr. HUNT. I may say to the Senator from Washington that what he hopes the State Department will do is exactly what the State Department is trying to do. Let me say further, that we must take into consideration in our negotiations with Spain what the effect will be on our other allies.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. HUNT. In other words, it is not solely a question of making a decision as between ourselves and Spain, but there is the problem of what the effect of such action will be on France and England.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I would not labor this point except that during the several opportunities I have had to raise the question with Mr. Averell Harriman and with the Secretary of State, they have not led me to believe that at any time since the Atlantic Pact treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States has the question ever been raised within the Council as to the wisdom of doing business with Spain. That is the source of my own great dissatisfaction with the State Department expressing a pious hope unaccompanied by driving action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In connection with the questions asked by the majority leader I should like to observe that we have a ceiling on the Armed Forces in this country at the present time of 3,462,000. The bill does not set that ceiling, does not remove that ceiling, does not change that ceiling, does not have one thing to do with that ceiling. The bill provides the method, sets up the machinery, sets out the priority, for raising such men as we need in our armed services. It does not seek to deploy those men. It seems to me that the discussion, interesting and informative as it has been, has nothing to do with the bill at hand. It is a question of how we are going to deploy those troops we have been discussing. If we do not act on the bill, or if the bill had never been reported, if the President has the authority, as some contend, to deploy troops wherever he may believe they should be deployed, he could deploy his 4 divisions whether the bill had ever been considered for an hour or not. I want to insist again that the bill does not set the ceiling, or raise it, or lower it. It has nothing to do with the ceiling. It has nothing to do with the deployment of troops. All the troops could be sent to Hawaii or could be kept in this country or could fight from Cape Cod—whatever might be dictated by those who have the responsibility of making the decisions. However, the bill says that when we do decide, here is the method the Congress has laid down, so far as the machinery and the priorities are concerned.

I assume that the Senator was in the Chamber yesterday, Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been very patient, and I should like to make this statement.

I assume that the Senator was in the Chamber yesterday when our distinguished friend the junior Senator from Oregon was pointing out to the Senate, particularly the military, what might be good public relations. The junior Senator from Texas does not pose as being a public-relations expert and he is not going to assume for the moment that the junior Senator from Washington is a public-relations expert, either.

Mr. CAIN. No, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But I wish to call the attention of the junior Senator from Washington to the public relations policy of the junior Senator from Oregon. We have on each Member's desk a number of amendments offered by the junior Senator from Oregon. There is no Member of the Senate who worked harder on this manpower bill than did the junior Senator from Oregon. Morning and afternoon, day after day, week after week, the junior Senator from Oregon came to the subcommittee hearings and questioned witnesses and made observations. We have 1,200 pages of the committee hearings. I am told that each volume of the hearings has cost $16 to print. During all that time we got the benefit of the testimony of 100 witnesses, and some testimony from the junior Senator from Oregon and other members of the subcommittee.

However, none of these amendments was offered in the subcommittee. None of them was presented to the subcommittee. The subcommittee was almost as surprised as I believe the junior Senator from Oregon was when these amendments started rolling out of the machine as it was cranked.

I wish to discuss those amendments briefly. They should be entitled "The Public Relations Amendments," I think, since the Senator called them to the attention of the Pentagon yesterday. I wish to point out to the Senator from Washington the effect of these amendments, if adopted. I hope he will follow me, taking his lead pencil in hand, and will see what would happen if the Members of the Senate were unwise enough to disregard the recommendation of the 12 members of the committee to which the Senator from Washington referred, and elected, instead, to follow the recommendations of the junior Senator from Oregon. I want them to know what they are doing when they decide.

The amendment under discussion calls for a change in the age limit to 18½ years as a minimum. That will take 321,000 men out of the manpower pool. However, that amendment is very appealing to many of those 321,000. It may not be appealing to the man who spent 30 months in a concentration camp during the last war and who has been yanked up and sent to Korea to fight another one; but the amendment certainly does appeal to those it does affect, namely, the 321,000.

Then we find that there are 545,000 in the 18-year-old bracket that are available. The committee decided, on the basis of the recommendations of all the experts, that out of that 545,000 we should defer 75,000 for reasons of education—education in medicine, dentistry, engineering, and so forth; but the junior Senator from Oregon has a better plan

than that, for he multiplies the figure 75,000 by 2, and provides in his amendment that 150,000 should be taken out of the manpower pool to go into that group.

Next, by reducing the service of the reservists from 26 months to 18 months, he would have another 100,000 men eliminated from service.

Then, as the Senator said, we have another group—the large group of enlistees. In the Navy, and the Air Force, most of them are serving under 4-year enlistments, and in the Army they are serving under 3-year enlistments. The junior Senator from Oregon says to those in the Navy and the Air Force, "You have enlisted for 48 months. But I have not done anything for you yet, so I will reduce your term of enlistment to 30 months. I will just knock off roughly 30 percent of your term of enlistment." The junior Senator from Oregon makes a corresponding statement in regard to those who have enlisted in the other branches of the armed services. He says to those who entered the Army, "You enlisted for 3 years and signed a contract and agreed to serve for 3 years, but I will take care of you by reducing your enlistment, by simply cutting it down by one-third."

That change will take care of another 310,000.

Then the Senator from Oregon says that the committee bill provides for service for 26 months, and he says that is entirely too long. So he has a 21-month amendment. In 1948 the Senator was in favor of a 12-month limitation. At that time we were told that the United Nations was probably going to take care of everything, and that we did not really need an induction or draft law; but then the limitation was moved up to 18 months, and finally we battled through a 21-month draft bill. As a result of a lack of wisdom, ever since then we have made our contribution to the uncertainty and the little wars that are going on all over the world. Today we are paying for that mistake. We have a $41,000,000,000 budget coming up. We saved a little bit temporarily in 1948; we whittled down the program, we crippled it, we made some appeals to some groups.

So now the Senator from Oregon has an amendment which would reduce the service under the bill from 26 months to 21 months, and that would result in eliminating 92,000 men.

The total change made which will be made by all the Morse amendments, if we adopted them en bloc, if we just took the public-relations package, to say nothing of the talk that has gone on about reducing the ceiling to 3,000,000—will be that we shall have eliminated 973,000 men.

Mr. President, where are we going to get those 973,000? Let us assume for the moment that General Marshall and General Bradley and General Collins and General Vandenberg and Admiral Sherman, under our directions and with our authority, with the approval of every Member of the Senate—there was not a vote against it—said that the minimum for the present, for today, was 3,462,000. Practically everyone of them will tell you that they do not expect that ceiling to hold very long. But Senator MORSE says that he takes that figure and cuts it from 3,462,000 to 3,100,000.

Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Oregon had his way, he would cut three-hundred-odd-thousand off the ceiling and he would cut 973,000 men out of the pool. So by the Morse amendments we would have eliminated approximately 1,300,000 men. I do not know how good a public-relations policy that is, but is it not a very good security policy.

Of course, the Senator from Washington knows, as the testimony shows, that we can get those 973,000 men from only one or two sources. First, we can redraft the veterans who were drafted in World War II, and say to them, "Come back; we are going to draft you for another 26 months." If it is not desired to follow that course—and no one has advocated it before the committee—it would then be necessary to lower the age limit, and we would get 973,000 men, beginning with the 18½ amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. How far down would it be necessary to go? Let us assume we are going to keep a ceiling of 3,462,000. From 18½ to 18 we could pick up 275,000, but we would still be 700,000 short, because the Senator has eliminated 973,00 by his amendments.

No one has ever estimated how many men in the 17-year-old group would be available, because they would be allowed to remain in high school. But, assuming that as many were available in the 17-year group as are available in the 18-year group, we could pick up 545,000 men. With 545,000 and 275,000, it would be possible to get about 800,000 there. But we would still be short 173,000. To show how ridiculous it is for the Senate to be seriously considering a group of amendments which hold out bait to this entire group, let me say that, if we should adopt these amendments en bloc this afternoon, we should have one of two choices: either to redraft World War II veterans, or to go as low as the 16-year-olds; and that is the question which the Senate must decide.

Mr. President, no one likes to draft anyone, but we think our liberty and our freedoms are endangered. The Congress came here and said, "We are going to remove this ceiling. We are going to ask the the trained military experts to determine how many people we should have in our retaliatory striking force." What do they say? They say, "We need 1,016,000 men in the Air Force to deliver the bomb and to deliver it quickly, the moment we are required to do it." What else? They say, "In order to support those men, in order to seize and hold the bases, and in order to back up that Air Force, we need 1,400,000 men in our Army." No one disputed it. In order to support that Army and that Navy, and to have a balanced force, we need 1,000,000 men in our Marines and in our Navy; and that is how we got our figure of 3,462,000, It is the ceiling today. The Joint Chiefs may decide the next week that it ought to be increased another 200,000 or 300,000. We are not deciding that. That is not in this question. All we are doing is saying, "Here is the method. Here is the machinery. Here is the priority." The difference of opinion and the issue is very clear. The junior Senator from Oregon said, "When the boy attains the age of 18½ years, let us yank him in and say, 'This is your time to come. Now the fact that you have a 25-year-old brother and a 23-year-old brother and a 21-year-old brother, who have never seen a day's service, still sitting back there on the farm or in the city, or working on the assembly line, does not make any difference.'" He does not at all require that they be taken. The 18-year-old boy can be taken. All the priorities which 12 men thought ought to be placed in this bill are wiped out at one fell swoop. The older boys can stay at home, and the baby boy can go and do the fighting for them. We do not want any of them to do the fighting. We hope and pray it will not be necessary; but if it is, we say, "Begin here. Here is your priority. Rescreen the IV–F's, and let us pick up some more men there. Pick up every single man you have in the 19-to-26 pool. You cannot take an 18-year-old until you do. Take every husband, every nonveteran nonfather, and make him go in first." The Morse amendment says, "No, it may be necessary for them to remain at home to look after Ma, while the baby boy goes and does the fighting for them."

After taking all those priorities, then the committee says to the draft board, "You can take the 18-year level, and 18-10 and 18-9, but until and unless you take each one of those, you cannot go to any 18-4 or -5 or -6."

The Morse amendment says, "Take them the day they become 18-6." Then, after we go down to 18-9, we go on down to 18-6. The Senate might as well know that, after that, we are going to draft the 18-6 boys, the day this bill is signed, and we are going to say by our votes, "Do it." That is what we would be doing if we were to adopt the Morse amendment.

The other way, we are going to say, "We are not going to let you touch one of those 18-year-olds unless and until you have taken his older brother, the married, and until you have screened the IV–F's. We think that is the better part of wisdom. But when and if you have taken them all, and you are down to the bottom of the barrel, and you have got no more, we are not going to hold up the white flag and say, 'Come on Stalin, and get us,' we are going to authorize the selective service to go on down to the age of 18, and then, if we do not have enough men, we have set up the machinery, we have laid down the ground rule. We have told him that we mean business, that we have got the machinery and the procedure for our military men to operate under, and then all we have to do is to come back with an amendment to strike out the veterans' exemptions, and probably raise the age limit." But if we adopt these amendments today, we must do one of two things in order to get the men. It will be necessary to either draft our veterans——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If Senators think the 18-year-old correspondence has stirred up someone, let them send over the wires tonight a statement that veterans who served in World War II are to be redrafted and are to serve the second time.

I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question? If we assume that all the Morse amendments are adopted, I think we may assume that they will follow a pattern, and that if we adopt one, we may as well adopt them all. If they are all adopted, what could we say to the American people as to what the result would be? How would we defend what we had written into the law, or what we have as a law, if we take as an assumption that we shall approve all of the recommendations offered by the junior Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think we could say that we have gone along with what we thought was a good public-relations policy. If one thinks it is good public-relations policy, let him know that we have gone along with it. If we cut our Armed Forces by a million men we should realize that we must draft a million veterans, or must lower the 18½ age limit to about 16½, in order to pick up about a million more men of that age. I know of no other alternative.

Of course, it may be said that we can avoid a great deal of waste which exists at the present time in the Armed Forces. The Senator from Oregon has no mortgage on that idea. The Preparedness Committee is one committee which, to my knowledge, has been doing something about it besides talking. We have coming into the capital this week end a dozen investigators who have been at every indoctrination center in the country, with two or three dozen classifications in their hands, to see how many chauffeurs they have, how many typists they have, how many hospital attendants they have, and how many clerical jobs they have, which are being held by men who are qualified for combat duty. We made the study at Lackland Air Base and pointed out the deficiencies, and we have secured some results.

We have corrected the deficiencies. But I think it would be very unfair to the Senate and unfair to the country to hold out the hope that as a result of those studies and as a result of cleaning up the inefficiency wherever it exists we are going to be able to avoid facing the issue and giving the Military Establishment the machinery by way of a draft bill which will support an Armed Force of 3,500,000. We may say there will be 50,000 here, and perhaps 100,000 there. The Senator from Washington will remember that we hammered on that all the way through, and the chairman took the lead in saying, "You must get more divisions out of a total given number of men." He will also remember that the committe is busy, and that its investigators are busy, and that during the month of March we plan to have a report written on the subject of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force which will give specific figures, not glittering generalities, which cover everything and touch nothing. But we must do one of two things: We must make up our mind to accept for consideration the best estimates that can be brought to us by such men as General Marshall, General Bradley, General Eisenhower, General Collins, and General Vandenberg, of what they need in order to have a retaliatory striking force, with the marines and the Army to support them—or we must follow General Morse.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my observations several telegrams I have received from the American Legion and other organizations.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON.

DEAR SENATOR: Please push Senate bill 1, as amended.

NELLIE B. THOMAS, *President.*
AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
*Twenty-second District, Texas.*

---

PORT ARTHUR, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Legionnaires of the Second District, Department of Texas, urge you to support the universal training bill No. 1.

R. J. DOMATTI,
*Second District Commander.*

---

VICTORIA, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Ninth District of Texas, the American Legion, has gone on record endorsing universal military training No. 1. We offer our full support in the matter.

O. P. AUSTIN, JR.,
*Ninth District Commander.*

---

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Washington, D. C. :*

One hundred and sixty-three members, Unit 52, American Legion Auxiliary, Houston, urges your support of universal military training bill, S. 1.

Mrs. THEO A. KOCH,
*Legislative Chairman.*

---

HUNTSVILLE, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

American Legion members, Seventh District, Texas, urge you to support passage of Senate bill 1, universal military training bill, sponsored by American Legion. Our present national emergency can be aided measurably with such a measure operating at this time.

DON REID, JR.,
*Commander, Seventh District, Texas.*

---

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The 6,500 Legionnaires of Bexar County urge passage of universal military training bill, S. 1.

E. A. BOEHM,
*Twentieth District Commander,*
*American Legion.*

---

LEVELLAND, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Senate Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

I would like to urge your full support of Legion's universal military training bill, No. S. 1.

W. T. BRIDGES,
*Nineteenth District Commander,*
*American Legion.*

---

LAREDO, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

I urge you support Legion's universal military training bill, S. 1.

B. J. RUPERT,
*Third Division Commander,*
*American Legion, Department of Texas.*

---

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Please push Senate bill 1, as amended.

LADIES AUXILIARY, AMERICAN
LEGION POST NO. 801,
Mrs. LEONA P. MOORE,
*President.*

---

AUSTIN, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Three thousand five hundred Legionnaires of tenth district urge adoption of Senate bill 1, universal military training.

V. F. TAYLOR,
*Tenth District Commander, the American Legion.*

---

TYLER, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Senate Office Building:*

Please support bill No. 1, as amended. Thank you.

Mrs. C. E. MCKAY,
*Third District President, American Legion Auxiliary.*

---

AMARILLO, TEX., *March 1, 1951.*

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urge your continued effort toward passage of amended Senate bill 1.

Mrs. A. PITT,
*Eighteenth District President,*
*American Legion Auxiliary.*

---

BEAUMONT, TEX., *February 27, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Senate bill 1, as amended, contains provisions vital to the security of our Nation now and in the future. I am hopeful of its passage and ask your continued support of the bill as now being considered.

Mrs. A. J. BREAUX,
*National Security Chairman, American Legion Auxiliary.*

---

HOUSTON, TEX, *February 27, 1951.*

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Please vote for amended UMT bill, S. 1.

FRED MILLER.

---

CUERO, TEX., *February 28, 1951.*

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Respectfully urge your support Senate bill 1, as amended.

Mrs. FRED HENNEKE,
*President, Fourteenth District,*
*American Legion Auxiliary.*

HOUSTON, TEX, *February 27, 1951.*
Senator LYNDON JOHNSON:
Urge passage of UMT wholeheartedly.
Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. H. V. RAU.

---

AMARILLO, TEX., *February 27, 1951.*
Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
I have been directed by the Board of Directors of the Amarillo Junior Chamber of Commerce to inform you that we wholeheartedly approve universal military training and reduction of draft age limit to 18 years.
S. TOM MORRIS,
*Chairman, Public Affairs Committee,*
*Amarillo Junior Chamber of Commerce.*

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is there any practical way of relieving the Reserves who are now in the Armed Forces without inducting the 18-year-olds?

Mr. CAIN. As best we can judge, it is not likely that any 18-year-olds will be taken this year, or at least that any considerable number of 18-year-olds will be taken. The answer to the question, then, with reference to the next year, is that I know of no way by which we can get the reservists out of the service as rapidly as we would like to do so, without drafting the 18-year-olds.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then, eliminating the 18-year-olds from the bill would put an aditional burden, or continue the burden, on the men who served in World War II, would it not?

Mr. CAIN. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that that is one of the big questions the committee had to face, and finally, after considerable thought, the committee came to the conclusion that in the national interest it had to provide for utilizing the 18-year-olds, if, in so doing, it would get out of the Army more rapidly those fine Americans who, goodness knows, have made a great contribution in the past. A majority of the committee thought that every young American aged 18 worthy of his salt would rather be drafted to serve the needs of his country if it meant that a man who had been drafted as his elder in the last war would be relieved from a further responsibility.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator, and should like very much to associate myself with his last remark.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I would make a personal request of the junior Senator from Oregon. I know he is going to provide the Senate with much information, to which I certainly wish to listen, but because of what has preoccupied me and some others on the floor, I am sure the Senator would like to accommodate us to fulfill obligations outside of the Chamber so that we might return and hear what his views are.

## CONSTRUCTION BY UNITED STATES STEEL CORP. OF NEW PLANT AT MORRISVILLE, PA.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to have unanimous-consent that I may occupy the time of the Senate for 5 or 6 minutes without the Senator from Oregon losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, yesterday in historic Bucks County, Pa., the United States Steel Corp. celebrated half a century of service by starting the construction of the new Fairless Works.

The plant will cover almost 4,000 acres. The site is a part of Pennsbury Manor, where William Penn built his American residence in 1685. It is across the Delaware River from Trenton, where Washington ferried his small army across to New Jersey and won his memorable victory over the Hessians.

The ceremonies yesterday were most significant. Both Pennsylvania and New Jersey joined in the celebration. The distinguished Governor of New Jersey, Hon. Alfred M. Driscoll, pointed to steel as a symbol of our way of life. He declared that right now, in these critical times, we need steel in our hearts and in our minds in order properly to perform the job ahead.

The distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, Hon. John S. Fine, also stressed the importance of steel in building the American way of life. He called for all levels of Government to aid business in moving forward by giving the people good, sound, honest, economical government.

Another talk discussing the important bearing of good government on the expansion of productive enterprise was given by Hon. Simon K. Moyer, chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Bucks County.

He pointed to Bucks County as an example of government operated with economy and efficiency. The result has been a low tax rate and virtually no bonded indebtedness.

The steel plant when completed will cost $400,000,000—all of it furnished by private capital. There will be no new stock issue, nor will there be an issue of bonds.

United States Steel is owned by more than 238,000 stockholders, and no single person or corporation owns more than 1 percent. It gives employment to more than 300,000 men and women.

The plant started yesterday will be the largest single integrated plant in the United States.

The production of steel in the United States now is approximately 1,000,000 tons a year. The expansion of steel at the end of 1953 will raise this production to 120,000,000 tons a year. To show the significance of what we are doing through private capital, this expansion alone will mean capacity to equal the production of 80 percent of the total German output during World War II.

William Penn lived in peace. The plant started yesterday should provide additional strength to help preserve peace in the world.

The plant was named for Benjamin F. Fairless, the present directing head of this mammoth corporation. His rise to world eminence is another argument for the American way of life. He was born in Ohio, the son of a miner.

The United States Steel and other industries of America, large and small, have the know-how and the willingness to push ahead. It is the duty of the Government to encourage private enterprise by maintaining the value of the dollar, balancing budgets, restricting credit, and practicing rigid economy.

Mr. Fairless made a significant address at these services yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distinguished guests, and fellow members of the United States Steel family, to all of you gentlemen who have taken time out of your busy lives to join us here today, I am deeply grateful. We have come to witness the first step in the construction of a great new steel works—the turning of a spadeful of earth. That ceremony will take but a few moments and will command, at best, but little notice in the troubled world. And yet, to me, it seems that what we are doing here today is of more than passing historical interest to our Nation and our people.

Most of you know, of course, that during the Revolutionary War this area around Morrisville and Trenton was one of the Nation's most important iron-making centers. Iron and steel produced here went into the weapons which enabled George Washington and his continental armies to establish the United States of America as a free and independent Nation. Now that our liberties again are threatened, I think it is not only fitting but indeed significant that the iron and steel industry should return today to its historic home here on the banks of the Delaware, to embark upon the largest single expansion project that has ever been undertaken in its entire history.

There are bigger steel plants in this country, of course, but never before—not even under the tremendous pressure of two world wars—has a steel plant of this size been built all at one time. That should be of interest abroad as well as at home.

There is international significance, too, in the fact that today we are setting in motion two great streams of intercontinental trade that will greatly benefit both North and South America. In the years ahead, millions of tons of iron ore will come out of Venezuela to charge the furnaces that we are building here. On the other hand, many millions of American dollars are already pouring out of the United States to develop the ore deposits in Venezuela. So this constant interchange of wealth between two continents will create new jobs, new homes, new opportunities and new prosperity for

the people of both countries, and will surely strengthen the historic bonds which have so long united the Americas—economicaly, politically and fraternally.

But to me there is, in all of this, a deeply personal significance which will always overshadow any other; for—as you know—my colleagues have contrived that this great plant be named the Fairless Works. There is nothing, I suppose, that any man desires more in life than the affection and respect of those who know him best. That is why no honor he could receive can ever mean quite so much to him as one that comes from the hands of those who work with him and around him. Certainly no man who has spent his lifetime making steel, living steel, and loving steel as I have, could want a finer monument to his career than this—a plant that will go on, for 50 or perhaps 100 years to come, pouring steel into the ribs of our Nation and wealth into its economic veins.

And finally, on behalf of all of us at United States Steel, I want to say a word of thanks to Commissioner Moyer and to all the others who have welcomed us so warmly and so cordially to our new home here in Bucks County. It has been your home for a long time; and your are rightfully proud of it. I just want you to know that although we are newcomers here, we already share your pride in it and we fully recognize and accept our responsibilities as your fellow citizens. You and I both know, of course, that in any undertaking of this size there are bound to be problems that will perplex and distress us all—things like traffic, schools, housing, utilities, and recreational facilities—things that may disturb, temporarily, the traditional patterns of our community life. We of United States Steel have earnestly sought to anticipate as many of these problems as we can. We want to work with you in finding a quick and satisfactory solution to them all. We cannot do all this alone; and neither, probably, can you; but together we must and we will.

You have made us feel that we are welcome neighbors. I want you to feel that we are good neighbors. In short—and above all else—I want to be sure that the people of this community can always be just as proud of the Fairless Works as I am.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure my very good friend, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and my equally good friend, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], will not take any offense at the introductory remarks I am going to make, but will consider them to be friendly, good fun-joshing when I tell them about my reaction to their speeches this afternoon.

Seeing the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in the chair of the minority leader, I wish to say that the speeches of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Texas remind me of an experience I had in Ferney, S. Dak., in the summer of 1921, when I was there working through the harvest fields. It was a very hot summer day. I was driving a team of horses in front of a mower cutting hay, and I noticed that the sky started to become gray. The wind started to rise. My boss, at the far end of the field, signaled me frantically, and shouted that I should unhitch the horses and go to the barn as fast as I could. I was not familiar with the kind of storms which frequently develop around Ferney, S. Dak. I obeyed instructions, however, and I soon discovered, as the sky darkened further, that we were about to have what is called a South Dakota cyclone tornado. A long black, funnel-shaped cloud started to descend from the heavens. With considerable speed we got our horses into the barn, in time for us to rush into the cyclone cellar. We could hear outside the force of the terrific wind. After the passage of some time we came out. Mr. President, not a shingle had been taken off the barn, and not a limb had been torn off a tree. The cyclone had bypassed us.

I recalled the incident this afternoon because I had been forewarned, before the distinguished junior Senator from Washington began his speech, by being handed a little ticker sheet, taken off the news ticker in the cloak room. It said that I was going to be devastated. I wish to report to my good friend from Washington that I never felt in better physical or mental health than I do at the present moment. I think I survived the storm in pretty good shape.

I recall also that we went back to work that afternoon. Along toward night the skies darkened again. There was a great deal of lightning, but not very much rain. However, it was refreshing, and it cooled us off a little. I was reminded of the sequel to the tornado as I listened to my good friend from Texas. I felt quite refreshed by his speech.

I am glad to direct my attention to both speeches. As they were being delivered I made note of about 35 points.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. No; I shall not yield. I wish to preserve complete continuity in the RECORD, so far as my rebuttal to the speeches is concerned. It is Friday night, and I want to finish at a reasonable hour.

Mr. CASE. I should hate to press the point. I was merely rising in defense of the fair name of my State.

Mr. MORSE. I enjoyed my experience in South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Did not the Senator notice that cyclones generally go around and never really materialize?

Mr. MORSE. That is the experience I had. I would say that in life I have never been caught by a cyclone. One can usually go around them, too. In my desire to finish at a reasonable hour tonight I shall proceed in continuity without interruption. Before the Senate convened today one of the gentlemen of the press had a little fun with me.

Referring to the fact that I hardly ever make a speech except somewhere between 4 and 7 o'clock in the evening, because usually that is the only time I am able to get the floor, the member of the press said, "Senator, we in the Press Gallery are beginning to think that there is something wrong with your home life, because you never go home at night." I assured him that a more delightful home life than mine does not exist anywhere in the world. I hope I can finish in a short time. I shall try to finish in a few minutes, because I think it will take only a few minutes to make my points.

In reply to my good friend from Washington and my good friend from Texas, I want to say at the outset, as I said the other day, that, although the bill came to the floor of the Senate by unanimous vote, it came with very definite reservations on the part of the junior Senator from Oregon. Every member of the committee knew that I would offer amendments to the bill when it reached the floor of the Senate. I offered the subject matter of the amendments in the Committee on Armed Services. The Senator from Texas referred to the fact that I had not formally offered any amendment in the subcommittee. I am sure he did not mean to be unfair to the slightest degree to the junior Senator from Oregon.

In the discussion which we had in the subcommittee, after full hearings had been held, we were of the opinion that the bill ought to receive consideration by the full committee as rapidly as possible. Why? Because every member of the full committee was an ex-officio member of the subcommittee, and a considerable number of members of the full committee, who were not members of the subcommittee, participated at length in the subcommittee hearings and discussions. I do not know whether it is literally true, but I am inclined to think that at some time during the hearings every member of the full committee, with the possible exception of one or two members, exercised his ex-officio privileges. In the subcommittee we considered more or less all the time that we were functioning as a full committee, so far as hearings were concerned. Therefore, I question whether it was particularly fair to suggest that I had not offered these particular amendments in any meeting of the subcommittee, when the general understanding was that we were going to proceed to take up the bill in full committee at the earliest possible time after we had finished public hearings in the subcommittee. That is exactly what we did. If I had thought for a moment that the members of the subcommittee wanted to go through a discussion of a long list of amendments, outside of a meeting with the full committee, I most certainly would have presented my amendments in subcommittee. To the contrary, Mr. President, I was satisfied that they did not want to do it. I cooperated with the subcommittee at all times in getting through with hearings as rapidly as possible so that the bill could be discussed by the full committee.

I should like to point out, too, that, although the bill was reported unanimously, with respect to my reservations in regard to the 21-month proposal, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] voted with me on the roll call vote, as the record of the committee will show. I think the record will also show that after we were defeated on the 21-month limitation, when a compromise of 24 months was suggested, the Senator from Georgia voted with me also on that question.

I make that comment in passing because someone may get the impression from some things said this afternoon that the junior Senator from Oregon was alone in the committee on everything he proposed. I even succeeded in having one amendment adopted by the committee. I think it is an important amendment. I got the committee to agree, again with the very able assistance of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, to an amendment which at least made an attempt to limit somewhat the arbitrary discretion of both the military and of the President under the original draft of the bill.

As the bill came from the full committee, it contained a provision that when universal military training was inaugurated reduction in the length of service could be brought about by the President upon recommendation, believe it or not, of the Secretary of Defense. I thought that was too much power to give to any Secretary of Defense, especially when it was very clearly understood in the Senate during the debate on the unification bill that adequate checks were going to be maintained against vesting in the Secretary of Defense wide discretionary and arbitrary power. I did not think the language in the bill as it came from the subcommittee and went to the full committee kept faith with what I thought was the general attitude which prevailed in regard to the importance of seeing to it that there was not placed in the office of the Secretary of Defense too broad discretionary and arbitrary powers.

Then, too, Mr. President, I thought it was unwise to give such blanket discretionary power to the President as was proposed to be given him by the language of the bill as it first came to the full committee. I said in committee, and said the other day on the floor—and I think, in passing, it needs to be repeated today because of the points which have been raised with respect to my position—that I thought we should be careful in enacting legislation not to make it so broad in its scope as to fail in our constitutional obligation to apply the checks and balances of our constitutional system to the military and to the President of the United States as well as to other branches of the Government. I think we are impliedly obligated by the Constitution to see to it that they are not given the sweeping and blanket power which at times we are too prone in the Senate to give to the executive branch of the Government.

I proposed the amendment providing that the Congress, by a concurrent resolution, which would not require the President's signature, could decrease the length of service. The Senator from Georgia joined me and made a good argument in support of the amendment in committee.

I wish to say, in complete fairness to my colleagues on the committee, that each and every one of them then voted for my amendment, and it became a part of the bill. By way of keeping the record straight, I think it is only fair to say that one might think, to hear the discussions on the floor of the Senate in regard to some of the amendments which I have offered, that the attitude in the committee was that there was no merit whatever in my amendments. That was not so, because my colleagues on that committee are honorable men who do not deal in double talk. A large number of the members of the Armed Services Committee, in conversation with me—in fact, in some instances in the committee hearings themselves—stated that they felt that there was a great deal of merit in my amendments. Some of them came to me and said, "You have me puzzled. I do not know whether I should go along with you or not. I am inclined to your point of view, but it seems to be that, after all, we had better go along with the recommendations which are made to us. However, I think you are performing a service in raising those points."

That is the kind of thing they said to me privately. I do not think it is very important. It is rather interesting to sit in the Senate Chamber and see the impression being created—if such an impression could be created—that the points of view which I have been expressing in this debate are singular to me, and that no other member of the committee felt that there was any merit whatever in them.

So much for that. Let us move now to some of the points made by my good friend from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

In the first instance, he says that he was not able to be present at a good many of the committee meetings. We regretted that he was not. We were very happy when he returned, because his absence was due to illness, and we were very happy to know that he had completely recovered, and that he returned in time to vote in committee. However, he was not present during most of the hearings.

He observes that because of his absence he feels that he now brings to this subject an unbiased point of view. I do not think he would have to be absent from the committee in order to bring to the discussion an unbiased point of view. I believe the Senator from Washington would be unbiased whether he was present at the committee hearings or not; but I think it is fair to say that the fact that he was not present at the committee hearings leaves some question as to whether or not he has had the benefit of all the overtones and undertones which went along with the committee discussions, both on and off the record. So I do not think it is so important that he now speak from the depths of a lack of bias because of his absence from the committee hearing. What I think is important is that he speak in regard to the merits of the issue which is before the Senate.

He then proceeded to discuss the 21-month amendment, and in his discussion he first quoted from a speech which I made in the Senate on June 7, 1948, in which speech I advocated the modification of the selective-service bill which was then before the Senate, which provided for a 24-month term. I advocated an amendment providing for a 12-month term.

The Senator from Washington quoted from that speech, in which I stated that I thought it was a very serious thing to draft men in peacetime. I think it is. I thought so then, and I think so today. I would that we did not have to do it. But I recognized then that we needed to do it; and a full reading of that speech will show, without any question of doubt, that I said then that I thought we needed a selective service act. I stated that I was going to vote for a selective service act; and I did so. I voted for the bill as it was finally worked out on the floor of the Senate by the exercise of the legislative process which characterizes the passage of any bill in the Senate.

Let me digress long enough to say that I said the other day in respect to this bill that I was going to vote for the final bill as we worked it out on the floor of the Senate, on the anvil of conscionable compromises which always characterize the passage of any major piece of legislation on the floor of the Senate. That is exactly what I did in 1948.

I wish to say, if it will give the Senator from Washington any satisfaction—because he seems to think there is some great inconsistency between my argument of 1948 and my argument today—that we acted on the basis of the conditions which existed in 1948, as we then knew them to be. If the same conditions prevailed today I would still make my first offer on the basis of a draft bill for 12 months. But the conditions are not the same today as they were then.

After I made the offer of an amendment providing for a 12-month term, in 1948, a series of conferences was held with me. A considerable number of Members of the Senate said, "If you will go along with 18 months, and so perfect your amendment, we will go along with you." I could not quite figure out what the emphasis was which the Senator from Washington was trying to place on that very technical word as we used it in our trade here in the Senate. We speak of "perfecting" an amendment. By that we simply mean that we modify an amendment. A group of Senators said, "If you will perfect your amendment so as to provide for 18 months, we will go along with you."

At the time of those discussions, it looked as though I had a pretty good chance to get a majority vote on 18 months. In my opinion, 18 months would have been better than 24. I would have preferred the 12-months period. Everyone knew it at the time. However, I made the compromise in the legislative process and offered to go along on the basis of 18 months. We did pretty well on that amendment. We did so well on the 18-month amendment that other conferences had to be held in the cloakrooms around the Senate in order to work out a compromise for 21 months, because it seemed for a while as through we were going to carry the 18-months amendment. That is the way the matter developed in practice in 1948.

I am entitled ao only a part of either the credit or the responsibility, depending upon one's point of view on the merits of this issue, for getting some

modification of the 24-months proposal in 1948, cutting it down from 24 months to 21 months. I think it is very well known in the Senate now that in regard to the pending bill the junior Senator from Oregon is going to continue to be a legislative realist in regard to the legislative process and the compromising procedure which characterizes it.

I hope that if we do not end up with a 21-month provision, we will end up with a 24-month provision, which is much better than a 26-month provision, for reasons which I shall present in detail when we reach the amendment dealing with that figure. But I judge from what the Senator from Washington said today that, if later in the debate, sometime next week, the junior Senator from Oregon says he wishes to offer a perfecting amendment, or he wishes to offer a new amendment calling for 24 months instead of 21 months, provided my 21-month amendment should be rejected—and I suggest that the proponents of the bill be not so sure that it will be rejected, because they may have a surprise—then in the thinking of the Senator from Washington I would be guilty of an unconscionable inconsistency rather than to be a participant in what we all know is the legislative process in the Senate of working out the best meeting of minds we can bring about by way of conscionable compromises which will give one a majority vote on what he thinks is the best bill he can get through the Senate. I say that, because when I finished my discussion in my June 7, 1948 speech, I said to myself, "So what?" What I said in the June 1948 speech is exactly what I would say today, if the facts were the same.

Then the Senator from Washington proceeded to quote from my June 9, 1948, speech, and said I sought to perfect my amendment to provide for 18 months instead of 12. I have already explained why I did that. But he seemed to be disturbed because in the course of that speech on June 9, in explaining my so-called perfecting amendment, I referred to the fact that I was satisfied I was presenting what was the point of view of a great many members of the American public, and that, because of speeches I had made and conversations I had had in various parts of the country, and from letters I had received, I said I was satisfied that the people of the country preferred 18 months. The Senator from Washington seemed to think a great inconsistency was evident because 2 or 3 days before I had been fighting on the floor of the Senate for a 12-month provision.

Again I say most respectfully I think my friend from Washington was reading into the speech both motivations and intent far beyond anything the junior Senator from Oregon contemplated. Again I submit, Mr. President, that if Senators will read my speech of June 9, 1948, I think it will become perfectly clear to them that what the junior Senator from Oregon was saying to the Senate was that he was satisfied from his conversations, from his public forum discussions across the country, and from his correspondence, that public opinion was that 24 months was too long. That is why I was trying to have it reduced. That was my opinion. I am satisfied that today if we were to take a referendum of this question, the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Texas would be very much surprised at the vote on the subject of a 26-months draft. I think both Senators would discover a tremendous amount of support for the position of the junior Senator from Oregon has taken on the 21-months proposal, along with the improvements and the other reforms he has been fighting for on the floor of the Senate in recent days.

Then the Senator from Washington asked, "Where would we be in Korea today if we had not adopted the 1948 act?" He left the impression, of course, that the position the junior Senator from Oregon took in 1948 respecting the draft act was a position that would weaken our position in Korea today. If I ever heard a non sequitur in debate, Mr. President, that is a "beaut." When the Senator from Washington starts talking about Korea he ought to talk about the mistakes which have been made by the Federal Government in the field of Asiatic policy since 1948. Why should the junior Senator from Oregon or the junior Senator from Washington or any other Member of this body have assumed in 1948 that the Government would have been guilty of the stupid mistakes it has made in Asia since 1948? Does the Senator from Washington mean that in the Senate of the United States we must pass legislation on the theory that an insurance policy must be provided against the stupidity of the administration? I submit that is not the way to pass legislation here. We ought to act on legislation on the basis of the facts existing at the time we pass it. We should not enact legislation on the basis of conjecture. We should not enact legislation on the basis of an assumption that we have an administration that could be guilty of such mistakes as have been made in Asia since the Draft Act of 1948 was passed.

Again I say that, in my opinion, it is a non sequitur to argue that because of what has happened with respect to the foreign policy of the United States since 1948, the junior Senator from Oregon must be branded as having been willing in 1948 to weaken our position in Korea, when the Korean incident had not even arisen. I do not think any Member of this body had any idea that such an incident would arise. If the Senator from Washington wants to talk about Korea, the Senator from Oregon is perfectly willing to discuss that issue at great length.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said in a radio broadcast this morning, that we have got to make up our minds what our policy in Korea is, If our policy in Korea is an all-out war in Asia then the bill before us does not represent a drop in the bucket so far as filling the manpower needs of the country is concerned.

I am going to take the military witnesses who appeared before the Armed Services Committee both in public hearings and in executive session, and tell the Senate a little bit about their testimony concerning Korea. Do not forget that in 1948 we had not yet swallowed the Russian propaganda line on Korea, as the State Department and the Military Establishment subsequently swallowed it. In 1948 we still had our troops in Korea. In 1948 we were still in a position in Korea both with troops and equipment, if we had taken the necessary steps, to have prevented the kind of border incident which finally gave rise to the break-through by the North Koreans of the thirty-eighth parallel and ultimately to the war in Korea. Do not forget that it was in 1948 that Russia was bombarding the air waves of the world with vicious, lying, false propaganda that she was taking her troops out of Korea, but that militaristic, imperialistic America was keeping her troops in Korea and crushing the freedom of the South Koreans under her heel. That is the rot that Russia spread over the world. I have seen some of the translations of the Russian broadcasts.

What did we do? We proceeded to withdraw our troops.

We were not taken by surprise by events in Korea. The American intelligence service had put sufficient information into the posesssion of the military and of the State Department. Our intelligence service knew that Russia had trained an effective Communist army in North Korea. After all, that is the Russian pattern. Our intelligence service knew that Russia had brought down from Manchuria thousands of North Koreans who had been trained in the Russian Manchurian armies, and infiltrated them, in accordance with the Russian pattern, all through North Korea. Our intelligence service knew that. Why do you suppose Russia was doing that, Mr. President? Why should those in the military department and in the State Department have been so dumb, for Russia had already demonstrated by other patterns, involving satellite countries in other parts of the world, that once she got herself into a strong infiltration position, she took over. So she took over in North Korea.

It is Russia behind the scenes that has been fighting us ever since the North Korean incident started. I have said frequently, in speaking at various places across the country ever since that incident, that the American people ought to face this problem with realism, namely, they should realize that our enemy is Russia, and has been ever since the outbreak of the Korean war. Why kid the American people about it?

What have we been told? What has been the attitude of the State Department and the military witnesses, when we present these realistic facts to them? They do not intend to follow in Korea a course of action which might raise the serious threat of an all-out war—at least, not now. I think that is about as concise a statement, in summary of their position, as one can make.

Of course, let me say in passing that I thought we made another "beaut" of a mistake after we withdrew our troops from Korea, when we announced to the world that our front line of defense in

the Pacific would be from the Aleutians down through Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines. That announcement did not strengthen our defenses, nor did it strengthen the morale of our allies in Asia. The course of events since that announcement was made by the State Department has clearly supported, I think, my view regarding it. It is my opinion that one of the reasons why Nehru has not appeared to be so strongly on our side on this issue as he was prior to January 1950 is because India was very much disturbed about what our position in Asia was going to be, by way of defense.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Washington has raised the Korean issue, I say let us meet it in this debate and see whether we can smoke out of the administration information as to what our plans in Korea are going to be.

Mr. President, for the most part the testimony has been that we must hold for the time being, and that there are several reasons why we must hold. We cannot lose face in Asia; and of course if we move out of Korea, that will be very disappointing to other peoples in Asia—which I think is true—with the result that we would lose some face. We are also told that we must not be too hasty about using Chinese guerrillas, whether they are on Formosa or whether they comprise what have been estimated as some 150,000 Chinese guerrillas on the mainland of China, in no way connected either with the Communists or with Chiang Kai-shek's army. I understand that now some military supplies are being sent to them; but the whole attitude has been that we will continue a holding operation in Korea, in the hope that the diplomats, through international negotiations, can work out some kind of settlement of the Korean problem. However, during that time the precious blood of thousands of American boys has been sacrificed in Korea because, in my opinion, we have not followed a proper defensive policy there.

Mr. President, I have been criticized for the statement, but let the critics shoot at it again, because I make it again today, as I did on December 21 on the floor of the Senate, that I believe the American people have a right to have the military and the State Department make up their minds as to what the policy in Korea really is to be, and then let the American people in on the secret. I think they are entitled to know, because they are going to make the sacrifices. The boys who have been raised by American parents are going to pay with their blood and their lives.

However, recurring to the pending bill, it has not been offered to the Senate Armed Services Committee as a solution to the problem of providing large numbers of additional troops in Korea. To the contrary, for a very long time, until just recently, the attitude of the Pentagon was that we were not going to make available to MacArthur any considerable number of additional troops. I am somewhat in doubt, in recent days, as to what their attitude on that point really is. We receive some indication that perhaps some additional troops are to be supplied. Certainly the military authorities should furnish some replacements, if our forces are going to stay in Korea, because I think there are thousands of boys there who should be replaced and brought home for rest and recuperation. Believe me, Mr. President, I am satisfied that there is nothing in the position I take on this bill that will prevent the Military Establishment from doing that.

Let me also say to my good friend, the Senator from Washington, when he begins talking about this bill in relation to Korea, that it could not possibly in the immediate future, and also for some time to come, give to Korea the kind of support which he, by implication, is weaving into this bill as a justification for it. Whether we give support to Korea depends on whether we have today the trained manpower to send there. It is my understanding, on the basis of everything I have heard up to today in the Armed Services Committee, that we do not now have the trained manpower.

Then the question may hastily be asked, "Does not that show that a longer term of service is needed in order to get the manpower ready for Korea?" I say that just the opposite should be the logical answer, because I repeat that under a 21 months' period of service—and in a moment I shall come to discuss the distinction between training and service, about which I respectfully submit my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington, seems to be confused—under a 21-month service we can train more men for replacement purposes faster and we can also build up the Reserve faster, as I said the other day.

So the length of service has very little, if anything to do with getting men trained for Korea. We want to get as many men trained now, as fast as we can get them trained. I say we can train more men in the next 4 years, which are the critical years, under a 21-month program than we can under a 26-month program.

On this point the Senator from Washington seemed to lay great emphasis on the fact that I was suggesting that a longer period of time than 21 months was needed for training certain specialties. Mr. President, he completely misunderstood my argument. I am sure he read my speech, but he is quite mistaken in his report of our good-natured discussion in the corridor the other day. I did not ask him to read every word of my speech. I was joshing him, and I said, "I hope you scan the speech and see how much of it you can go along with. I think you might go along with some of it." He had not been at the committee hearings. In that speech I brought to bear the major points I had made throughout the committee meetings.

But be that as it may, I did not say the other day, and I have never said, that more than 21 months are needed to train men for certain specialties. So far as the men selected for the draft are concerned, I have said that there is need for more than from 4 to 6 months of basic training within which to train men for a goodly number of the so-called special jobs or assignments or positions in the Army. That was the testimony given. I know enough about it to know that it is true. By and large, most of the men can be given the basic training necessary to make combat troops of them, so far as the basic training is concerned, in a period of from 4 to 6 months. That is what all the generals testified. They also testified that there are special jobs and assignments which require a little more time than that. But I have said, and I repeat, that a 21-month program will make it possible to give the basic training and get from 8 to 15 months of field service out of the overwhelming number of the men who are drafted. If it be true, as I believe it to be, that the next 4 years will be the critical years, and that, if we can get by the next 4 years, there will be a good chance of escaping world war III, then we ought to build up reserves as rapidly as possible with the largest pool of trained manpower possible. It is possible to do a better job of that, by training men under a limitation of 21 months rather than 26. That is the burden of my argument on that point. The mathematics of it are unanswerable, and they have not been answered.

The Senator from Washington said we did not go far enough in 1948, and should have gone further. That is an interesting use of hindsight on the basis of conditions which have developed since 1948, conditions which no reasonable man in this body could have expected to develop and which would not have developed had our Government not made so many mistakes in its foreign policy.

The Senator had a little fun with me, in reference to another part of my speech, regarding a conversation I had with him, apparently, about a bet I am supposed to have offered him in 1948. On the basis of similar conditions, I would offer the Senator the same bet today. I would have lost the bet, but it was a good bet. I would have lost it because of the foreign policies which the administration followed, but which it should not have followed.

The comments of the Senator from Washington in his references to my speeches of June 7 and 9, 1948, also need to be read in the light of the position which I was taking on universal military training. I know of no Member of this body who has fought harder or who in 1948 was fighting harder than the junior Senator from Oregon for the adoption of a UMT program. I was urging its adoption then. Had we adopted a UMT program plus a draft program for 12 months, or for 18 months, for which I was fighting, we would have been in a remarkably strong position today in regard to our military manpower. But not a word does the Senator from Washington say in his comments about my position in regard to the term of service for the draft in 1948, or about the fact that I was urging that we supplement or coordinate with that draft program a UMT program.

The Senator from Washington knows my position on this question. He is

well aware of the fact that late last summer, when we were urging adoption of a universal military training bill, the then chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives had a conference with the President of the United States. The chairman of the Senate committee returned to us and reported that, in the conference, it was suggested—and he said he had agreed to go along with the suggestion—that action on a universal military training bill should be postponed until the next session of Congress. I am proud of the fact that I was one of the four members of the Armed Services Committee—and it is a matter of record—who refused to vote for postponement. But we were in the minority. Yet, Mr. President, let me say that some of those who at this time are the strongest proponents of this bill did not vote with us when it came to the question of opposing postponement of the UMT program.

I have always been of the opinion—I was of that opinion in 1948, when I was making the speeches referred to by the Senator from Washington in regard to the draft bill, not a UMT bill, which was then under discussion—that Congress ought to enact a draft bill, in order to supply the immediate manpower needed to fill up the companies and regiments in the Military Establishment, but that we ought also to start building a reserve of trained manpower through a universal military training program, in order to take care of conditions which might develop, but which were not apparent at the time. That was—and is now—my position. If it is not a logical and a consistent position, then I know nothing about the rules either of logic or of consistency.

Mr. President, because the Senator from Washington made a passing reference to it in his speech, I say now that the pending measure is not a universal military training bill, except in title. It contains a provision for a UMT civilian commission with some Army personnel on it. A stamp of approval is placed upon the general objective of the Compton Commission on Universal Military Training, but there is no blueprint for a UMT program in this bill. It is all to be worked out in the future, if and when the President of the United States, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, decides to cut down the term of service provided for under the Draft Act, and to start then a universal military training program. I simply feel that there are a host of people in the United States, including a great many members of veterans' organizations, who have the notion that by advocating the passage of this bill they are then given assurance that, at long last, we shall have a universal military training program. They are wrong about that, because we still have ahead of us the entire job of implementing any UMT program that is simply referred to by title, for the most part, in this bill.

Mr. President, let the hearings and the record speak for themselves. In the course of the history of this bill the junior Senator from Oregon has been critical of the fact that the bill does not go far enough with a blueprint either for universal military training or a blueprint for an adequate Reserve program.

Let us comment now on that program for a moment, because the junior Senator from Washington made passing reference to it. I almost fell out of my seat when I heard him say that he agreed with me on something. He agrees with me about the Reserve program. He agrees with me that it should be strengthened. He apparently agrees with me that by building up the Reserve we will give the American people in the years to come the best assurance of having thoroughly trained, military-trained, manpower to rise to the defense of the Nation in case of an all-out war with Russia. I am happy to join with the Senator from Washington in that point of view. I have been saying that for a long time, both in committee and in my speeches in the Senate and elsewhere.

What is there in the bill about the Reserve program? I see that the House committee is doing a little better job in smoking out the Pentagon than we did in the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. If I read the press aright today, the House committee has given the Pentagon orders, and said, "Come on; let us see what you have in the way of a Reserve program." Unless the newspaper report I saw was erroneous—and I do not believe it was—the House committee has said to the Pentagon, "We want to see a Reserve program now." I congratulate the House committee. I believe that is the proper position to take. I believe the Pentagon should have brought a Reserve program along with the proposal for a military manpower bill. We cannot separate the two. We cannot separate the question of how many men we are to have, what length of service they are to have, and what age groups are going to be inducted, until we know what the Reserve program is to be, and until we know how we are to implement and put into effect a universal military training bill.

I do not like to attribute motives to anyone, but as an individual Senator who has to pass judgment on the merits of legislation I sometimes cannot blind myself to what I think motivations are. It is my honest opinion that one of the reasons why the Pentagon did not bring forth a Reserve program in a blueprint form and a universal military training program in blueprint form, at the time they brought forth the bill now before the Senate, was that they knew it would be much more difficult to establish some of the figures they have in this bill, if we could take a look at the Reserve program and the effect of the universal military training program.

Let us move to another point made by the Senator from Washington. He seems to be a little sensitive about the fact that I referred to the bill as the "Pentagon bill." I am sorry he is, because I never meant any such implication as he seems to have read into my remarks. He seems to feel that somehow I am implying that he has not exercised an honest, independent judgment on the bill. I think the statement is sufficient that I had no such intention.

I did have the intention—and I repeat it now—of telling the Senate that for the most part the pending bill is the bill which the Pentagon brought to the Armed Services Committee. The Pentagon was the source of the bill. We did not write the bill. The bill did not originate with the Armed Services Committee. It is the bill recommended by the Pentagon, with such changes as the committee made in it, which I say, considering the bill as a whole, are not substantial.

We do not have to worry about the Senator from Washington making up his own mind. One of the things I admire about him is that he makes up his own mind. But I am somewhat disappointed that he does not know me better than to think that I would imply by anything I said that he was being a tool, or a stooge, or a rubber stamp, of the Pentagon. My only disappointment about the Senator from Washington, and some of my other colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services, is that they were persuaded by the recommendations of the Pentagon. I wish their persuasion resistance had been a little more impervious.

The Senator from Washington says that he does not think these statistics——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I desire to finish my comments; then I shall be very happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate is the only place where time goes fast for me. I did not realize I had been speaking for almost an hour. I desire to hasten.

I wish to make the point that the Senator from Washington seems to think that I am in error when I refer to what I consider to be the statistical weaknesses of the bill, and that I am in error when I say the statistics are unscientific. I think he and I have a very honest difference of opinion. I believe that some of the statistics of the Pentagon in support of the bill are pretty inaccurate. In my opinion, the Pentagon suffered some terrific statistical casualties in its operations on the bill. I went into them in some detail yesterday, and I am in the course of preparing, in connection with some of my other amendments, further criticisms of the statistics of the Pentagon. But let me say one thing about the ones which relate to this part of the debate.

As I said yesterday, I think it was a remarkable statistical performance on the part of the Pentagon when on January 10 it assured the Armed Services Committee that the size of the Armed Forces it wanted was 3,200,000 men. Under cross-examination they stood by that statement. They said through their witnesses on January 10, 1951, that that

was the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was perfectly obvious from the charts, and graphs, and beautiful art work which they displayed before the committee, that that had been their information for quite some time, because they did not prepare those charts overnight. A great deal of work went into the preparation of the charts. So on January 10, the figure was 3,200,000.

I do not know what happened. The Senator from Washington was very much interested in what happened to my thinking between June 7, 1948, and June 9, 1948, when, as he quoted me, I perfected my amendment as a result of the operation of unconscionable compromises on the floor of the Senate, from a 12-month term proposal to an 18-month term proposal, but along with my fight for a universal military training program to supplement it and to be coordinated with it. He thought that was a remarkable change of attitude. In my view, it was a very remarkable change of attitude on the part of the Pentagon that between January 10, 1951, and January 12, 1951, they should raise the figure by some 250,000 men, in round numbers, or from 3,200,000 to 3,462,000. Why? I do not know why. I wish I knew for a certainty.

Another interesting thing about their performance in that respect was that they did not get their charts changed by January 12. Even on January 12 they were still defending their position by pointing to charts which were based upon a figure of 3,200,000. They never said a word in their testimony, as I recall, or as I have been able to find, about the difference between their chart testimony on that date and their oral testimony on that date. The difference was about 250,000 men. I do not know why they changed. I am sorry, but they have left me with an impression as to their motivations with respect to the change. I am sorry that I have a suspicion about it, but I do. After all, Mr. President, in court one must judge a witness not only by what he says, but by the intangible things which cause an opinion to be formed as to attitudes and motivations. I think that some of their later—or perhaps I should say belated—calculations were brought forth by the realization that if they stuck to the 3,200,000 figure and eliminated some of their manpower waste they would not have to dip into the 18-year-olds at all. That is why I think they raised the figure. I think their first figure confessed them out of court so far as their arguments for 18-year-olds was concerned. Therefore they revised their figures very quickly and came in a few days later with the figure of 3,462,000, but before they had a chance to change their charts. If they had stayed with the 3,200,000 and brought about reforms in manpower waste which they should bring about they would not have to touch a single 18-year-old.

Perhaps my good friend from Washington thinks that I have a slanted attitude in regard to the statistics of the Pentagon. I cannot get away from the fact that by the record itself they made the change in a very few hours. I have heard it said, since I made my argument yesterday on the floor, that changed conditions in Korea brought about that change. Let me say, Mr. President, that with respect to those two dates that argument cannot be supported by the facts. Conditions in Korea were just as bad on the first day as they were 2 days later. It is impossible to reconcile such an explanation of the change with what the Pentagon was telling us with respect to their manpower plans in Korea, because it was about that time, or in the neighborhood of those dates, that high officials of the Pentagon, standing before the committee in executive session, told us that they had no intention of sending any considerable number of replacements or additional troops to Korea. No; they will have to do better than that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have stated that I should like to finish my comments without interruption so that they may be made with some form of continuity. Does the Senator wish to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. TAFT. No; I wanted to ask about the general need for 18-year-old boys.

Mr. MORSE. That is the next point I shall take up, if the Senator will permit me to discuss it. It also bears upon some comments made by the Senator from Washington. The Pentagon is having a hard time with its figures. They are having a hard time with the figures on which the Senator from Washington disagrees with me because I think they are a little bit slanted. I do say that. I say they are slanted. I say they have been presented in a way which constitutes an overstatement in favor of the Pentagon's position. I say also that I have a hunch that the men in the Pentagon would be the most surprised men in Washington if the bill went through without the imposition of some modifications and checks. It is my opinion that their general legislative strategy is to ask for more than they need or expect to get. I do not think we ought to victimize ourselves by not putting into practice through fair amendments some needed checks upon the military.

Referring to what I think the Senator from Ohio had in mind, the Pentagon is having a little trouble these days with the statements which some of their men have made with regard to the question of 18-year-olds. As I said yesterday, I am not at all satisfied with the statements of General Marshall or General Bradley in regard to the question of 18-year-olds before the House committee, particularly with the statement of General Marshall as reported in the press yesterday. I think the record is perfectly clear that the Pentagon admits they do not intend to take any 18-year-olds until sometime in 1952. General Marshall yesterday made a statement which I interpret to mean that if we did not here and now give them the authority to draft 18-year-olds they could not raise an army of 4,000,000 or more men. It is very hard to pin them down. I have not the slightest idea what size Army they contemplate for the immediate future in view of what I think are rather complicated remarks with regard to the 18-year-old issue. First they say they will not take any 18-year-olds until 1952. They say they would not take them anyway under the bill until they reach 18½ years, because that is how old they would be when they got around to inducting them. However, they do not want us to write any such restriction in the bill. When the suggestion is made, they say, "Oh, no." Now they say, "Don't put any restriction in the bill which will prevent us from taking 18-year-olds, because if you do we cannot raise an army of 4,000,000 or more men."

Mr. President, we have the right, and as members of the Committee on Armed Services we have the duty to find out what their ceiling plans are in the immediate future. I believe we also have the duty of saying to the military, "We are not going out of business in the Senate or in the House. We will be at the same old place 2 years from now. If you can come forward 2 years from now and convince us that 18-year-olds ought to be taken on the basis of conditions which then exist, we will consider the conditions, and grant you the power." I cannot understand why the military want it both ways and all ways. What they are really asking for is blanket authority to take 18-year-olds, no questions asked or answered.

Is that the point the Senator from Ohio had in mind?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. If the Senator does not mind I should like to read from the Washington Post regarding General Marshall's statement:

> Marshall said the 18½ draft age would not provide a large enough manpower pool to meet any sudden emergency which requires expansion of the Armed Forces from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 or above. Moreover, he went on, it would be unfair to the many reservists who had to be called when Korea broke.

Believing, as I do, that 3,500,000 men presents the very economic limit we can provide on any permanent basis, I feel very strongly that if the difference between 18 and 18½ is for the purpose of providing 4,000,000 men or more, that is a strong argument in favor of making the age 18½, so that the military cannot go above 3,500,000 until Congress acts affirmatively.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask the Senator what his figures would show as to the reservist argument? Does it make any difference? Are there not plenty of men above the age of 18½ to enable the reservists to be returned to civil life?

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion that is true. I dwelt on that point yesterday, and to some extent today.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make one further comment in regard to the statistics of the military. Yesterday I pointed out that I thought they had suffered some other statistical casualties in their figuring. Mrs. Rosenberg agreed

that they could probably pick up 100,000 men—and I think more than that—by taking more rejectees than they are now taking. I assumed, when she made that statement, and when I read her testimony, that that was going to be the policy. However, nowhere did they subsequently insert that 100,000 in their calculations. In all their calculations they have gone ahead with that 100,000—and I think it ought to be pretty close to twice that number—eliminated. I do not know whether or not I am justified in saying that I think their statistics are slanted or presented by way of overstatement so as to place their position in the best light. However, it seems to me, that is a perfectly good example.

As I stated yesterday, they lost another 250,000 to 300,000 men in their statistics on the margin of safety. So I leave this point by saying that I have nothing to modify or qualify or take back in what I have said about what I consider to be the slanted statistics of the Pentagon.

I enjoyed particularly the literary style of my good friend from Washington when he told us, with his beautiful speaking ability, that he was going to reject my approach to those statistics because he thought he had to build a line of defense on the floor of the Senate in answer to my criticisms of the statistics. I know that he thinks I am dead wrong. I am sorry he does. I have great respect for his sincerity of conviction, but I simply wish to say that, in my opinion, it would be better to modify the figures of the Pentagon downward, as I am suggesting, because the result of that, I believe, would be to force the military to eliminate some of their manpower waste.

I agree with the Senator from Washington that the Military Establishment is not the only place in our Government where there is manpower waste; but I have never believed that two wrongs make one right. Here we have the opportunity to correct one wrong. I will join with the Senator from Washington in taking care of the other wrongs of manpower waste within the Government any time he comes forward with a program which shows that he has a way of eliminating some of the waste, because, in my opinion, to do so would increase the efficiency of administration.

Many Federal employees do not like to hear me say it, but I believe that in most of the civilian agencies of the Government we could eliminate a substantial number of employees, with resulting greater efficiency in the operation of the departments. For years I have been willing to do that very thing. But I say that now we have the opportunity of forcing the administration to eliminate some of the manpower waste in the Military Establishment.

The Senator from Washington wants to know where I am going to get the additional manpower to handle the paper-pushing jobs. I am going to get them out of the age brackets not covered by the draft, save and except for the thousands we could get by taking some of those within the age brackets covered by the draft, who do not have the physical ability to be trained for combat, but certainly could do a great deal of the paper work, the administrative work which goes along with running the military on the lower echelons. That is where I would get the additional manpower. I would get it by making greater use of womanpower, both in uniform and in civilian capacities, in the armed services. I would get it by making greater use of civilian womanpower and manpower above the age brackets covered by the draft. I am satisfied that it could be done. That is why I think we can come pretty close to the three million ceiling I have suggested. Instructions should be given to the military that they must fill some of their jobs with civilians, and release for combat training a great many able-bodied men now filling such jobs. If we could accomplish that it would improve the efficiency of the Military Establishment and save the taxpayers a great deal of money, because we could maintain civilians in those jobs more cheaply than we could maintain men in uniform in the same jobs.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. If my friend from Washington will be patient with me and let me finish these points, I shall be very glad to discuss with him our differences.

Mr. CAIN. I enjoy being patient. I thoroughly appreciate the opportunity to listen to every word.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Washington is a very patient man.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. He is a wonderful man in a great many other respects. Patience is not his only attribute.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to return the compliment.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington attributed to me a desire to hold a threat over the military. I am not suggesting any exercise of threats, but I will tell the Senate what I am suggesting. I am suggesting that the Senate exercise its constitutional checks over the military, which is quite a different thing from a threat. I am suggesting that the Senate insist upon writing into the bill, on the basis of present conditions, explained to it by the Military Establishment, a ceiling for the Armed Forces for the immediate future, letting them know that we will stand ready and willing to raise that ceiling as they show that world conditions call for it.

I repeat, merely by way of reference, what I said yesterday in regard to what I think the military did to their own manpower bill when they unwisely committed themselves the other day to only an additional 100,000 troops in Europe. When they did that they reinforced my argument for a ceiling around 3,000,000. Let me say to my friend from Washington that I am going to be susceptible to a compromise of 3,000,000 if I lose out on my proposal, to such a compromise as 3,100,000, or even go back to the first recommendation of the military itself for 3,200,000. I give advance notice of that so I can be free of any charge that by doing that I will be guilty of some inconsistency. That happens to be a part of the legislative process itself in the Senate.

I have already covered the point the Senator made respecting Korea, when he said that we need more men in Korea. I believe we do. Of course, in my opinion, it is fallacious to jump at the conclusion that if my amendment is adopted we cannot get them. What we need more than anything else in determining the manpower program in Korea is a clear statement of policy respecting Korea. That is what we need. If we cannot obtain a clear statement respecting our policy in Korea in the near future, then I think the Senate ought to take whatever steps it can to carry the fight to the administration, and insist on having either a clear statement of policy respecting Korea or that we fall back to a line of defense we can defend in the Pacific with the use of air and naval power short of sacrificing the manpower we are presently sacrificing by way of casualties.

I do not think the American people are going to be very tolerant much longer of a military policy in Korea that does not protect the American boys there by taking action against the bases of supply which are providing the materials which are used in killing them. I am just about fed up with this on-again off-again policy, this program of vacillation in Korea in regard to what our program toward Communist China and Communist Russia is going to be.

Now I come to the comment by the Senator from Washington that my amendment would result in freezing men in combat units in Korea. I say that simply does not follow. It does not follow that we could not send men to Korea if we get men who would be trained as a result of the adoption of my amendment. If it is desired to send more men to Korea than the number I have heard anyone suggest so far, then let me say we must go far beyond the figure of 3,000,000 or 3,100,000 I am talking about, or the 3,462,000 the majority are talking about. We must recognize then that we will have to bring back into the service a much larger number of reservists and National Guard men, and really put on a manpower drive that will leave no doubt in the minds of Communist Russia and Communist China of what we intend to do in Korea.

The Senator from Washington said: "Let us get ready to rotate men in Korea." I say the same thing, only I say it can be done under my amendments. My amendments do not prevent that being done. I have no question about the need for rotation in Korea. But I have the feeling that raising the Korean issue in support of the bill and seeking to give the impression that anyone who does not go along with the bill in every particular must be charged with following a course of action that somehow weakens our position in Korea, is another grand non sequitur and a good example of false reasoning.

In view of the fact that the military is not going to send more than 100,000 men to Europe, my amendments will not prevent them from sending large num-

bers of men to Korea when the men are trained. But again let me say, as I said earlier, what we need in Korea now is men presently trained. For the most part we are talking about a bill which deals with the problem of bringing in men by way of induction for future training. Certainly they are not for some months going to be ready to take up positions in Korea. When the Senator from Washington argues about doing something for Korea, he should not overlook the fact that we must do it, if we are going to do it now, in terms of men presently trained, not in terms of men who sometime in the future will be trained under the bill.

Then the Senator from Washington had something to say about my position in regard to enlistments. He said the figures show that under the present system the average enlistment in the Navy and in the Air Force is a little more than 5 years because of reenlistments. My amendments do not stop enlistments, and they do not stop reenlistments. I think it is reasonable to presume that if the services can sell their program to their enlistees after 30 months, as called for by one of my amendments, the boys will reenlist.

When the Senator from Washington talks about it being important to maintain the right of boys to enlist voluntarily if they want to, I have no quarrel with him on the principle. I point out, however, that I have a little quarrel with the military about the way they have been applying the principle. I am satisfied that the enlistment policy of the Air Force and the Navy in recent months—in fact, for the most part since Korea—under which they have been stressing the 4-year enlistment program, has amounted to a type of pressure which I think raises the question as to whether, in a great many cases, enlistments are as voluntary as the Senator from Washington would have us believe. As I talk not only to the boys involved but to the parents of many boys, I somehow get the impression from both groups of witnesses that the boys feel they have been, in a way, pressured into a 4-year enlistment because if they do not enlist for 4 years they run the danger of being drafted and sent to Korea as foot soldiers at some time in the future.

I wonder if it is good policy on the part of the Government to use that kind of pressure device—I think I called it the other day a sort of legal blackmailing procedure—to induce boys to enlist for a longer period of time than they would otherwise voluntarily enlist for, if it were not for the fact that they are given to understand that they run the risk, if they do not so enlist, of being drafted as foot soldiers.

The Senator from Washington said, "That is up to them." I believe there is something up to us also as representatives of the people in protecting them from the kind of pressure tactics I think the military is guilty of in its present enlistment program. I believe we have that responsibility, Mr. President. We are dealing with 18- and 19-year-old boys, courageous, daring, many of them rather rash young fellows, who will be more matured in a few years than they are now, irrespective of the fine maturity that characterizes most of our 18-year-old boys. Even the best of them will be more mature in a few more years.

In venturing a suggestion now, let me include the word "if," because perhaps 2 years from now the Senator from Washington or some other Senator will refer to the speech I make today and will take out of context certain excerpts, read them on the floor of the Senate, and seek to give the impression that somehow, in some way, the Senator from Oregon was inconsistent in subsequent speeches, as compared with the speech he made early in March 1951. So, if in several years the period of tension now prevailing is about the same, in other words if we are not any nearer war then than we are now, and if there is indication then that there is a good chance of avoiding war entirely, I have a suspicion that we shall be hearing a great deal about those who enlisted at this time, for 4 years. I think many Members of Congress will be saying, "We should be doing something about them, as they were rather blackjacked into enlisting, because of the exploitation of them by means of the pressure exerted by the military in 1951." I think that will occur, and I think time will prove my suspicion to be correct.

Mr. President, I do not think my amendment limiting to 30 months the service of those who enlist is the monstrosity that my friend the Senator from Washington seems to think it is. However, there is another part of the speech which is dangerous, so far as he is concerned. He would like to take all my amendments in one package, and say, "Here they are; the Senate should not consider by itself this amendment the Senator from Oregon is offering, but should consider them as a one-package en-bloc presentation."

Mr. President, I have not offered the amendments en bloc, and I do not intend to do so. Depending upon the outcome of the votes on some of the amendments, will not the Senator from Washington be surprised if he should discover that the adoption of some of them might have a controlling effect in regard to whether the junior Senator from Oregon will offer all his amendments?

I am perfectly cognizant of the fact that each one of my amendments will have definite effects upon the military manpower program. I am aware of that. Even though I have offered the amendments, the fact is—whether the Senator from Washington would believe it or not—that I intend to continue to keep an open mind on this bill as the debate progresses. If at any time I became convinced, after the adoption of some of my amendments, that any further modification of the program would not be good for the manpower program, I simply would not call up another amendment. Situations of that sort arise all the time in the Senate, of course. If I could make either the clerk or the Parliamentarian my witness for a moment, either one would have to testify—because the RECORD supports me—that it frequently happens in the Senate's proceedings, in the midst of the legislative process of working out the best bill obtainable by means of conscionable compromises among us, that amendments are sent to the desk, but never are called up, because of action taken by the Senate on amendments which are considered prior thereto.

I am not making an offer in this connection; let no one assume that I am.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment.

Mr. President, I am not making an offer as to what my procedure will be; but I simply wish to reply to the assumption made by my good friend, the Senator from Washington, that all my amendments are going to be called up before this debate is over. They may be; but whether I call up all of them will depend very largely upon the course of action taken by the Senate on the individual amendments as they are considered. I think Senators will find, in the course of this debate, that not all the amendments may be called up—just as, in the case of every other major piece of proposed legislation which comes before the Senate, not all amendments are always called up, even though they may be at the desk.

Mr. President, I should prefer to have my good friend, the Senator from Utah, wait——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have a question which I think is pertinent at this point, but it may not be later on. The Senator from Oregon has been speaking of examples and of calling up witnesses to testify about what happens. I simply wish to furnish an example now.

Mr. MORSE. If my good friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] will accept an apology in advance for my not yielding to him a moment ago, and for my yielding at this time to the Senator from Utah, who apparently is about to support me—whereas I assume that my friend, the Senator from Washington was not going to support me—then I do yield to the Senator from Utah; and in due course I shall yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I can thoroughly understand that the Senator from Oregon is in need of support, and I am glad to have him supported.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator may think so; but the Senator from Washington has had opportunity to present his case in chief, and my remarks at this time really are rebuttal. Later I shall give him time for surrebuttal, and I shall welcome it.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is very thoughtful.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Oregon to jump to conclusions in regard to what I am going to do. I said I would furnish an example of what he has been saying. I do not know which way I shall vote. I have heard the various speakers in the course of this debate.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Utah does not know which way he is going to vote, then he is on my side.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator from Oregon know, either?

Mr. MORSE. I am just pleading for open minds.

Mr. WATKINS. At any rate, I wish to ask the Senator some questions.

I heard the argument made by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] awhile ago, in the course of which he pointed out that all the priorities provided for in the bill, as it now stands, as reported by the committee, will be wiped out if the 18½-year amendment of the Senator from Oregon prevails. I should like to have the Senator from Oregon comment on that.

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator from Utah to restate his question, please.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to the Senator's amendment in regard to 18½-year-olds, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] said, as I understood him, that all the priorities—in other words, those in regard to the ones who would be taken first, before we reached the 18-year-olds—would be wiped out if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted. I should like to have the Senator from Oregon comment on that.

Mr. MORSE. That is really my last point, but let us get to it now.

Mr. WATKINS. I am very much in doubt. I say to the Senator that if that is actually the effect of his amendment, I am afraid I am not on his side.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator may not be; but certainly I shall give him an honest answer to his question.

I think I have completed the point I was on, so I shall come now to the question the Senator from Utah has asked and the point he has raised.

Under the bill presently before the Senate, its operation, as I understand, in respect to 18-year-olds will be as follows: Each local draft board can take 18-year-olds after it has used up all the men in the age group of 19 through 25 that it wishes to take.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, single men?

Mr. MORSE. No; under this bill it can take single men and it can take married men who do not have children.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Let me point out that we should not forget that the local draft board has considerable discretion in the exercise of its functions, in determining which men it will take and which men it will defer. In each local community the draft board, under the operation of the old selective-service law—in other words, the 1948 act—will begin to consider taking those in the 18-year-old group, under this bill, after it has taken those in the group from 19 through 25. It exercises its discretion. But I point out to the Senator from Utah that when the Senate adds this provision of this bill I am inclined to believe that the discretion of the local draft boards will be substantially modified, knowing that they have a pool of 18-year-olds, into which they can dip, rather than to send someone who is in the 19-to-25-year bracket.

Mr. WATKINS. Could they do that without violating the law? Would they be permitted to do that?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes; they would be permitted to do that, within their discretion. Let me apply it to the individual case. Without the 18-year-old provision attached to the law, the local draft board would be given a call to produce so many men. So, in actual operation, without the 18-year-old pool to draw on, to fill up the quota, they would come to Mr. X. I care not what his occupation is, but let me say for example that he operates a small farm, or is a young fellow getting started on a small farm. They have the authority to take him. They must fill the call upon them, and when they get down to the final decision, they can say, "You must go."

Mr. WATKINS. What is the family status of this man? Is he married or unmarried.

Mr. MORSE. He is single.

Mr. WATKINS. He is single?

Mr. MORSE. Let us consider that he is married without children.

Mr. WATKINS. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. He is taken. It is my opinion that, in the actual operation of this bill, applied to that same case, the draft board would have the discretion of saying, "We will not take him; we will take an 18-year-old." The Senator sees my point, does he not?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator means, does he, with the amendment, or with the bill as now drawn?

Mr. MORSE. The bill as now drawn permits the taking of the 18-year-olds. The board would look around for a boy 18 years and 9 or 10 months old or 18 years, 10 months, or 18 years, 11 months, until they could find one whom they could draft.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator assume that the draft board would ignore the provision of law which says they must start with a certain group, proceed to next group, and exhaust all those classes, before they get to the 18-year-olds?

Mr. MORSE. But the law does not destroy the discretion that the boards presently have in making their local community deferments on the basis of the particular circumstances of the individual cases. In other words, it does not follow under the administration of the bill proposed by the majority of the committee that the board could not take an 18-year-old until they had taken all the 19-year-olds, irrespective of the circumstances surrounding the 19-year-old.

Mr. WATKINS. If I understand what the Senator means, the board could go ahead and for some reason or other defer many of the eligibles until they got to the 18-year-olds and still be within the law.

Mr. MORSE. What I am saying is that if this bill is passed they would be allowed to exercise the same discretion on deferments in individual cases that, as local boards, they are now able to exercise in respect to 19-year-olds, or 20-year-olds. In my opinion, there is nothing in the bill which takes away from the local draft board its discretionary authority to say, "We simply believe that X, the 19-year-old boy, should not go."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not true that under the bill as reported, the local draft board is directed to induct no one under 19 years of age, as long as there is available within the jurisdiction of the board someone above 19 years of age?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Texas is reading into that language the elimination of all discretion on the part of the local draft board to make decisions on deferment that it wills to make. I do not think the language of the bill would require a draft board in Podunk County, for example, to take a boy off the farm—a boy who owns his farm, and who is married, and has no children—and put him in the Army, rather than take an 18-year-old.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I heartily agree with the Senator that the language I refer to does not take away from the draft board the authority it has to issue deferments. The Senator from Texas does not contend that. The Senator from Texas is in agreement with the Senator from Oregon that it does not take away their deferment authority. But the bill does specify that, so long as there is available any person above 19, no person under 19 shall be taken. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon would strike that language from the bill, and therefore, if the amendment should prevail—and I hope it will not prevail—the draft board could reach in and take an 18½-year-old boy and leave a 23-year-old brother at home.

Mr. MORSE. I shall come to that.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall discuss the effects of my amendment in a moment, but I first want to discuss my understanding of the operation of the committee bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Since I have asked the question, I shall be glad to have the Senator proceed without interruption; but I should like to have explanation of the point raised, because to me that is the very heart of this whole thing. It seems to me there should be the priorities, as provided in the committee bill. The Senator's amendment, in my opinion, would be much better if it included a provision starting with the older groups, and taking each one in turn, down to the lower-age groups. Without such a provision, it seems to me we would be getting into a difficult situation. We would be putting the draft boards in a position where they would probably have to wink at the law or evade the law in order to get down to the 18½-year-olds.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to my good friend from Utah that I merely want to

get the statement of facts in the RECORD as I understand them, under either the committee bill or my amendment; after which, I shall be perfectly willing to let the Senator from Utah make his decision as to which one he wants to vote for, or to vote against both of them, which he certainly would have the right to do.

Mr. WATKINS. I say it is highly important because I have been converted to the idea that the younger boys should not be taken until we have exhausted the pool of older men. I had understood that the Senator's amendment, changing the age from 18 to 18½, did nothing but that. Now, if it does more than that, then it is certainly worthy of considerable investigation before we take the step.

Mr. MORSE. I think it does more than that. Possibly it needs to be modified so it will not do more than that. But I think that in its present form it does more than that, because that is what I intended it to do.

Let me now summarize my position, first, as to the operation of the bill of the committee as to 18-year-olds. It is true that that bill says the local draft board shall exhaust its pool in the 19 to 25 group before it takes 18-year-olds; but, in my opinion, as a lawyer, I see nothing in that bill which in any way circumscribes or limits the discretion of the draft board in regard to deferments. I think the moment there is set up under this bill a pool of 18-year-olds available to the draft board, after it has exercised its judgment in respect to deferments of men within the age group of 19 to 25, it will inevitably be found that it will defer more men in the 19 to 25 group than it would otherwise have been able to do. The board would justify it on the ground that they think those men ought to be deferred, and they would then dip down into the 18-year-olds and take them.

Mr. WATKINS. Would not the same reasoning apply with respect to the Senator's amendment as to 18½-year-olds?

Mr. MORSE. I am coming to my amendment, but what I am trying to point out is, I think that is the way it would work under the committee bill.

Now, as to my amendment, I think it goes further than that. The Senator from Texas is correct that what my amendment in its present form says is that the 18½-year-olds will be a part of the total bracket, 18½ to 25, of boys to be taken.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator would eliminate the priorities, would he?

Mr. MORSE. I would eliminate priorities.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I was endeavoring to ascertain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I may say that a simple answer "yes" would answer the Senator, but it would not make the RECORD very clear as to what was the intent of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator, and ask him to consider it over the week end, at least, I know what he wants to do, and there is a fundamental difference between us as to what is the best thing to do. I think we are in disagreement on what the Senator's amendment does, and it may very well be that the Senator from Texas is wrong, though the best advice I am able to get is that the Senator's amendment does not at all provide for taking the boys at 18 years and 6 months. The Senator's amendment makes them eligible for induction at 18 years and 6 months, but we will not get a single one until he is 18 years and 9 months old.

I followed the Senator's remarks yesterday and enjoyed listening to him today, as all of us enjoy listening whenever he speaks, but as I understand his amendment, he is laboring under the illusion that his amendment will take men at 18 years and 6 months. At 18 years and 6 months they will be eligible for induction, but under the induction procedure it will take another 90 days, and I believe the Senator will have another revision to make if he concludes that the staff, which has studied this matter very carefully, is correct. It may be that 2 hours will not be needed to rewrite the amendment, because we are in agreement on the priorities, but not on the induction.

Mr. WATKINS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator wants the priorities; or does he want to have them eliminated?

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to eliminate them so far as they apply to a man after 18½ years of age.

Mr. WATKINS. Then the Senator would be in agreement with the provisions of the bill, except as to the provision as to 18½ and 18, would he?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The difficulty that bothers me is that I do not want to eliminate the priorities, and if the Senator's amendment would do that, I cannot go along with it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I have the legislative counsel investigating the point he has raised, and my present understanding from counsel is that the Senator from Texas is wrong. My amendment contemplates the same registration as does the Senator's bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Boys register at 18. They can all be processed by the time they are 18½, and they can all be called up for induction at 18½, and would be ready to move at 18½. Incidentally, they would then be in a position, so far as my amendment is concerned, to move a little faster, I think, than under the Senator's bill. I am inclined to think that both the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Texas have overlooked the fact that my 18½-year amendment would get a little more manpower into the pool, and a little faster, than they would under the bill.

What I am seeking to do by my amendment is to continue the present provision, that a boy can present himself for induction at 18, but that he canont be compulsorily taken until he is 18½.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We agree on the first two points, but as to processing, it is the information of the Senator from Texas that under the Senator's amendment it is not posible to process a man until he is 18½, and it takes an additional 90 days to process him. If the Senator will give that his consideration over the week end, I am sure he will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. MORSE. That is not the information I have, and if it proves to be correct, a slight change in the language of the amendment will be necessary, and the change can be offered in a few seconds at the opening of the session on Monday. I have very clearly, in my statement on the Senate floor, shown what my intent is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. To what would the Senator change the figure? Would he change it to fit the committee bill as we have it?

Mr. MORSE. No; I would change it so that the processing could be completed by the time the boy is 18½, and he could be inducted when he was 18½.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then the Senator would make him eligible at 18 years and 3 months in order to make him eligible for induction at 18 years and 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. As I said yesterday, I think the 6 months' period for processing would be of great help to the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator plans to have the boys taken at 18 years and 6 months, as I understand the procedure, it will be necessary to make them eligible for induction by the draft at 18 years and 3 months, because by the time they send a number out and classify a man, and he takes care of his business, and what not, 90 days elapses.

Mr. MORSE. I have not been so advised by the Legislative Counsel, and if I am so advised, we will make the necessary changes to accomplish the end desired. The point is that even when we do that, we are getting the boy in at 18½.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct, and that is the point I want to have understood. If the Senator desires to take the boys in at 18½—and that is what I understand his purpose to be——

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing to have those taken in who are needed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that, but we will have to make a man eligible at 18 years, if the desire is to get him at 18 years and 3 months. We make him eligible at 18, and get him at 18 years and 3 months.

Mr. MORSE. We will go into that, so far as the draftsmanship is concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is it not a matter of law that when a man receives his notice to appear, his induction is as of that date? Does not his time begin to run at that point?

Mr. MORSE. The time begins to run when he gets his call.

Mr. WATKINS. Then he would be inducted at 18 years and 3 months, if we are to allow for the 90 days.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to have a man inducted 1 day before he is 18½ years old.

Mr. WATKINS. Then he is inducted when his notice states he is inducted?

Mr. MORSE. Whatever language is necessary to make that clear, if it is not already clear, will be inserted. But I say to the Senator from Utah that a man will not be inducted, on the basis of the amendment on which the Senator will have the privilege of voting at 2 o'clock on Monday, until he is 18 years and 6 months old. That is the form in which we have drafted the amendment, and if it is not so drafted, it will be modified so that that will be the result.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator intend to make it clear that all the priorities in the pending bill will be taken care of?

Mr. MORSE. I will tell the Senator about the priorities. I do not think they mean very much.

Mr. WATKINS. They will be in the law, whether they mean much or little.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator mean the 18 years?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It is not my intention.

Mr. WATKINS. I misunderstood the Senator, then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is against priorities.

Mr. MORSE. I have not agreed with the Senator from Texas that the priorities amount to much.

Mr. WATKINS. Whether they amount to much or not, for my satisfaction, I hope they will be in.

Mr. MORSE. That is all right, but I have to look at the effects, and I believe the Senator from Texas has created a great many administrative problems with the 18 years 11 months, 18 years 10 months, 18 years and 9 months. It will be necessary to have a small army to do the paper work.

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator desires to get rid of the administrative problems, let us get rid of the draft law.

Mr. MORSE. I am talking about specific amendments to the draft law, on the assumption we are going to have a draft law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is less of an administrative problem with the draft board to take a man 18 years and 11 months old than one 18½ years old.

Mr. MORSE. Ask the chairman of any board, and he will give the information. In the first place, he is pretty crabbed if he is not given the secretarial help he ought to have, and is working night after night and trying to run his bank or his law office in the daytime. When the additional load that would be entailed is imposed, a talk with some of the local chairmen will disclose their view that it is a red-tape monstrosity imposed on them. Go back to your home States and talk to your draft board chairmen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is no red tape about it. It is only a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. MORSE. Additional bookkeeping is not red tape, is it? That is the kind of red tape they are crabbing about now.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I had rather hoped that some system of priorities might be maintained. It seems to me that if there is a draft call for a thousand men it is better to take them by their age classifications, or age group classifications, than to distinguish among 50 and say which ones out of the 50 are to be used to fill the call for 12. It is simpler to have an arbitrary answer.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to keep it as simple as possible from the standpoint of administration. I am open to persuasion. I think it is much simpler as an administrative matter to draw the line at 18 years and 6 months and say any boy between 18 years and 6 months and 19 can be treated in a group by the draft board, and those from 18 to 18½ can be treated as a group.

I do not think there is sufficient difference on the month-by-month basis from 18 years, 6 months to 19 years to put it on a month-by-month priority. As I said to the Senator from Texas, I will give it some thought over the week end. If it seems to me that a priority ought to be retained, I will be open to such a suggestion on Monday.

Mr. CASE. May I suggest one other thing which might be taken into consideration? A boy who is going to be 18 years, 11 months knows about where he stands. He knows the call will come. If a 6-months clause is inserted, all the boys in the 6-months group will be uncertain until they hear from the draft board. If a boy is 18 years, 7 months old he is likely to know with some certainty that the call will come, and it will keep him from doing what he might otherwise do.

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt about it, although in the 6-month period he is going to be presented with a considerable amount of uncertainty anyway, because he would never know whether the draft board has any 18-year-11-month-olds, any 18-year-10-month-olds, or any 18-year-9-month-olds available. He would not know. He may think, "Well, I am 18 years 6 months old. Certainly there is not much danger of my being called for a few months anyway." All of a sudden he would discover that the local board had a call for 150 men and they had gone through the 18-year-10-month-olds, the 18-year-9-month-olds, and the 18-year-8-month-olds, and he would be called within a week. I do not think that in that 6-month period it would be possible to reduce very much the feeling of uncertainty on the part of a boy who is 18 years and 7 months old as to when he would be called.

Mr. CASE. I would not say that it mattered too much. In some cases it might. A fairly simple issue is presented by the amendment which the Senator from Oregon intends to offer. It would merely change the age from 18 years to 18 years 6 months as the basic age when a boy is to be inducted.

Mr. MORSE. I want it to be clearly understood that that was not my original intention. It may become my intention, again as part of the legislative process on the floor.

Mr. CASE. The introduction of the question as to whether we are to observe or abandon the priority system, as it has been presented by the committee, complicates the issue. It seems to me a clear issue is presented if the question relates only to the group between 18 and 18½.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly that is a much more simple issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to point out to the Senator from South Dakota that the bill as presently drafted and recommended by the committee provides for induction at 18 years 3 months. I understand that under the plan of the Senator from Oregon the boys would be taken at 18 years 6 months. It is my understanding that under his amendment, as now worded, they would be taken at 18 years 9 months. The question at issue is between 18 years 3 months, and 18 years 6 months. We might bear in mind the suggestion made with respect to the draft act of 1942, when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was speaking. I do not have his exact statement before me, but he said in substance that he agreed that we should take 18-year-olds if it is absolutely necessary, but he thought we should include a provision which would require the taking of the older ones first. I do not believe any Senator feels that when we have exhausted the quota of 19-year-olds we would run up a white flag and say, "Come and get us, Stalin." We would do whatever we needed to do at the time. Bearing in mind what the Senator from Ohio had advocated on the floor, and in attempting to find a solution to a very difficult question, the committee evolved a formula under which we would do what the Senator had suggested. In other words, we would take the older ones first. The bill so provides. It states that no one below the age of 19 can be taken as long as there is available a person above 19. After that they would be taken by quarters. The Department of Defense and selective-service people told us that that is what they plan to do anyway, namely, take the 18-year-11-month-olds before taking the 18-year-2-month-olds.

They opposed a priority provision as much as the Senator from Oregon opposes it. He thinks it is impracticable. He thinks it could be avoided. I am sure he has many good reasons for opposing it. The Department of Defense opposed it very strongly. They said they would take the oldest first. They said that within the 18-year-old group they would take the oldest first. We said, "If you can do it with the 18-year-olds, why can it not be done all the way down? We will put it in the law that you must do it. You must take all above 19 before you take any under 19. Furthermore, when you get under 19 you must take them by quarters. You must take them from 18 years, 9 months to 19 years; then from 18 years, 6 months to

18 years, 9 months; then from 18 years, 3 months to 18 years, 6 months." They say it is practicable to do so. They say it is a plan under which they can operate.

I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to summarize my position on the point raised by the Senator from Utah, because I am sure as one reads the colloquy in the RECORD it will appear a summary is needed at this point. I shall present the summary without yielding for questioning. Irrespective of what modifications I may decide upon over the weekend in respect to the amendment, it is only fair to the Senate to state here and now what the intent of my amendment is. The intent of my amendment is to provide that the Military Establishment cannot induct a boy before he is 18½ years old. Further, it is my intent that the boy shall have the right to present himself for induction at 18 years of age, as he can under the present law and as he could under the bill proposed by the committee. Third, it is my intent that the 18½ figure shall be in addition to or as an extension of the proposed bracket of 19 through 25.

I believe the so-called priorities offered by the committee do not mean anything in practice. I do not believe they are practicable. As the Senator from Texas has stated, and as was testified to by the military and selective service representatives before the committee, when we start dipping into the 18-year-old group the local draft board usually takes the older boys first, and then works down to the younger ones. I think that by making it a compulsory step for the local draft board we may, as the military has pointed out, set up a more complicated administrative procedure. I think once we get into the 18-year-old group it really does not make much difference whether we take a boy of 18 years 6 months, 18 years 7 months, 18 years 8 months, 18 years 9 months, 18 years 10 months, 18 years 11 months, or 19.

There we have a time grouping in which we are not doing any particular injustice to any boy within the time grouping if we take him without checking to see whether or not his birthday is a few days before or after that of some other boy who is about to be called. Of course, this is a matter of degree in judgment. I believe that a difference of 6 months, as between 18 and 18½, makes a difference in the maturity of the boy. I would not argue that there is not some difference even beyond 18 years and 6 months. But I believe that my amendment would protect the great majority of boys who would be coming in too immature, between the ages of 18 years and 18 years and 6 months.

Let me say, so that there can be no doubt on Monday, that if the legislative counsel, with whom I have raised this problem, notifies me that he believes we need to modify the language somewhat in order to provide that the boy may be taken at 18 years and 6 months, I will offer a perfecting amendment.

Let me say further that over the week end I shall endeavor to have another conversation with the representatives of the Selective Service System. If they feel that the amendment should be strengthened, or if they believe that I am wrong in my feeling about the administrative difficulties created by the so-called priorities, I shall feel perfectly free, on the basis of the information I receive from them, to modify the amendment further by carrying along the priority provision.

The point I wish to make is that there is a great difference between my amendment and the committee provision, in that my amendment prohibits taking a boy before he reaches the age of 18½. Under the committee provision there is no certainty as to whether or not he would be taken, but the power is there to do so if the military wish to take him.

With the testimony of General Marshall yesterday, I think he let the cat out of the bag, and indicated that apparently there is a behind-the-scenes intention to take them, for an army larger than the figure which the military have thus far given to our committee.

That is my position on the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator from Oregon believe that if we are going to carry on the Asiatic war—and I think it is a war—practically alone, we shall have to have more than 4,000,000 men?

Mr. MORSE. I have already covered that point by saying that if we are to talk about Korea, we should first talk about our policy in Asia.

Mr. WATKINS. It is there. We are doing whatever we are doing——

Mr. MORSE. I do not know what the policy is.

Mr. WATKINS. The policy at present is to continue fighting. Apparently it is Operation Killer.

Mr. MORSE. The policy is to continue fighting, but on the basis of what policy restrictions? I think we ought to find that out. If we are to continue fighting on the basis of the way we are presently fighting, then I think it is an unjustifiable operation, because I certainly think those boys need to be supported by granting the power to someone to bomb the bases of supply which are producing the material which is killing them.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator believe that General Marshall, in making his statement yesterday, which the Senator says let the cat out of the bag, indicated very clearly that the intention of the administration is to go on with the war over there?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think so at all.

Mr. WATKINS. Otherwise why should the ceiling be raised? Why should we need more manpower?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know because I do not know what the policy really is in Europe.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that the policy which is to be pursued in Europe is one to which the Senator from Oregon fully subscribes and leaves in the hands of the military. I thought the Senator understood what the policy was.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think the Senator from Utah has been listening to some of the statements which the Senator from Oregon has been making in regard to what he thinks about the 100,000-troop commitment to Europe. If we are to have a policy in Europe, I think that is too small a commitment. I think it is a great mistake to make such a commitment, but if we are to have that kind of commitment, we do not need the manpower figures which are demanded by the bill because we do not need so many men.

Mr. WATKINS. The military authorities will probably listen to the Senator from Oregon and have a bigger army in Europe. In that event, General Marshall and the administration will have to go beyond the ceiling which the Senator thinks we ought to establish.

Mr. MORSE. Time alone will tell.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was interested in what the Senator said about consulting with the Selective Service representatives. He stated if he found that the priority system would work, he would incorporate it in his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I stated a great many conditions in that language. I said I would give the matter consideration.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will give it consideration; but if he finds that it will work, will he incorporate it or not?

Mr. MORSE. I will tell the Senator that on Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator finds that it will work, and he does incorporate the priority system in his amendment, it will be because he thinks it will work.

Mr. MORSE. I would not incorporate it if I did not think it was administratively feasible.

Mr. McFARLAND. If it is administratively feasible and will work, then no one is going to be drafted under the age of 18½ unless he is absolutely needed. Is not that true?

Mr. MORSE. What a falacious argument that is.

Mr. McFARLAND. Why is it fallacious?

Mr. MORSE. That all depends on whether or not the military follow a wise course of action.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the Senator's amendment they could not be taken.

Mr. MORSE. Under my amendment they could not be taken.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then we might as well lower the age.

Mr. MORSE. Under the provision which the Senator from Arizona is supporting, they could be taken. Under my amendment they could not be. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] uses the figure of 18 years and 3 months, but I cannot give assurance to the Senate that there is anything in the bill which would prevent the induction of boys below the age of 18 years and 3 months, but there he cannot give any assurance that there is anything in the bill which prevents the military from exercising discretion and speeding up the proc[illegible]ing, taking

the boy within a week, for that matter, if they wish to do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. How many men does the Senator say it is necessary to provide?

Mr. MORSE. For the time being, on the basis of present conditions, I would establish a ceiling of 3,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the priority system, if the age limit of 18 years and 6 months works, on the basis of 3,000,000 men, they could be obtained without going below 18 years and 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. I would not go below 18 years and 6 months.

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not be possible to go below 18 years and 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. Under my amendment it would not be possible, but the Senator must take into consideration——

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not be possible otherwise, if the priority system works.

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment. The Senator must take into account, in the syllogism he is proposing, which is based upon the very false major premise that the military has in the first instance put into effect reforms resulting in the saving of wasted manpower, that the military has not been putting in effect such reforms. They do not even take them into account in their statistical tables, on the basis of which the Senator is resting his vote. In my judgment, there are many limitations in their own statistics.

The Senator cannot fairly consider my position on this question unless he considers every other point which I have made in regard to saving manpower. When every effort is made to eliminate waste of manpower, then I say, if we need boys below the age of 18 years and 6 months, I am willing that they be taken, but only then.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one further question?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am basing my question upon the premise that the priority system will work, and that a limit of 18 years and 6 months will provide the 3,000,000 men which the Senator says we need. If it works, and 3,000,000 men are all that are to be taken, we would not go below 18 years and 6 months, would we?

Mr. MORSE. Under my amendment we could not.

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not be possible under the committee provision, if the priority system works.

Mr. MORSE. We could not go below 18.

Mr. McFARLAND. We could not go below 18½ if the priority system about which we are talking worked. I merely wish to understand what the Senator is stating. As I understand, the Senator is in favor of placing a limitation of 18½ years on the draft age, because he says the priority system will not work. If the priority system should work, and if it proved to be a good provision, and if the military were prevented from drafting boys below the age of 18½, and if we could get the number of men needed by drafting boys above that age, there would be no necesity of going below it, would there?

Mr. MORSE. I will say to my very good friend from Arizona that he is now presenting to the Senate on age-old fallacy in logic. He is trying to delimit the whole picture by focusing attention on one point and forgetting all about the rest of the case, but in his assumption assume that everything else has been done, and then say "Now with that being done, of course, this would follow, would it not?" I want to say to the Senator from Arizona that if he will go along with me in doing what is necessary to check the military in its waste of manpower, and agree to raise a 3,000,000-man army with 18½-year-olds, at that point we might end up with some plan. But let me say about the priority system proposed by the Senator from Texas—because the Senator may some of these days find its operation of interest in Arizona—that under the bill, as proposed, 18-year-olds may be taken in Arizona, but only 20-year-olds in New York or 21-year-olds in Washington State. In order to prevent that kind of geographical discrimination, I think it is much more sound to support my position, which is that we should deal with these boys in a common age bracket. That is why I think it is better to take 18½ as the age break-off and say that the draft boards all over the country in considering their deferment policies will start at 18½. Then all the 18½-year-old boys, I think, will come a little nearer to receiving equality of national treatment than they will under the program of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that he is absolutely correct in saying that the langauge of the bill may make it possible for one draft board to take an older man and for another draft board to take a younger man. That is something which should be made clear, and the Senator from Oregon has made it clear.

I am also glad to have the Senator give his views in opposition to the priority system. He talked about it in committee. Perhaps inclusion of the priority system is one reason why he would not go along on the bill.

But the thing that most interested me was that the Senator from Oregon indicated he might reconsider his views on the question and confer further with Selective Service about it. The Senator from Texas thought maybe we had made some progress because there are indications that the Senator from Oregon might abandon his amendment, at least so far as priorities are concerned, and make his proposal on a straight 18 years-6 months, and 18 years-3 months basis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am always willing to confer with anybody I think can ever shed any light upon the discussion involved. I have been conferring with selective-service officials right along. I can even get into the Pentagon Building without a bodyguard. I am still conferring with them.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator can do more than I can.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator to have felt all along that it was a mistake to put the priorities in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I still do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator plans to confer with selective service. They still might go along with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be better not to have that provision in the bill. I think the bill would be more cumbersome administratively if it contained that provision.

There is another little problem involved. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] presents one point of view. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] presents his point of view. I do not know how many Senators share their views. I want to secure the best bill we can work out. I certainly do not want to go as far as the Senator from Texas goes in this matter. If I have to yield in some degree respecting my amendment, in order to secure the support I need in order to have the amendment adopted, I will make that concession. The modified provision would at least be better than the provision of the bill offered by the Senator from Texas. I do not know whether my friend, the Senator from Washington, would charge me then with some great inconsistency rather than recognize that I am trying to make the legislative process work as it really should work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas wishes to say that he is certain the Senator from Oregon wants to get the best bill possible. I am sorry that he and I, and other Senators, do not agree on certain points.

Mr. MORSE. With that expression of confidence on the part of the Senator from Texas in the Senator from Oregon, I should like in return, to express my confidence in the Senator from Texas, which he deserves manyfold. Although I have done my fair share of work on the bill I want to say that I have not begun to spend the hours that I am satisfied the Senator from Texas, as chairman of the subcommittee, has spent in his work on the bill.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I will be glad to hear from both Senators.

Mr. WATKINS. I expect to leave the Chamber in a moment after making a statement.

Mr. MORSE. Very well, I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. After listening to the questions and answers during the latter part of the afternoon, and to what I

think is a litle backing and filling all around, I am rather of the belief that 18½ years should be the cut-off line, and that the priorities provision should remain in the bill. I will say to the Senator from Oregon and to the Senator from Texas that in the event a proposal to that effect is not presented, I shall probably offer one.

Mr. MORSE. That is going to be my suggestion to the Senator from Texas. If between now and Monday I do not decide to make such a proposal I hope the Senator from Utah will. If the Senator does not do so, I reserve the right to do it myself.

Mr. WATKINS. I hope the Senator will. I thought he was weakening a little. If he does not make the proposal I shall.

Mr. MORSE. If I gave the impression of weakening, it was certainly not done with intent of weakening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator is going to weaken in any direction, I want him to weaken in favor of the position of the Senator from Texas rather than that of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Oregon has just referred to the bill of the Senator from Texas, and to the fact that with respect to the point now under discussion the Senator from Oregon would not go as far as the Senator from Texas. I think the RECORD ought to show that the pending bill is not the bill of the Senator from Texas. It is a bill of 12 out of the 13 members of the Armed Services Committee. The RECORD should show that each of those 12 members would wish to go as far with respect to the present question being discussed by the Senator from Oregon as does the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad I gave the Senator from Washington the opportunity to make that observation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to observe that it seems to me the whole proposal to use 18 years and 6 months as the cut-off point instead of 18, or 18 years and 3 months, rests upon the assumption that the lower down in age we go, the more difference there is in raising the figure by a few months.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is true.

Mr. CASE. The priority principle recognizes the same thing.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is true.

Mr. CASE. It recognizes that below 19 the matter of a few months makes more difference to a young man by way of maturity and so forth, than when he is 20.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is a fair assumption. It gets down to the point of exercising one's judgment in terms of the degree of the problem involved. I do not think it is necessary to keep the priority provision in the bill in order to do substantial justice to the boys. I think the breaking point of 18 years, 6 months, is a pretty good breaking point.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope the Senator realizes the confusion that is caused to those of us who have not sat on the committee and given as careful study to the bill as have the members of the committee, to have the Senator from Oregon, after having given this matter careful consideration, deliver a speech, in the course of which he says the priority is not any good, and then, by way of encouraging its proponents, says, "Well, I am willing to put the priority provision in the bill if it will mean votes for my amendments." The provision either is good or it is not good. If the Senator decides it is not good, and some Senator tries to place it in the bill, is the Senator from Oregon going to oppose the priority provision or is he not?

Mr. MORSE. I am certainly surprised, Mr. President, at that comment coming from the majority leader, who is one of the best compromisers on the floor of the Senate when it comes to the legislative process. When the majority leader suggests, perhaps by implication—although I think it was stronger than that—that it is confusing to have a Member of the Senate say he is going to give consideration to various suggestions which are made in regard to modifying the bill, in order to get a bill which he thinks will be better than the one the majority leader wants to vote for, I simply wish to say that I do not think the majority leader is nearly so confused as he protests he is. I think he knows exactly the problem which confronts me, and I think he knows exactly what the merits of this issue happen to be. I think he should join the smokescreen division of the Air Force, because he is now putting on a fine smokescreen on this issue, on the floor of the Senate, now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. No; I shall not yield until I complete this summary statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think this summary statement will be adequate, and I am sure it will clear up the confusion of the majority leader and of the Senator from Texas, if he is laboring under any confusion; and then I think all of us will get to a 7 o'clock dinner.

My intent as to what I shall do on Monday is as follows: My intent as to my amendment has been very clearly stated in the RECORD, I think; namely, that I want to have in the bill an absolute prohibition which says to the military, "You cannot take a boy before he is 18 years and 6 months old."

That prohibition is not contained in the bill presently being advocated by the Senator from Texas. There is no question about that great difference between the section of the bill on this point as advocated by the Senator from Texas and the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. That is my first point.

Second, between now and Monday I shall determine whether the present language of my amendment needs any modification—and thus far, legislative counsel is of the opinion that it does not—in order to make certain that a boy can be taken at the age of 18 years and 6 months, rather than at the age of 18 years and 9 months, as suggested by way of criticism of my amendment by the Senator from Texas. If it needs any clarification on that point, by way of change of language, that will be done.

Third, it is my intention, in regard to my amendment—and it is my present belief that it is best to have it that way—to avoid the priority system. I believe that the priority system proposed in the bill advocated by the Senator from Texas is administratively cumbersome. I think for the most part it will prove in administration to be so much window dressing. I think that in the actual application of this measure, as the local draft boards work, they are not going to pay a great deal of attention to birthday dates, month by month. When they get a call for men, if there is a boy who is 18 years and 8 months old they will take him if they think he should go, even though someone might point out that there was in the community a boy who was 18 years and 9 months old. I do not think we can get the details of administration down to the fine points that the Senator from Texas holds out for in this offer of priorities.

Yes, I believe—and it is perfectly proper—that it makes a good public appeal; but in the actual administration I do not believe the American people would get what a reading of that provision would lead them to think they would be getting.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has referred to me.

Mr. MORSE. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I do not yield at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. The fourth point I wish to make is that in view of the discussion with the Senator from Utah and the Senator from South Dakota, who seem to approve very much the priority system, if over the weekend a discussion by me with the Selective Service officers and with others satisfies me that I am overemphasizing or placing undue weight upon what I think is the administrative cumbersomeness of the priorities provided in the bill, and convinces me that I am mistaken about that, I give notice that I reserve the right to modify the amendment on Monday, either by inserting the priorities in it myself or by encouraging some other Senator, such as the Senator from Utah, to submit an amendment to that effect; and we shall get that voted on first. I make that

statement now, Mr. President—I am very frank about it—because I think my amendment, with the priorities in it, would still be better than the provisions for 18-year-olds in the committee bill as advocated by the Senator from Texas.

If it is necessary in order to obtain the adoption of the main provision of my amendment, which is the prohibition against taking men before they are 18½ years old, to agree to include in my amendment the so-called priority system, I may agree to do that. I say that because I feel that then I would still have a better provision in regard to 18-year-olds than would be the case if I adopted the section on 18-year-olds which is in the committee's bill. In other words, I would follow the well-known legislative compromise technique of accepting half a loaf if I could not get a whole loaf.

Mr. President, with that statement of policy, I shall let the Senator from Arizona take the floor in his own right, after I give an expression of thanks to my colleagues. Thereafter the responsibility for holding the Senate in session any longer will be removed from my shoulders, and will be placed on the shoulders of the Senator from Arizona.

I wish to thank my colleagues for the courteous attention they have given me as I have made my case on this amendment. Of course, I am perfectly willing to stand on that case, and I am satisfied that a careful review of it by my colleagues will result in their giving me a majority vote for my amendment.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for one thing in particular, namely, that he is definite in regard to the 7 o'clock dinner date and is willing to keep that as a permanent agreement, and that he did not change his position in regard to the dinner date in the way he is about to shift around in his position on this bill. Any Senator who has heard the distinguished Senator's speech this evening must realize that he would not be able to figure out exactly what the Senator from Oregon is going to do, and therefore could not figure out an argument against him, because later the Senator from Oregon may be entirely or largely on the other side of the fence—according to his statement in regard to adopting the priorities and adopting whatever is necessary in order to have the bill passed. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon will come around to agreeing to a provision with regard to men 18 years and 4 months old.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to say that earlier in the day when I made some observations, I had reference to the amendment now under consideration, namely, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon in regard to 18-year-olds. At that time I stated that the vote on the amendment was 12 to 1 in the committee. I may have left the impression that that was the vote on all the amendments which were voted on in the committee. If I did, I was in error, for on two amendments offered in the full committee—amendments in respect to terms of service—the vote was 11 to 2. On the particular amendment at hand, the one we are now considering, the vote was 12 to 1. On the amendment concerning the concurrent resolution—and that amendment was adopted—I want the Senator from Oregon to remember that I joined him and agreed to it, and thought it made a great contribution to the bill.

In closing, I wish to say, if the Senator from Arizona will indulge me, that the work done here this afternoon proves the wisdom of the democratic processes. The Senator from Oregon has offered several amendments. As to the amendment we now have under consideration, he thought it would result in the induction of young men 18 years and 6 months of age, but it is the judgment of the committee that his amendment would result in the induction of young men at the age of 18 years and 9 months. So the Senator from Oregon is going to work on the amendment. I hope we shall have a change in that respect before we vote on the amendment.

I believe that the Senator from Oregon was violently opposed to priorities. I know that in the committee he thought them unwise. I know he refused to embrace them. I know that during the larger part of the session today he was opposed to priorities, but when it appeared that, if priorities were provided, the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Utah might contribute some support to this 18–6 amendment, the Senator from Oregon at least agreed to study the subject. I hope that over the week end the Senator from Oregon will give further attention to his amendment because it may be that upon proper consideration he will come to the viewpoint of the committee. Nothing would make the Senator from Texas happier than to find himself again in the delightful company of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not want to be guilty of preventing the Senator from Oregon from keeping his dinner engagement. I merely want to say a word. I feel that the Senator has made a real contribution to the discussion of this very important measure. I know that he has done so with the same sincerity that other Senators have displayed. It is always well to have every possible viewpoint brought out on the floor of the Senate. I wish to congratulate the Senator, and to thank him for his patience and his willingness to remain to answer questions. However, I do not want to keep him from his dinner engagement.

Mr. MORSE. I understand.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Emil E. Palmquist, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

## RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 5, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 2, 1951 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Guatemala, to the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Rumania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

*To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Elvio H. Sadun
Edwin J. Robinson, Jr.
Geoffrey M. Jeffery

*To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*
Virginia L. Porter

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

### POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James R. Solomon, Abbeville.
Clyde D. Watson, Clayton.
Buford L. Hughes, Cottonwood.
Esther M. Sims, Delta.
James W. Cyphers, Foley.
Sister Mary Basil, Holy Trinity.
Katherine T. Perry, Lockhart.
Roy M. Williams, Midland City.
Helen T. Humphreys, Montrose.
James E. Channell, Odenville.
John R. Hinton, Prattville.
Lucy A. Robinson, Waverly.

ALASKA

Arlene A. Webster, Platinum.

ARKANSAS

William S. Huggins, Bauxite.
Earl H. Neely, Jr., Benton.
Elmer R. Gatten, Colt.
Eunice M. Harvey, Huntington.
Jack H. Griffin, Lake City.
Pierce A. Reeder, Leola.
Sam C. Ingram, Luxora.
William H. Bridgeman, Mineral Springs.
James B. Hill, Nashville.
Marvin H. Massey, Palestine.

COLORADO

Julius B. Pritchard, Fort Lyon.
Matthew Martinez, Milliken.

FLORIDA

Frank L. Burgust, Apopka.
O. B. Fowler, Citra.
William P. Baker, Hawthorne.
Howard S. Warner, Orange City.
Mark H. Shaw, Palatka.
Marian J. Davis, Wabasso.
Edgar M. Henderson, Winter Garden.

GEORGIA

Julian R. Grimsley, Adel.
Frank T. Paulk, Alapaha.
Charles W. Conley, Blairsville.
Mary Sue Hampton, Clarkston.
Marion H. Reynolds, Clermont.
Walter P. Hughes, Cumming.
Charles H. Phillips, Dahlonega.
Lanier R. Billups, Decatur.
Cephas S. Spruill, Dunwoody.
Robert C. Stembridge, Ellijay.
Huram R. Hancock, Gainesville.
Marion A. Burns, Hiawassee.
James M. Stallings, Jr., Lithonia.
Marjorie T. McCay, McCaysville.
Guy H. Toles, Jr., Menlo.
Ruth H. Grippo, Oglethorpe University.
Frank G. Owen, Stockbridge.
Robert A. Timmons, West Point.

HAWAII

Zenichi Muraoka, Kaumakani.

INDIANA

Olive C. Mohr, Flat Rock.
Loren R. Buse, Poneto.
Howard E. Dike, St. John.

KANSAS

Willard Eugene Foos, Healy.
William P. Halloran, Lakin.
LeRoy C. Higgins, Rolla.
Willard O. Elliott, Wadsworth.

LOUISIANA

Mamie W. Higginbotham, Delhi.
Leon J. Guidry, Lafayette.
Austin B. Smith, Rayville.
Nellie M. Whittington, St. Landry.
Raymond J. Jolet, Weeks.
Simeon P. Cartier, Westwego.

MAINE

Orman M. Fortier, Guilford.

MARYLAND

Hubert Glen Caple, Cedarhurst.
James F. Burke, Taneytown.
Francis M. Pickett, Woodbine.

MASSACHUSETTS

Raphael F. McKeown, North Abington.

MINNESOTA

Edward J. Stevens, Barnum.
John A. Rolig, Center City.
Lawrence B. Rothstein, Eden Valley.
Harland E. Stierlen, Elysian.
William C. Culhane, Marshall.
Joseph D. Folsom, Ogilvie.
Mabel V. Lundholm, Round Lake.
Cormac A. Suel, Shakopee.
Delbert D. Merrill, Silver Lake.

MISSOURI

Clarence E. Whittom, Downing.
Pansy B. France, Forest City.
George M. Lenhart, Higbee.
Joseph O. Burchfield, Marshfield.
Cletus H. Burkemper, Old Monroe.
Emil E. Bock, Pilot Grove.
Edward D. Clay, South Kinloch Park.
Charles E. Dixon, St. Clair.

NEBRASKA

Bertha A. Reese, Pleasanton.
Walter A. Lammli, Stanton.

NEW JERSEY

Anthony W. Raymond, Seaside Heights.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edward Russell Johnston, Belhaven.
Walter Wellington White, Hertford.
James H. Mullinax, Pomona.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ralph F. Covert, Calvin.
Edmond W. Green, Hankinson.
Peter N. Retterath, Lidgerwood.
Nettie E. Bruning, Solen.

OHIO

William T. Felske, Castalia.
Mary Jane Rebbin, Donnelsville.
Gerald V. Danison, Glenford.
Richard D. Ferguson, Risingsun.

OKLAHOMA

Martha V. Cowan, Cache.
Harold D. Gill, Hooker.
Taylor E. Cavins, Ringling.

OREGON

Kenneth V. Parmley, Banks.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carl C. Wilkes, Chester.

TEXAS

Kinchen V. Northington, Ballinger.
Victor J. Couture, Brackettville.
Ernest I. Pratt, Copperas Cove.
Alva C. Cotney, Jr., Follett.
Lem Ashinhurst, Henrietta.
Carl M. Curry, Kennard.
John F. Bennett, Jr., McGregor.
Morgan Haynes, Melvin.
Leslie Alvin Smithwick, Miles.
Archer T. Spear, Millsap.
Ernest Lynn Fisher, Mullin.
Henry G. Hankins, Newcastle.
Anna H. Dyer, North Cowden.
Clarence B. Freiley, Poolville.
Robert C. Phillips, Rotan.
Claude V. Kohutek, Rowena.
William E. Bryant, San Saba.
Henry D. Moreland, Snyder.
Willie O. Ham, Terminal.
Kenneth B. Daws, Throckmorton.
Irene New, Truscott.
Julia J. Williams, Valentine.
Willie M. Johnston, Wolfforth.

UTAH

William R. Green, Provo.

VIRGINIA

Virginia H. Phillips, Booker Washington Birthplace.
Homer G. Murray, Boones Mill.
Robert G. Jones, Buckingham.
Mamie H. Covington, Burgess.
Lloyd B. Taylor, Clifton.
Alan G. Rosenkrans, Crozet.
Thurston K. Stoneburner, Edinburg.
William P. Heath, Esmont.
Linnette B. Peak, Glasgow.
Howard O. Shields, Hurt.
James E. Willey, Jr., Irvington.
Lewis R. Rash, Jr., La Crosse.
John W. Bullock, Louisa.
Charles O. Faulconer, Monroe.
William J. Shull, Mount Solon.
Jesse M. Inge, Pamplin.
Ward Blagden, Petersburg.
Richard P. Davis, Phenix.
George E. Smith, Rawlings.
Aubrey E. Johnston, Jr., Strasburg.
Calvin C. Holt, Sutherlin.
Cecil M. Hunt, Sweet Briar.
Edward Ware, Tappahannock.
Billy L. Hottle, Toms Brook.
Lewis M. Meador, Vinton.
Ernest M. East, Waynesboro.

WASHINGTON

James S. Bellcoff, Brush Prairie.
Walter A. Young, Palouse.

WEST VIRGINIA

Joe Piccolo, Flemington.
Virginia D. Sorensen, Fort Gay.
Nan G. McCormick, Helen.
Sybil G. Jimison, Kayford.
Lois Mae Powell, Mallory.
Donald L. Jamison, Morgantown.
Rosalie K. Eanes, Nellis.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Mar. 6, 1951
For actions of Mar. 5, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 39

CONTENTS

Agricultural investigations.....10
Auditing.....3
Banking and currency.....36
Budgeting.....19
Buildings and grounds....31
Claims.....28
Commerce.....15
Cotton.....11
Credit unions.....5
Electrification....18,20,44
Expenditures.....19,42
Flood control.....33
Foods, distribution.....16
Foreign affairs, aid.7,8,38
Forests and forestry....45
Fuels.....27
Labor, farm.....23
Lands.....35
reclamation.....20,43
Legislative program.....21
Military training.....1
Minerals.....30
National defense.....17,25
Newsprint.....14
Organization, executive..9
Personnel.....6,32
Prices, control....2,26,40
Prices, farm.....11,12
Purchasing.....17
R.F.C.....13,29
River basin development.....39,45
Soil conservation.....45
Trade, foreign.....24
Transportation..... .....28,34,37,41,44
Weed control.....22
Wildlife.....4

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated military aid bill. House committees reported India-aid and emergency-reorganization bills. House agreed to resolution authorizing investigations of agricultural matters. Rep. Rankin claimed Government is "plundering" cotton farmers. Rep. Hill criticized price ceilings on certain farm commodities. Rep. Poage introduced bill on farm-labor deferments.

SENATE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military-training selective-service bill (pp. 1955-70, 1976, 1979-2001). Agreed to a modified Morse amendment changing from 26 months to 24 months the term of service of inductees. Rejected Morse amendments setting 18½ as the age for compulsory induction with voluntary presentation for induction at 18, authorizing the calling into service of certain reserve and retired components, and authorizing temporary removal from service of up to 150,000 instead of 75,000 persons for study or research in specialized fields.

2. PRICE CONTROL. Sen. Lodge inserted his letter recommending price rollbacks and Eric Johnston's reply (pp. 1982-3).

3. AUDIT REPORT. Received from GAO the audit report on the Federal Housing Administration for 1950 (p. 1970). Also received in the House (H. Doc. 73)(p. 2020).

4. WILDLIFE. Both Houses received the Interior Department's report on the effects of sewage and other polluting substances on wildlife (pp. 1970, 2020).

5. CREDIT UNIONS. Received from the Federal Security Agency a proposed bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 1970).

6. OFFICIAL REGISTER. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment S. 353, to provide that the Official Register be published "on or before December 31" instead of "as early as practicable after the first of June" (S. Rept. 145)(p. 1972).

7. AID TO INDIA. Sen. Maybank inserted an article by Constantine Brown stating that India has denied certain rare material to the U. S., and said we should get something in return for American wheat (pp. 1978-9).

HOUSE

8. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3017, to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India (H. Rept. 185) (p. 2020). For summary of the bill see Digest 38.

9. REORGANIZATION. The Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1545, to authorize the President to submit emergency reorganization plans necessary to the national security or defense (H. Rept. 187) (p. 2020).

10. AGRICULTURAL INVESTIGATIONS. Agreed as reported to H. Res. 99, to authorize the Agriculture Committee to investigate any matters within its jurisdiction, particularly any matters relating to the mobilization of agriculture for defense, and to give the Committee subpena powers (p. 2005).

11. COTTON PRICES. Rep. Rankin, Miss., criticized cotton acreage allotments as they apply to "little farmers," compared cotton prices in the U. S. and Brazil, and claimed the Government is "plundering" the cotton farmers by fixing the price of cotton (p. 2004).

12. FARM PRICES. Rep. Hill, Colo., criticized price ceilings on certain agricultural commodities, referring particularly to dried beans and hatching eggs, and inserted letters from Colorado firms on the subject (pp. 2003-4).

13. R.F.C. The Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee gave approval to Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1951, to reorganize RFC, by reporting adversely H. Res. 142, which would disapprove the Plan (H. Rept. 188) (p. 2020).

14. NEWSPRINT. Agreed without amendment to H. Res. 116, directing the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate production of newsprint (pp. 2004-5).

15. COMMERCE. Agreed as reported to H. Res. 51, authorizing the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate any matters within its jurisdiction (p. 2005).

16. FOOD CANNING. Rep. Hoffman, Mich., inserted a constituent's letter complaining of not being able to get containers for canning a mushroom sauce (p. 2007).

17. DEFENSE PROCUREMENT. Rep. Vursell, Ill, criticized procurement of some items by defense agencies, and said "we want to hedge against the possibility of waste" (pp. 2008-11).

18. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Angell, Oreg., urged the continued development of the electric power potential of the Pacific Northwest (pp. 2014-7).

19. BUDGET. Rep. Busbey, Ill., criticized the President's budget and urged reductions in nondefense spending and a moratorium on existing legislation that does not contribute to the defense effort (pp. 2017-9).

20. RECLAMATION. Received a S. Dak. Legislature resolution relative to the construction and maintenance of power lines by the Bureau of Reclamation (p. 2021).

21. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader McCormack announced that H. R. 2615, the bill to amend peanut allotments and quotas, is not to be taken up today, Mar. 6, but will be scheduled Mar. 7 or later (p. 2008).

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CASE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 87, line 24, strike out the quotation marks, and insert the following new paragraph:

"(3) Any person who volunteers for induction prior to reaching age eighteen years three months shall, upon his request made at time of induction, be permitted to attend a school and enroll for initial basic training offered in connection with a Reserve officer training unit, but on completion of nine months of such attendance shall be liable for assignment to any military unit for which an inductee is liable upon completion of four months initial basic training:

*Provided,* That failure to maintain a passing grade in the school attended will make the inductee liable for immediate military assignment."

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CASE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CORDON to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

Strike out all of page 83, and page 84, down to and including line 19.

3-5-51——B

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CORDON to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 78, beginning with the word "whenever" in line 16, strike out all through line 2 on page 79 and insert the following:

"(2) Upon the expiration of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have

not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than four months; but only if, between the first day of such period and the expiration of such sixty-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses, by the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of that House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor a universal military training program.

"(3) For the purpose of paragraph (2)—

"(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(B) in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

"(4) The following provisions of this paragraph are enacted by the Congress:

"(i) as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House

in the case of resolutions (as defined in subparagraph (B)); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(ii) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (insofar as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"(B) As used in this paragraph (4), the term 'resolution' means only a resolution of either of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the ———— does not favor a universal military training program.', the blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving House;

"(C) A resolution with respect to a universal military training program shall be referred to a committee by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be;

"(D) (i) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a universal military training program has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction, it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any

other resolution with respect to such universal military training program which has been referred to the committee;

"(ii) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the program), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to;

"(iii) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the universal military training program.

"(E) (i) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a universal military training program, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No

amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to;

"(ii) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(F) (i) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a universal military training program, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(ii) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a universal military training program shall be decided without debate."

On page 79, line 3, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

On page 80, line 6, strike out the quotation marks and

insert the following: "If a resolution of either House is passed pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, the provisions of this paragraph shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the date of adoption of such resolution."

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Modified and ordered to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: On page 91, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter no person shall be enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for an enlistment period in excess of thirty-six months. The period of enlistment of any person who, on or after June 27, 1950, has enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for a period in excess of thirty-six months is hereby reduced to thirty-six months.

3-5-51——D

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Modified and ordered to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: Page 91, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

"(c) All of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of the second sentence and the last two sentences of the fourth paragraph of section 4 (a), and except all of sections 4 (b), 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), 14, and 17 (c) shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the fourth anniversary of the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date."

3-5-51——E

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 5 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1951 No. 39

# Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou only art eternal and changeless: Like infants, with no language but a cry, we are but pilgrims of the night; beneath our uncertain feet is sinking sand, around us constant change and in all things, including our mortal life, the seeds of decay sprout death. With hurrying pace, swift to its close ebbs out life's little day. But at the altar of prayer faith flings open an escape into eternity, into a life flooded with meaning and in which earthly tasks are sanctified and glorified.

As we look unto Thee who art our life and our light, we know that the encircling gloom is not our home. Therefore, will we not fear though the earth do change and though the mountains be shaken into the midst of the seas; though the nations rage and the kingdoms do move: The God of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge. In this faith, tune our hearts this day to the infinite, that all perplexed meanings may be linked into one perfect peace. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 2, 1951, was dispensed with.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time between now and 2 o'clock is equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], one-half to be controlled by him and the other half by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take up 10 minutes of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a perfecting amendment to my amendment D, and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the words "eighteen years and six months";

On page 82, beginning with line 8, to strike out all down to and including line 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" the following: "and prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength."

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the unanimous-consent agreement, it requires unanimous consent to modify the amendment. Is there objection to the Senator from Oregon modifying his amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the pronouncement by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair said that in view of the fact that a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the amendment at 2 o'clock has been entered in, it requires unanimous consent to modify an amendment pending at the time the agreement was made, and the Chair asked if there was objection to the modification offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not desire to take advantage of any technicalities.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the amendment is so modified, it does not mean that additional time will be afforded for debate, does it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. It is offered as a new amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, may I inquire of the Senator from Oregon in what respects he modifies his amendment, and in what way he is changing his attitude from the position he took on the floor last Friday?

Mr. MORSE. I intend to make an explanation at this time, with the understanding that the Senator from Texas is reserving his right to object subject to my explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Oregon be able to make his explanation within the 10 minutes he has allotted to himself?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to do so within the 10 minutes I have allotted to myself.

Mr. President, I have perfected my amendment D so as to retain the provision in the bill requiring that the oldest eligibles are to be called first. In other words, the local draft board will have to exhaust the 19-through-25 group first, and thereafter in the 18½-to-19 group the older men will be called first.

If Senators will look at the printed version of amendment D, the change I am now making can be readily indicated. I am eliminating that portion of the amendment appearing on lines 4 through 6 on the first page; in all other respects the amendment remains the same.

I repeat, the perfecting change results in retaining the priority of call provisions in the bill as reported by the committee, so that the 19-through-25 group will be called first, and when it is necessary to call men below 19, those nearest age 19 will be called by local boards before men 18½ years of age can be called.

Mr. President, that is the modification of my amendment, which we discussed at some length on the floor late Friday afternoon. I announced that I would take the suggested change in my amendment under consideration over the week end. It was suggested to me by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. We had a somewhat lengthy discussion of my views on the so-called priority system under the committee bill. I said I would consider the suggestion, because even with the adoption of the suggestion I would still be able to accomplish what is the primary purpose of my amend-

ment, namely the imposition for the time being of a prohibition on the induction of boys prior to the time that they are 18 years 6 months old, with the understanding that at 18 years of age they would be free to present themselves for induction, as they could under the committee bill and as they may under the existing law.

Mr. President, it was my understanding that we would be free today to offer such amendments to my amendment. I was not aware of the fact that under the unanimous consent agreement we would not be free to offer amendments to pending legislation without unanimous consent. I could accomplish my purpose by way of an amendment to my amendment. Therefore I assumed that I would be free to perfect my amendment, in order to save time, if for no other reason. Certainly we would avoid a great deal of confusion. I think there is some misunderstanding in the Senate, and I want to make it clear that as the bill is presently worded, my amendment would place a very clear limitation upon indicting men prior to their being 18 years, 6 months old. It would mean that some action would be required in the future to apply the 18-year limit to universal military training, if and when universal military training is put into effect. Before any Senator votes on my amendment, I want him to know that that would be the situation. I believe it is exactly the way it should be. We should consider the question when we consider the application of universal military training. We should take the blueprint which the military present to us for applying universal military training, and consider the plan then.

So my argument is that the 18½-year limitation of my amendment strengthens the bill even from the standpoint of universal military training, because it gives the Congress an opportunity to take a look at the plans for universal military training some 2 years hence which, in my opinion, will be the first possible date when there will be any chance to put a universal military training program into operation.

That is my explanation of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield on my own time for any questions which the Senator from Texas wishes to ask.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas merely wants the Senate to understand the modified amendment presented by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Is the Senator from Texas correct in his understanding that under the amendment, as modified, a boy could not be taken for universal military training until he reached the age of 18 years and 6 months?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct, as of now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Texas correct in his understanding that under the modified amendment no man could be taken for the draft until he reached the age of 18 years and 6 months; and, considering the estimates which have been made as to the time required for processing, he would be available at approximately 18 years and 9 months?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Texas correct in his understanding that the Senator from Oregon has changed his position over the week-end, and consequently has changed his amendment, and is now adopting the committee priority system, so far as the age group from 18 years 9 months to 19 is concerned?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct; and the Senator from Oregon, on his own time, will discuss that question in some detail.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One final question. As the Senator from Oregon will remember, the best estimate the committee was given as to the total number available in the 18–19 age group was 545,000. As I understand the Senator's amendment, he would make available only one-fourth of that group, namely, the group from 18 years 9 months, to 19.

Mr. MORSE. I have a little disagreement with the Senator from Texas as to how many will be available, and I shall discuss that question at a later time, too. However, I will say that the Senator from Oregon makes fewer available than the Senator from Texas makes available under the language of the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Whether the number be 545,000, 645,000, or 745,000, is the Senator from Oregon willing to say that he makes available only the group from 18 years 9 months, to 19 years?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; provided it requires 3 months to process them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Based upon that estimate?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I am satisfied that with greater efficiency in the processing procedures that time could be reduced. However, my amendment is 6 months ahead of the Senator from Texas in regard to every step of induction. That is, where he would take them at 18 years and 3 months, assuming that 3 months are required to process them, I would take them at 18 years and 9 months, although I believe that period could be reduced. Where he would take them at 18—that is, where they would be available for induction at 18—they would be available for induction under my amendment at 18 years and 6 months. In other words, I delay the induction by 6 months, step by step.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senate should understand that we now have on the statute books a law taking boys at 19. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon would lower the age limit but 3 months only, and would allow the induction of an additional 135,000. In the debate on Thursday, March 1, the Senator made it very clear that he was just 3 months ahead of the committee; but the Senator from Oregon is very fleet-footed and, as I understand, he has moved that 3 months up to 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. I said that I was 3 months ahead of the military, not the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Oregon stated that there was an additional 3 months provided in his amendment, as compared with the committee bill. Before the Senate recessed for the week end, the Senator was 3 months ahead; but, as I now understand, he has moved that 3 months ahead an additional 3 months, and is 6 months ahead of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to explain that in my own time, as soon as we dispose of the question whether I can perfect my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection; and the question is on the amendment as modified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in addition to what I have already said about my amendment, I should like to make one or two observations, and then I shall yield the floor for the time being.

I am satisfied that under my amendment there will be a sufficient pool of men available to raise the force which the Military Establishment tells us they want to raise in the immediate future. We have been told by the military, in the hearings and since, that there is very little danger that a man will be taken before he reaches the age of 18 years and 6 months.

If that be true, then I say it is a very simple thing to write it into the law, and I propose to write it into the law. I think that calls, so to speak, the testimony of the military in regard to when they are going to take these men. As I stated the other day, I have a suspicion that they intend to take them earlier than 18 years and 6 months. My amendment would at least square the law with what they say the administration of the law would be under an 18-year-induction provision.

The second point I wish to make clear is that if we were to take the committee bill, it would require at least 3 months—so it is claimed by the proponents of the committee bill, as well as by the Selective Service officials—to process these men. So if they started to take them at 18, there would be a period of 90 days before they would actually be sent to induction centers. Under my amendment, that date would be just 6 months beyond that, or 18 years and 9 months, unless the processing period were shortened, which I believe is possible. If it is, then I have no objection, under my amendment, to taking them between 18 years and 6 months and 18 years and 9 months.

Next, we need to keep in mind the fact that the committee's provision and my amendment are identical in regard to the fact that a man may enter the service at the age of 18, if he wishes to

present himself for induction at that time, as can be done under existing law. The other day I read the applicable section of existing law into the RECORD, so I shall not repeat it.

We now come to the much discussed question of priority. Again I want to be completely honest with the Senate as to my personal judgment with respect to priorities. The so-called priority system under the committee bill provides that the draft board must exhaust all of those in the 19-through-25-age bracket before dipping into the 18-year bracket, and then the draft board must go to the group 18 years and 11 months, then 18 years 10 months, and next 18 years 9 months before going below that point. I believe that such a system would be administratively very cumbersome, and I seriously question whether it would produce the results which the proponents of the committee bill have told us it would.

As I stated the other day, we must look at the application of the bill at the local draft board level. The committee provision would make it possible to broaden the discretion of the local draft board in determining its own deferments. It has the right to do that, and I am satisfied that that is what is going to happen on the local draft board level with the priority system which the committee proposes. The draft boards will not take certain boys of the age of 19, 19½, or 20, as they otherwise would do with the 19-year limit for induction, because they will be cognizant of the fact that under the committee bill they have a pool of 18-year-olds to draw upon, and will be able to broaden their discretion respecting deferment. I do not think there can be given to the 18-year-old boys the guaranty the committee thinks its bill will give them, that they will not be taken until all the 19-to-25-year-old men have been taken.

Mr. President, I had a second objection to the priority system when it was considered by the committee. It seemed to me that it would make just that much more paper work and red-tape work for the members of the local draft boards, all of whom are offering their services gratis anyway. Many of them are lawyers, bankers, businessmen, who are operating their businesses or professions during the day. I have talked to a sufficient number of them to know that they feel that already they are encumbered with as much red tape as the Government should impose upon them.

However, the parliamentary situation, as I explained the other day, is that there are a considerable number of my colleagues who have sympathy for my 18½-year-old provision but who also would like very much to have the priority system of the committee bill retained. After the debate on Friday afternoon, after personal conferences with some of my colleagues, after further discussion with members of the professional staff and legislative counsel, I satisfied myself that, although there is some administrative cumbersomeness to the priority system, nevertheless it is worth a trial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has consumed 20 minutes, including the colloquy respecting his modification.

Mr. MORSE. I will take 5 minutes more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question which I think he can answer in 30 seconds?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The modified amendment now leaves the first part of the Senator's amendment as it is on page 72, line 5, where the Senator struck the word "eighteen" and inserted "eighteen and a half"?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the remainder of the Senator's amendment the same as the committee amendment?

Mr. MORSE. The remainder of the amendment is the same in its effect as the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MORSE. So my last word on the priority proposal, Mr. President, is that because the priority system of the committee bill finds favor with some of my colleagues who also join me in the feeling that an 18 years 6 months prohibition ought to be made in the bill, I have accepted the priority provisions of the committee bill. That is the only change I have made.

Mr. President, for the time being, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield to me for one brief question.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In response to the inquiry of the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Oregon said his amendment provided a draft age of 18 years and 6 months. Is the Senator from Texas correct in assuming that the boys cannot be inducted until they are 18 years and 6 months old, and that there must be added to that, according to the estimate of the Selective Service, an additional 3 months, and therefore, they will not be available until approximately 18 years and 9 months?

Mr. MORSE. There will have to be added whatever time it takes to process the boys after they have received their induction notice at 18 years and 6 months, but that is also true of the committee bill. Under the committee bill they would be taken at 18 years, but at the present time, so it is alleged, it requires at least 90 days to process them, so if they are taken at 18, that would mean 18 years and 3 months. I merely advance it by 6 months. I repeat that, of course, the general assumption is that the military will not be taking any of the boys anyway until they are 18 years 6 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So the issue is 18 years 3 months, as the committee bill provides for taking the boys, and 18 years 9 months, as the Senator's amendment would provide,

Mr. MORSE. Plus the testimony of the military witnesses that there is not any great probability that the military are going to take any 18-year-olds until some time in 1952.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor, and the Senator can speak in his own time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wanted to ask the Senator a question in regard to his modified amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understood the distinguished Senator from Texas to say that the Senator from Oregon proposed to take the boys beginning at 18 years and 9 months. Is that the provision of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. MORSE. No, the provision of my amendment is 18 years and 6 months, plus whatever processing time is required, which I think can be shortened. The effect of my amendment would be to keep 6 months ahead of whatever the application of the committee bill is, so far as induction is concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I came into the Senate Chamber late and did not hear the entire statement of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I referred to the Senator from Utah as one of those with whom I talked after the debate on Friday, and that as a result there is retained in the amendment the priority system of the committee bill above the age of 18 years 6 months, so the military will have to exhaust the 19-to-25-year group before they can dip into the 18-year-6-month group. Then, as is provided by the committee, under my amendment the military, if they have used up the number of 19-year-olds, can take boys in the bracket from 19 to 18 years 9 months, and consider them as being in the same category, as is the case under the committee bill, and next they can take boys in the bracket from 18 years 9 months to 18 years 6 months, as they would do under the committee bill, but there they must stop. There is a prohibition upon them below that age.

Mr. WATKINS. That is the lower limit?

Mr. MORSE. That is the lower limit.

Mr. WATKINS. In other respects the Senator's provision would be the same as the committee bill?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, it would be the same as the committee bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am in favor of enacting universal military training legislation now as a part of the bill. That being the case, I am in favor of leaving the age limit at 18 years, because for universal military training that is the best age.

The first question is, Why should we provide now for universal military training as a part of the bill? My answer is that it is exceedingly important that we

develop our intention to have the utmost possible of military strength at this time in view of the situation in which we find ourselves with reference to a potential enemy.

I do not believe we will win peace by military means only. I feel, however, that the means by which peace may be won, which will be largely in the international political field, and in the winning of the hearts and minds of men, can be successfully pursued only if we deal from strength, and that strength should be of the highest degree possible. In dealing from strength, we must have a universal military training bill, and mean it. There must be no compromises about it. Eighteen years is the best age at which to apply universal military training. That is the contribution of the youth of the land to the solution of the world situation which confronts us.

Our responsibility lies, Mr. President, in moving on from this position of strength militarily into the fields of international political action and the winning of the hearts and minds of men, by which alone, in my judgment, peace can be obtained. But we must first have this background of strength to deal from.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] 5 minutes, or as much thereof as he may wish to take.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, during my long tenure in the House of Representatives, I was a member all the while of the House Committee on Military Affairs. When I came to the Senate, I became a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. When that committee was merged into the Armed Services Committee, I served on the Armed Services Committee until I went on the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the Armed Services.

During my years in Congress, I have always served on a committee that has had before it questions which are presented in the bill now pending. I have heard many witnesses and much evidence on the questions presented by this bill. An examination of the hearings held by the subcommittee presided over by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] convinces me that the subcommittee did a most careful, thorough, and painstaking job. I think the subcommittee wrote the best possible bill to meet the situation which confronts us, namely, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has expressed it, the challenge to provide men for the moment and reserves for the future.

After the subcommittee reported its bill, the full Committee on Armed Services considered the bill carefully. I submit that there is not an abler committee of the Senate. Its membership represents almost every shade of Senatorial opinion and its members are a splendid cross-section of this body. The full committee, by a vote of 12 to 1, reported the bill to the Senate. I think the committee is entitled to the support of the Senate. I do not believe it could have reported a better bill to meet the severe and unpredictable situation that our country faces.

So far as the pending amendment is concerned, 18-year-olds are called under the bill only if their services be absolutely necessary. Other sources of manpower must be exhausted first. As the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has just said, if we must take the 18-year-olds—there is strong reason for having them taken when they reach the age of 18. The testimony shows that it is at the age of 18 that the average boy reaches the point in his life when he finishes high school and then goes on to college or into a career or to his life's work That is the age at which he can best afford to take time to serve in the Armed Forces. It is the age when the least harm will be done to his educational life, his family life, his career, his work, or his community life.

Mr. President, if we are forced to use the 18-year-olds in combat, then we owe them the solemn duty of doing all we possibly can to train them, prepare them, and make them ready to defend themselves in combat. I have often said that war is a terrible tragedy; but there is a tragedy greater than war, and that is the tragedy of being forced into war and then being forced to send our young men into battle when they are not trained and prepared and made ready to take the best possible care of themselves. General Eisenhower, in testifying before the subcommittee, said that, in his opinion, lack of training was responsible for more graves of American boys than perhaps any other thing.

These young men have a right to the training and preparation that will give and insure them the best possible chance to protect and save their lives.

Mr. President, in supporting this bill, we stand with all the great veterans' organizations of the country, the men who speak from experience—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Amvets, and the American Veterans Committee. We stand for our country, its freedom, and its institutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] 5 minutes, or so much thereof as he may desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the modified amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Oregon comes approximately quite close, I must admit, to the committee's recommendation. I assume that the junior Senator from Oregon has modified his amendment in that way in order that it shall be so close to the committee's amendment that the Senate will adopt his amendment. However, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not make that mistake.

I should like to say to the Senate that the Armed Services Committee is composed of 13 men. I am wondering whether the Senate wishes to take the consolidated judgment of 12 men on the committee, who have given greatly of their time to this subject. In this connection, I point out that, in addition to the members of the subcommittee, two additional members of the Armed Services Committee, not members of the subcommittee, attended a great many of the subcommittee's sessions. So I am wondering whether the Senate will perhaps feel that it is better and proper to take the judgment of those 12 members, most of whom attended the subcommittee's meetings very frequently, rather than to take the advice and suggestion of an individual member of the committee.

I consider it to be quite significant, Mr. President, that many nationally-known persons testified on these particular points. Because of their outstanding reputation in the United States and because of their activities, they were invited to come before the subcommittee and give it the benefit of their advice. In checking the record of the hearings, I notice that at the subcommittee hearings approximately 59 witnesses said to the committee that they favor the drafting of the 18-year-olds. Those 59 witnesses were made up of outstanding nationally known and internationally known military men, of men nationally or internationally known in the fields of education, science, and industry. Fifty-nine of them testified before the subcommittee that 18-year-olds should be drafted. Every representative of all the various service organizations testified favorably to the drafting of the 18-year-olds.

Mr. President, who testified against adoption of the provision calling for the drafting of 18-year-olds? There were some 17 persons who did so. They represented—and I certainly do not say this in any disrespect whatsoever—church organizations, temperance organizations, various committees with various names, committees for peace, for the prevention of war, the International League for Peace and Freedom, and a few persons who probably are not known even in their own communities.

So we have 59 well-known, nationally or internationally known persons testifying in favor of the drafting of 18-year-olds, whereas only 17 persons testified against it; and of the 17 who testified against it, most of them did not specifically say they were opposed to the drafting of 18-year-olds, but they were simply opposed to any kind of draft; they were opposed to the use of the draft in order to enable us to meet the emergency we are facing.

Mr. President, I note in the Senate an attitude of "business as usual." I note on the part of some Members the same attitude that we have had to contend with ever since the outbreak of the Korean affair. It seems that there are some of us who still feel that a halfway measure will suffice, and who seem to ask, "Why worry about the Korean War or the war conditions which are appearing?" It is astonishing to find some taking that position.

Mr. President, I say to you that time has passed, and I think, as do so

many others who have testified before the committee and who have spoken on this matter, that the Congress can no longer ignore the fact that we are in a critical situation, and that we must go all out and must adequately prepare if we are to assure the survival of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes, or so much thereof as he may desire, to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], not as a member of the Armed Services Committee, but as a Member of the Senate who has attended all the hearings on the pending bill, and has become thoroughly convinced that the bill in its present form, particularly as it relates to 18-year-old groups, is in the best shape and provides the best formula which, under the present conditions and circumstances, we can work out.

I believe we all must start with the fundamental basic proposition that, much as we dislike it, we must build up a strong military force and put the Nation in a strong military position at home and throughout the world, so far as that is concerned. There is little if any disagreement among us as to that necessity.

In my judgment we should and must recognize now that the strength we are building is not merely for the purpose of meeting an emergency, not merely for the purpose of meeting conditions as of today; but we should realize that our program must be geared to meet conditions as they will most likely develop at least for several years. So while we have this study before us, I think we must meet the issue squarely and not pass a law which is merely adequate to build up our military forces for next year or for only 2 years. We should include the basic fundamental machinery now which will keep the process moving, not only to meet the present emergency, but to meet any emergency which may arise in years to come.

That is one of the principal reasons why I was driven to the conclusion that, after all the questions involved are fully considered and after all the points are heard, it is best to put this machinery in motion now, and to let the bill include the 18-year-olds, provided we always carry with it the formula which was developed by the preparedness subcommittee. My position is that I do not favor the taking of the 18-year-old unless it is reasonably necessary. To express the thought a little differently, let us take the 18-year-old only when his time comes.

This bill goes into the area above the 18-year-old, at 19 and above, and says that all the classes must be exhausted first before dipping down to the 18-year-old. Then, when that group is reached, the military authorities can take only those who are of the age of 18 years, 18 years and 11 months, 18 years and 10 months, and so on down the line. I am convinced, if we should stop at 18 years and 6 months, as proposed by the amendment, or at the age of 18 years and 9 months, that within the span of a few months, or certainly within 1 year or within 18 months, we will have this same subject matter again before us, and will have to go through the legislative processes again, causing uncertainty in our own minds and in the minds of the people.

I think the best thing we can do is to adopt the plan and formula as reported by the committee, pass the bill, and let the processes start moving. Certainly it will come nearer to giving understanding, and it will come nearer giving proper treatment to the 18-year-old boys.

When I started into the hearings I was leaning against the idea of taking 18-year-olds; but proof of the necessity came out during the course of the development of the formula carried in the bill. So I am entirely satisfied that it is best for the 18-year-old, in view of what he has facing him anyway, that the Senate accept the fundamental concept of the bill and adopt the provision putting him into the picture, but with the provision that he may only be taken in accordance with the stair stepladder procedure set forth in the bill, which will insure that he will not be taken until his time actually comes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, It seems to me that the Senator from Oregon, if he cares to take any of his time in behalf of the amendment, should do so.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely suggested that it was not entirely fair to have us consume all our time, if the Senator intends to yield any time.

Mr. MORSE. I think I have yielded more time now than has the Senator, thus far.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I have a report of the timekeeper on that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has 37 minutes remaining; the Senator from Georgia, 41.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield at this time 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am in favor of the amendment as now modified by the Senator from Oregon. It seems to me we can agree on certain things. It is less desirable to draft 18-year-old boys than to draft 19-year-old boys. The committee recognizes that, and I think they have done a very good job on one method of approaching that problem, but they admit the fact that we ought not to draft 18-year-old boys, if we do not have to. So that is the question: Do we have to?

We have the same question at the beginning of World War II. At that time we reviewed the evidence, as we did this time. I said then what I say now, Mr. President:

> Mr. President, I feel that, on the average, boys of 18 are not nearly so mature as are boys of 19. Probably it is the period of life in which there is the greatest change. Boys of 18 are, in effect, freshmen in college. After his freshman year a boy is usually very different and more mature than when he graduated from high school. One year makes a tremendous difference, and unless we can see a great necessity for it, I do not believe those boys ought to be drafted or, at least, they ought not to be sent into actual combat service.

I may say that this argument about taking them when they leave high school, I think, is utterly fallacious. I think a boy in the first year of college matures more than he does at any other period in his life, and I believe very strongly that there is a marked difference after one more year at that age.

I also said:

> I had a call on Monday from a man in Cincinnati who came to see me because he said he had enlisted in the First World War at the age of 17, and that he was 18 when his unit went abroad. He served during the World War in the unit in France. He said to me that there were two other boys in that unit who were 18 years of age and "Do not let anyone tell you that we were good soldiers or that we were the best soldiers in the unit." He said, "We knew we were not, and the other men knew we were not, and, so far as our service is concerned, we were, in effect, mascots and water boys for the company." He said, "My own experience is not suited to encourage the idea that boys of 18 should join a unit which is to engage in active combat service."

I believe there are many 18-year-old boys who are better fighters, and otherwise equally as good as anyone else, but there is a greater proportion of 18-year-old boys who are not mature, and who are likely to be injured by service in the Army. So the question comes back to this: Is it necessary to draft these boys? I think the committee bill, postponing until after the others have been taken, is better than nothing, but I doubt very much whether it really protects them, because as they are divided among different States and different sections, some places may be found where they will have to be taken long before they would have to be taken on a national basis.

Furthermore, we have the testimony here of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, that under the bill as written, and with a limit on the Armed Forces of 3,460,000 men, she does not believe any boy under 18 years and 6 months of age will be drafted before the 1st of July 1952. So it is unnecessary to draft boys under 18 years and 6 months, for a period of 18 months.

Mr. President, if it is not necessary, then it seems to me we ought not to do it. Let us take a look at it a year from now. There is an infinite number of completely uncertain matters in the whole situation, particularly in the international situation. There are all sorts of reasons why we may find at that time that we have more than enough boys without 18-year-olds. Experience may prove that we want to draft men with children. Experience after 12 months may prove that we want to change the order which the Senate committee bill now provides. Why should we decide now, when it is unnecessary, and when it is agreed that, unless it is necessary, we ought not to draft 18-year-old boys?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a moment. My time is limited.

Mr. MALONE. I should merely like to ask, Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the American Legion bill, the veterans' bill which was introduced, provided only for training of from 6 to 8 months for 18-year-olds, and that the Rosenberg-Marshall bill was substituted for the measure introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada and others and no hearings were ever held on the training feature of it?

Mr. TAFT. I understand that. I have another positive reason, Mr. President, as to why I do not believe we should include the 18-year-old boys referred to unless it is necessary, and it is founded on what was very clearly stated by Secretary Marshall in his testimony before the House committee. This appeared in the Washington Post regarding General Marshall's statement:

> Marshall said the 18½ draft age would not provide a large enough manpower pool to meet any sudden emergency which requires expansion of the Armed Forces from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 or above.

In other words, what Secretary Marshall says is, "We do not need them for the present Army, but we want a pool from which we may secure an army of 4,000,000 men." Between December 1950 and January 1951 this Army, without any authority from Congress whatever, grew from 2,700,000 to 3,500,000. The same process may be repeated next year and we will have a 4,000,000-man army without Congress passing on the question.

My own feeling is very strong, and I think a consideration of the figures will bear me out. I do not care to debate that at present, but I believe an Army of 3,500,000 men goes to the very limit of the economic possibility of the United States in time of peace, if it does not go beyond it. I have said that 3,000,000 is the limit, but, in my opinion, 3,500,000 certainly will stretch beyond the point of safety, if we are to maintain a sound economic system in time of peace. Yet Secretary Marshall in effect says we must have a larger pool so that we can increase the 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 if the generals desire to do so. I believe the excess would be a constant temptation to increase the Armed Forces.

Of course, the number cannot be finally increased before Congress appropriates money, perhaps, but if the commitment is made, we do not expect the Committee on Appropriations to cut down what is contemplated in the pending bill and made possible by the bill, Congress having removed the limitation on numbers. It seems to me the check through the Committee on Appropriations in 1952 would also be a very limited and remote check on the action of the committee.

Incidentally, the other statement of Secretary Marshall seems to me unfair also, and, if I may say so, a "blackjack" statement, as quoted in the Washington Post: "Moreover, it would be unfair to the many reservists who had to be called when Korea broke."

His assistant has just testified that under present conditions it is not going to be necessary to draft these boys. She was contemplating fair treatment of the reservists, and said it was still not necessary to draft boys before the age of 18½. Secretary Marshall comes along with an obvious effort to stir up the reservists, and says we should take the 18-year-old boys so that we can release the reservists. The fact is it is not necessary to take 18-year-old boys even if we release the reservists.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No one wants to stir up the Reservists. They are already stirred up. There are already more than 800,000 who served in World War II who have been recalled because there was no one else the Government could call upon. Unless we add to the manpower pool, it will be necessary to keep those 800,000 plus additonal thousands who have already rendered service in one war, some in two wars. Under the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, they will have to render further service.

Mr. TAFT. That is absolutely contrary to the argument of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. She promised the 18-year-olds they would not be drafted. General Marshall is promising to let the Reservists out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am not a member of the subcommittee which considered the proposed legislation, but I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I doubt if any legislative proposal has received greater attention and more thoughtful consideration than the bill now pending. Of course, it should receive such careful consideration, because it is very vital and important that such legislation be enacted so as to give to us adequate military defense at the least possible hardship to the people of America.

It was a very difficult task the Committee on Armed Services had, because it was necessary to pass a comprehensive bill to integrate the National Guard, the Reserves, and the new draftees, and also provide universal military training for the future. In other words, what the committee had to do was to draft a long-range program adequate to meet the crisis and threat which now confront this country.

I am not one who believes that war with Russia is inevitable. To the contrary, I think it is only inevitable if America is weak, weak either militarily or fiscally. I believe that if we remain strong at home, and have a strong military defense, not only is war with Russia not inevitable, but I do not believe that war with Russia will occur.

It was with that thought in mind that the subcommittee, and then the general Committee on Armed Services, worked with all possible diligence and thought and consideration to bring out a bill of a long-range character which would protect our country.

I have great admiration for the distinguished Senator from Oregon who is one of the most useful members of the Armed Services Committee, but I can see very little difference between his amendment and the measure proposed by the committee. He proposes to draft boys down to the age of 18½ years, while the committee proposes to draft boys down to the age of 18. But in the committee bill it is provided that those above 19 should first be drafted into the service, and then that those between 18¾ and 19 be drafted, then those between 18½ and 18¾ be next taken, then those between 18¼ and 18½, before we get down to the 18-year olds. I cannot see much difference between the proposal made by the Senator from Oregon and the bill as submitted by the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Just one further word. Let us remember, too, that the bill as it was presented by the committee provided that not a single soldier could be sent into combat until after he had received 4 months' training.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] 4 minutes, or so much thereof as he may desire.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill as reported by the committee. I listened to the Senator from Ohio, and I wish he were now in the Chamber. As I understand, the question before the Senate is whether we desire to force men to serve in the Army who have fought in war, men who in some instances have suffered wounds, men who have families, men who have places in the community, or whether we want to build up the strength of our peacetime army from younger men.

I should also like to answer an argument the Senator from Ohio made along another line. The pending bill is not one that is drafted to build up a wartime army. It is a bill drafted to build up our strength so that there will not be another war. If we are strong enough now we hope and pray no nation will dare to fight us.

As I see the question, we took off the ceilings, from the armed services by a bill passed last August. If we meant what we said when we did that, we gave it into the power of the armed services to build up to the strength they felt was necessary. The last figure was 3,462,000 men. There is no indication that if we put the pending bill into effect that figure is going to be increased next year or the year after. I say that because, as the committee got the information from the armed-service authorities, from General Marshall, General Collins, and others in authority, what we want is to build up a force so that if M-day does

come we can have enough strength in our Air Forces and enough force in our Navy to maintain the strategic areas line so that they can strike and we may go on from there. War is a nasty business. It is a disastrous business. We all hate it. We do not want our boys to serve. We all hope and pray, however, that if they do serve, they will be trained and will be able to fight, if they have to fight, as well as they possibly can.

The Senator from Ohio spoke about reserves. The figures show that today we have 800,000 men in the Reserves. That figure in the next year will be cut down to 351,000. At the present time, we have approximately 418,000 men serving under reenlistment whose terms will expire in a year. There are a sufficient number of men in the 19-to-25-year-age group, plus reenlistments, plus those who are now in the Reserves, to build up the Armed Forces for a year. After that time, we shall not have them. We must get them from somewhere else. Therefore, we must either go into the veteran pool, or we must go into the younger-persons pool. I believe it is only fair that we go into the younger-persons pool.

As the Senator from Wyoming and others have stated, educators, public-spirited citizens, and the boys themselves testified before the committee that there would be less dislocation to the lives of the boys and less dislocation to their communities if the boys were taken at 18, rather than at an older age. It seems to me it is much better to plan ahead now rather than to wait.

The Senator from Ohio stated that if we are not going to use 18-year-old boys for a year, why not wait and pass another bill later on? Mr. President, to me that seems preposterous. I say that because we must make plans. If we wait another year, we would again have to consider the whole problem. In the meantime, the armed services could not make any plans, and we would have to leave the veterans in the service and seek to get reenlistments and more volunteers.

Mr. President, it takes 901,000 men a year to maintain a force of 3,500,000. One age group alone will supply only 545,000.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Georgia will yield me an additional minute I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio based his argument on the fact that we are at peace. At least three times he said that 3,500,000 men were all we could afford in peacetime. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that if we were at peace we would not be talking about the pending bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. Of course we would not be talking about the pending bill. We are proposing to take this action in order to assure our security and to maintain peace. I agree that we cannot over a long period in peacetime maintain a force much greater than 3,500,000 men without ruining our economy. The Senator from Connecticut and I heard figures mentioned which would lead us to that conclusion. From economic reasons, from manpower reasons, and from the general desire of the country as a whole, we need not have any fear that the Armed Forces would run about 3,500,000 men because of the demands of the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining and how much time the Senator from Georgia has remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon has 27 minutes. At the same time the Chair would inform the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that he has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if it is satisfactory to the Senator from Georgia, I wish to take 10 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it agreeable to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to reply to some arguments made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], because I think the Senator from Massachusetts is clearly wrong in his statistical analysis of the problem which confronts Congress with regard to the pending bill. In my opinion, the Senator from Ohio was completely right when he said in effect that on the basis of the showing made to date by the military itself no need has been demonstrated for taking 18-year-old boys at the present time. The Senator from Ohio is clearly right when he points out that it has been the position of the military in weeks gone by that they were not going to get into the 18-year-old group for approximately a year and a half. I believe the Senator from Ohio is right when he says Congress had better take a second look at the situation in a year and a half from now, or 2 years from now. Congress will not be out of business. It will be in session.

Mr. President, on the basis of the constant shifting which the military has been doing throughout the presentation of its statistics at our hearings I wish to say, as I said the other day, that I still hold to my present opinion, namely, that the military has loaded its statistical reports in its presentation of its case in a way which slants it in favor of the military.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to finish my statement. At the conclusion of my statement, if I have any time remaining, I shall be very happy to yield.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts had better take his pencil and find out what the military did with several hundred thousand men. As I said the other day, in the preparation of its art work, which it offered to the committee during the presentation of its case, the military lost over 250,000 men on one chart. If the Senator from Massachusetts has any answer to the position I took with reference to the statistics submitted by the military, let him present it in his own time. I repeat my charge that the military has constantly shifted its position in the presentation of its statistics before the committee.

Mr. President, it has been said that in order to have adequate manpower for the Armed Forces and an adequate safety margin for the selective service we must take into the pool the 18-year-olds during the fiscal year beginning next July 1. Let us examine the manpower picture to determine if that is so. First, let us look at the figures on manpower available during the period from the end of last October, to which most of the data presented to the committee related, to June 30 of this year. From the committee report we learn that 816,000 men were available under present standards from the selective-service group 1–A at the end of October. We also learn that an estimated 457,000 available men will become 19 years of age from the 1st of November through the end of June. During the 8 months' period more than 700,000 men should have reached their nineteenth birthday.

The committee adds these figures to give us a total available manpower by enlistment and induction from the end of October to the end of June of 1,273,000 men. From this human resource the committee reports an estimate of enlistment and induction totaling 862,000. This leaves a safety margin of 411,000 in the pool of available manpower on June 30.

Let us look at the actual or possible additions to this pool, which the committee has not included in its figures. The bill under consideration cancels the deferment of nonveteran husbands, an action which the committee estimates would add 290,000 to the available pool, but that figure is not included in the charts of the military. Such husbands should become available before June 30, unless Congress is unusually slow in passing the pending bill, or defers its effective date until July 1. Added to the admitted pool of 411,000, it gives the Armed Forces and selective service a total pool of 701,000, well above the maximum safety margin, which I believe to be an inflated one, of 600,000 men.

As I said in my speeches on Thursday and Friday, we should take a long look at the safety-margin figures which the military has presented because I think the safety-margin figures are also filled with overstatements.

In addition to this change resulting from the present law, I believe we may safely assume that tighter standards of deferment might result in an additional 250,000 men.

I have come to this conclusion from the following facts: Spokesmen for the Armed Forces have admitted that by

lowering their standards, but not by such an amount as would seriously harm the services, they would be able to add 100,000 men from the 18-year-old pool.

Today, Mr. President, I repeat that we have a great opportunity, in passing judgment on this bill, to adopt some checks which will force the military to stop the unconscionable waste of manpower which characterizes its present operations. We must see to it that it puts into practice a change in its deferment standards, so that the 100,000 men who their own witnesses testified could be saved, will be saved. I think also that that 100,000 should thereafter be included in the calculations of the military in respect to the statistics which they present to the Congress

Mr. President, I say that they should be able, therefore, to add 50,000 from the pool of men becoming 19 years of age during the 8-month period from November 1 to June 30. A 50-percent figure has been used to calculate the 816,000 available men from the 1,632,000 pool of the I–A's. I believe it should be possible to raise this percentage to approximately 60 percent, adding 160,000 to the number of men available on or before June 30 next.

Unfortunately—and I am as guilty as any other member of the committee—no member of the committee challenged the 50-percent figure for I–A's, and the figures do not give us an indication of the real cushion in this estimate, but I am satisfied, as I have studied the whole statistical presentation of the military in this case, that there is a cushion there. I think I am engaging in an understatement when I make my suggestion of a percentage of about 60 percent, adding 160,000 available men.

Next, I joint out that if we can add 100,000 men by lowering the standards for the 1,052,000 18-year-olds, I believe we should be able to get at least 5-percent salvage, that is, 40,000 men and possibly quite a number more, from the 800,000 in the selective-service pool.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I will take an additional 5 minutes.

Summarizing these data, we find that this has added 290,000 men, and indicates that it is possible—and I should say that under pressure it would be probable—that it would mean a further addition of 250,000 men. This would raise the safety margin of men remaining in the pool on June 30 from 411,000 to 951,000. Using the data for the fiscal year 1952 already presented by the military, and assuming only that the lower induction standards would be applied to those becoming 19 years of age from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, we find that it would be possible to go through the fiscal year 1952, with inductions and enlistments reported by the military, and have a surplus of more than 1,240,00 on June 30, 1952.

Further, I point out that when the military came before the committee in the first instance, testifying through the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, it testified in terms of a military establishment of 3,200,000. That was the figure on which all of its charts in the first instance were prepared.

It was some days after they increased that amount, in round numbers, by 250,000—that is, up to 3,462,000—before they got around to changing their charts before the committee to represent this increase in the Military Establishment. So the original basis on which the military prepared its statistics is apparently very flexible. I am inclined to think that we ought to hold them to the position they took on January 10, 1951, that is, to the 3,200,000 for which they testified, and ask them to eliminate the thousands of able-bodied men now in paper-pushing jobs in the Military Establishment. They should be relieved for combat training. The number of women and the number of civilians in the Military Establishment should be increased to do these noncombat jobs. I believe we have a right to make that insistence before we give them any such sweeping power as they ask for in this bill.

I wish to say also, Mr. President, that in my judgment, we have a great obligation constantly to review the military. I think it is a great mistake to give them this blanket bill now, and let them, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] implied in his remarks, form the impression that they can go on, as General Marshall certainly indicated before the House committee the other day, and increase the number to some 4,000,000 or more, at their discretion. I think we ought to say, "When you dip down into the 18-year-olds and start taking them for combat, we want to review the program at that time."

As I stated the other day, and now repeat, I am for a universal military training bill. I was so much for a universal military training bill that last summer, contrary to some members of the committee who are ardent advocates of this bill, I voted against postponing action on a universal military training program. If in 1948 we had taken the position then insisted upon by the junior Senator from Oregon, putting into practice then a universal military training bill, the defenses of the country would be in much better position than they are at present.

I expect to hear the same argument again, because it is constantly being presented. I refer to the argument that we ought to vote for this bill because of Korea. In view of the testimony that the military has given us as to how long it is going to take to get men ready for combat under this bill, I say that this bill, in its present form, has very little to do with Korea. However, any time the administration wants to talk to me about policy in Korea in terms of a Military Establishment, I say that all of us in the Senate ought to be willing to face frankly what our Korean policy is.

I ask, What is our Korean policy? If we really want to do the job in Korea that needs to be done, if we are going to stay there, this bill is but a drop in the bucket. Why fool the public about the Korean situation? So far as the amendment which I have offered is concerned, the Korean situation has very little to do with whether or not we take boys at 18 years and 6 months or at an earlier age. The thing about which we must make up our minds in Korea is whether we are going to face the fact that Communist China and Communist Russia are really carrying on a war against us in Korea. We should protect our American boys in Korea by authorizing the bombing of the bases which furnish the supplies which are killing them.

I am ready and willing at any time to face the Korean situation; but I think it is stretching the point to try to read into this bill any great relief for Korea, when the military itself testifies that it is not going to be taking 18-year-old boys until sometime in 1952, as pointed out by the Senator from Ohio.

No, Mr. President, I believe that now we should say to the military, "Get ready to take 18½-year-old boys; and when you have saved the manpower which your own statistics show you are capable of saving, come before Congress a year or a year and a half hence, and we will hear you again. In carrying out our constitutional checks, we will hear you again on the straight 18-year-old issue."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question which will require only 1 minute, which he can take out of his additional time?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. On January 22, 1951, on page 653 of the hearings, testimony was adduced relative to the manpower pool.

On page 681 of the hearings, there is a statement by Anna M. Rosenberg.

On page 687 she placed in the record exhibit A, the long-range security program for the Nation.

On page 691 a chart was introduced calling for 3,500,000 men.

On page 696 we find in the testimony of the assistant to General Marshall the following:

> Mrs. ROSENBERG. The coming year if the law becomes effective June 1951 to June 1952, the maximum men we would take in would be about 400,000. We at no time feel that in that phasing-in we would take in a man less than 18 years and 6 months, plus the minimum training which we guarantee that we would have to give and would give by law, would bring it up to 18 years and 10 or 11 or 12 months.
>
> I would like to give a statement by General Marshall, a very brief one, of why we are sure we can carry this out * * *.
>
> In the year 1952–53 we would not phase-in more than probably 400,000 to 450,000 18-year olds, and as we carry over a backlog from the year before, we again would not have anyone under the age of 18 years and 6 months.

Does the Senator from Oregon understand that is the testimony of Anna Rosenberg, Assistant to General Marshall, who in this long range program for 3,500,000 men, specifically stated that under her formula the military would not draft an 18½-year-old, and that under the training period allowed, active service would not begin until probably 18 years and 11 months or 18 years and 12 months?

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the fact that it was the testimony, and in giving that testimony I think, although she would not have wanted to, she was my witness in support of my amendment, although she was quite unconscious of it at the time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think any change has occurred since that happened on January 22, that would justify changing the formula Mrs. Rosenberg suggested for this bill?

Mr. MORSE. It is my personal opinion that when the military come to administer the bill proposed by the committee, if it is adopted in that form, they will not be taking the boys until they are 18 years and 6 months. Therefore I ask, What is the objection to writing it into the bill?

I new yield the floor for the time being.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now yield 4 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. First, relative to the statement made by the Senator from Oregon on several occasions that these figures are Pentagon figures, I wish to say that the fact of the matter is that the figures on manpower came from the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Census, and from the Selective Service System. So, they represent a composite view of the best information available from the several departments of the Government which would have factual information. I fully appreciate that there can be, of course, an honest difference of opinion respecting figures, but I believe that the committee, the Defense Establishment, and the Government itself have tried to present to the best of their ability figures upon which the committee and the Congress might rely. So they were not figures merely pulled out of the hat by somebody in the Pentagon entirely regardless of what the facts might be.

Mr. President, I note from the bottom of page 1779 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 1 that the Senator from Oregon states that under the terms of his amendment a young man could present himself for induction at the age of 18.

He therefore concludes that actually his amendment involves only 3 months difference, instead of 6 months—according to his remarks as found on page 1785.

With all due respect to the Senator's logic, I would point out that this is a very material oversimplification of the facts.

I agree with the Senator when he states that the young man who wishes to volunteer for induction may do so.

Obviously that same young man could have enlisted in the Armed Forces even at the age of 17—a year earlier—with his parents' consent.

But the great bulk of persons who enter the services through induction do not volunteer for induction. They enter the services as part of a call, and as part of a regular quota.

Now, Mr. President, under the committee's bill the requirement to register is imposed upon a young man at age 18—the same age as has been prescribed all along by the 1948 act.

However, the committee bill also imposes an obligation for service at this age. Hence, the classification and other preinduction processes may begin at 18, instead of 19, as is the case today.

The registrant has a prescribed period of days in which to present himself for registration.

Following that, his local board must convene on his case and direct that the classification questionnaire be mailed to the individual.

Here again the individual has a prescribed number of days in which to fill out the questionnaire and return it to his local board.

The local board must then meet, consider his case, and decide upon his classification.

Again the individual has a prescribed number of days in which to appeal his classification. If he does appeal it, his induction cannot be accomplished until final decision is made by the appeal board.

The average time consumed by these steps is 90 days.

Now, Mr. President, these are all time-consuming measures. We all admit that. But they add up to the democratic way of accomplishing this process.

The Selective Service System is not a military organization. It has no connection with the Department of Defense. It is not under the control or the direction of the Department of Defense. Its sole function is to meet calls which are approved by the President for induction of men into the Armed Forces.

Selective Service personnel are mainly volunteer workers, selected because of their high standing and reputation for integrity among their neighbors.

Now, Mr. President, under the Senator's amendment none of the classification procedure could start until age 18 years and 6 months. As a consequence the earliest possible date of induction, excepting for the relatively few who volunteer for induction, would be 18 years and 9 months.

We have ample evidence—simply look at the record—that in the very immediate future we must induct men substantially below the age of 18 years and 9 months if we are to meet our manpower requirements.

The amendment of the Senator from Oregon virtually hamstrings the Selective Service System in its ability to meet quotas.

It will result in an arbitrary treatment of registrants, and a revised deferment policy, the rigidity and inflexibility of which this country has never seen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 4 minutes' time allotted to the Senator from California have expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me a couple of additional minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator that the chairman of the committee just left the Chamber, but he has allotted the remaining time. I myself, however, will yield to the Senator from California an additional minute. That will be taken out of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. President, I suggest that we must be realistic in this matter. We must tell the people the truth. We cannot delude them by any implication that there is money in our manpower bank which is not there.

The Senator oversimplifies the situation when he says that his amendment simply involves a mere matter of 3 months.

He is confusing his amendment with the House version of the bill.

His amendment definitely involves a period of 6 full months.

His adroit suggestion that the armed services should be good fellows and adopt his amendment is impossible for them to accept if they are to do their duty to their country.

His implication that the armed services have said they could live with this amendment is unfortunate. It confuses two completely different proposals—the House version and the Morse amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall not use all the time allotted to me. I merely wish to say respecting the issue involved that I have never been a member of a committee before whom a matter has been more fully considered pro and con than the subject now before the Senate was considered by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and particularly by the subcommittee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Certainly the parents of the young men and the young men themselves who may be called for service can know that every idea has been explored, that the whole matter has been most fully considered, and that the authorities, both pro and con on the matter of age for induction and conditions of induction have been given an opportunity of fully expressing their views.

Mr. President, I think the matter narrows itself down to a rather small field of controversy. From looking over the report and reading the excellent hearings conducted by the committee, it seems to me the preponderance of the evidence and certainly to my mind the more practical approach is in favor of the bill as it is now presented.

I have been particularly interested in what the educators have had to say, as it appears on page 23 of the report, respecting whether 18 years and 3 months is a better age at which to induct the boys than 18 years and 9 months. The men upon whom I believe the Nation can place the best reliance favor the provision now set forth in the bill fixing the period between high school and college, or going into some avocation, as the best interim time at which young

men can get away for their military service.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the viewpoint of the majority of the committee, the preponderant majority and also, it seems to me the greater number of educators who have given the matter study, will prevail when the question is voted upon. Correspondence I have received from both educators and the young men themselves express the viewpoint favoring adoption of the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 4 minutes to the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, during the hearings on this bill your committee sought information from every available source. There were some voices of dissension, but the overwhelming preponderance of opinion was in favor of placing the 18-year-old boys in their country's uniform for military training and service.

If we do not induct and train the 18-year-old boys, it will be necessary either practically to destroy the National Guard by inducting its members as individuals, or to tear veterans of World War II away from the industrial and agricultural life of America, many of them in critical work; drag them away from the homes they have established and have assumed obligations to support, and redraft them—those who served in World War II—into the military service, to which they already have given much of the best time of their youth, and many of them at the age of 18.

Mr. President, training and service by 18-year-old boys will cause less interruption of the normal processes of American life, will interfere in a smaller degree with education, with the continuity of industrial and agricultural production, and will disrupt less the promising home life of young America, than would induction at any other age.

It was not with lack of extraordinary experience and vast knowledge that our great leaders in World War II, upon whose judgment, wisdom, and leadership we depend now to build a great defensive force, told us, with complete agreement, "that experience in both world wars has shown that men of 18 are among the bravest and best fighters."

Mr. President, I should feel sadly remiss in the performance of my duty as a Senator if I fail to say a few words in behalf of a very fine, capable, and dependable young man, who in some quarters seems to be woefully misunderstood. I refer to the subject of this argument which has been raging for weeks—the young man himself, the controversial 18-year-old. For several months a number of well-intentioned but misguided people have reflected unfairly on his reputation, by portraying him, not as the alert, brave, vigorous, dependable young American patriot that he is, but as a juvenile, and irresponsible weakling, a problem child not to be trusted beyond his home town or his immediate neighborhood.

All of us have received scores of letters about this young man. I have received a few from teachers, a few from fond mothers, whose sentiments I respect sincerely, and a very, very few from fathers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am sorry that I cannot yield because of the limitation of time.

Mr. President, some people may think this robust, vigorous, young man is a baby, but he knows he is not a baby. Some witnesses have protested against calling him to the colors, but he has not protested. I have not received one letter of protest from young America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to ask a question of him?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; in the time of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to cooperate completely with the Senator from Georgia. I have 7 minutes remaining. I would yield a few minutes now to the Senator from Montana; and then I wonder whether we could have a gentlemen's understanding that the Senator from Georgia would have the last 5 minutes, and that I would have the last 5 minutes preceding his 5-minute period.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will be agreeable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, at the outset let me say that I have the profoundest respect for every member of the Armed Services Committee, and I realize what a difficult task they have had in preparing this bill and making it ready for action on the floor of the Senate. Since I am not a member of the committee, I am somewhat reluctant to question the committee's recommendations.

However, Mr. President, at the same time I wish to pay my respects and compliments to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is a member of the committee, for bringing before the Senate many figures and many arguments of which I think we, as Senators, and also the people of the United States should be aware.

Mr. President, throughout this debate there have been certain irreconcilable arguments, so far as I am concerned. At the beginning, I understood that it would be necessary to lower the draft age to 18 years in order to give the armed services a "shot in the arm," so to speak, to build up our potential armed strength. However, the Senator from Oregon has brought out the fact that the military authorities of the United States do not have any idea of inducting the 18-year-olds and getting them in uniform and actual combat service before 1952. If that is the case, I wish to know why objection is entertained against the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana whatever additional time he may need.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, on this question I think there has been gross misunderstanding among the people of the United States. There has been a great deal of juggling of figures. When we deal with this question, we should not juggle the lives of young America.

Of course the 18-year-old boys would not write to us; but I wish to say that I have heard from thousands of mothers and fathers and I have heard from hundreds of brothers who served in the last war and who do not want their "kid brothers" to be inducted at 18 years of age.

I intend to support the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. As I view the matter, Mr. President, there is no possibility of relieving the Reserves in the Korean situation at the present time, even if we lower the draft age. We could not possibly get the newly inducted boys to Korea soon enough to relieve the Reserves.

It is proposed that we draft these young boys to serve in various countries throughout the world; yet only one of those countries requires its 18-year-old boys to be drafted into its military service.

So it seems to me that we shall have gone far enough if we adopt the amendment of the junior Senator from Oregon, lowering the draft age to 18½ years of age.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Washington to wait 1 minute until we can get the time straightened out. The Chair understands from the Parliamentarian that 3 minutes remain to the Senator from Oregon and 19 minutes remain to the Senator from Georgia.

The Senator from Georgia has yielded 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington, who is recognized at this time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington has not been moved by the amended amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon. I began to lose my interest in the Senator's original amendment when its author began to spin like a top last Friday afternoon, in answer to questions.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senate of the United States will vote down this amendment, not primarily because it is a bad amendment, as I believe it to be, but because the Senate understands the committee's position and believes that position to be sound, reasonable, fair, and in the national interest.

For over 2 months I have listened to, and carefully studied, every available argument given as to why 18-year-olds

should not be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service. I can sincerely say today that I have yet to hear a single substantial reason why 18-year-olds are essentially different from 18½-year-olds.

Some have said that a man at 18 is immature, hardly more than a baby out of his mother's arms. They have said that he needs the sheltering protection of his home, his family, and his community. I have been unimpressed by these arguments. I cannot see that a man age 18 is a baby one day and a mature man 6 months later. I cannot believe that there is any reason for thinking that a family that has not constructively influenced a man's character in 18 years can do so in an additional 6 months.

At age 18, few men have married, and even fewer are fathers. Age 18 is the time when a man can contribute his military service at the lowest cost to family and community life.

There are other considerations that we must face in deciding the minimum age at which a man becomes eligible for induction. The first of these is one that is all too often overlooked in these discussions, namely, the question of our military security and how we can meet our basic military needs.

In making our plans for the future we cannot afford to place so rigid a limitation on the availability of men for our Armed Forces that our national security can be imperiled.

Returning once more to the question of whether or not we should make 18-year-olds eligible for induction I cannot avoid raising the question as to what is the alternative. If we do not make 18-year-olds available, and I remind you that they will be taken when they are 19 anyway, whom should we take? Should we take older men with children; men with family responsibilities, men who are performing essential jobs in our factories and on our farms? Would this not be more disruptive in every sense than taking 18-year-olds?

Is it fair to ask the veterans of World War II to serve again? To ask men who have already given many years of their lives to the national service to take up arms again? I think the answer to these questions is clear.

Then, too, we must consider the members of our Reserve Forces who have already been called in for their second tour of duty and those that will be called in during coming months. These men, in joining the Reserves, voluntarily assumed the obligation of defending their country in times of crises. However, from the standpoint of justice we cannot expect these men to serve for long periods of time. Many of them have left their families and interrupted their careers at great personal sacrifice, and have caused hardship to their families and loved ones. We must set as an objective the early return of these men to their civilian lives and pursuits. The sooner we can develop a reservoir of trained men as replacements for them, the sooner we can accomplish their return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the chairman permit me to finish this sentence and several brief concluding paragraphs?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the building of such a Reserve is one of the prime features of the bill which is now before the Senate.

From the viewpoint of the young man himself who may be called to serve suddenly at some future time, it seems only fair to give him the benefit of proper training before his possible involvement in combat. We should be doing these men no favor by delaying their induction and their training until the crisis was at hand and they would be needed hurriedly and, like all too many times in the past, be sent into battle ill prepared and insufficiently trained. Too many of our young men rest in soldiers' graves as witness to the danger of such a short-sighted policy.

What we are really talking about is the 6-month period between age 18 and age 18½. What reason can there be for delaying induction for these 6 months? A man cannot get a worth-while job in that period and make any progress toward his lifetime career. Nor can he make any substantial progress toward acquiring his higher education. It would be for most young men a deadly waiting period of inactivity and frustration. Anything that he might start during that period would be shortly interrupted.

In short, I can see no reason why we should distinguish between the 18-year-old and the 18½-year-old. On the contrary, I can see every reason why we should not distinguish between them—from the viewpoint of the man's own future, from the viewpoint of our community lives, from the viewpoint of assuring justice to our reserves and to our veterans, and, finally, from the viewpoint of safeguarding our national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, there is little that can be added to this discussion. As I have previously stated, this is probably the most important bill which will come before this session of Congress.

Why is it important? It is important because this Nation and the world are confronted with a crisis. The pending legislation has been drafted to meet that crisis. It has a dual purpose. It is designed to bring about peace in a troubled world by making our Armed Forces so strong that certain nations which recognize and respect might, and might alone, will think long before taking actions which would involve us in world war III. Its second purpose is to prepare this republic to meet any military contingency which may arise in the future.

I say we cannot meet either of those objectives by half-way measures. The distinguished Senator from Ohio has said that we should adopt this amendment in order to limit the number of American Armed Forces. There is, of course, a far more proper and specific way to do that. If the distinguished Senator wants to limit the number of men and women in our Armed Forces, he should introduce a bill which will have that for its purpose. That is the proper way the logical way, and the direct way to do it.

We should not snipe at basic defense legislation by indirect methods. We should not tear down by indirection the very measures which will keep us adequately prepared; and all of us agree that under existing world conditions the United States of America quickly must become adequately prepared and must remain so. How else are we going to do that than by facing up to our responsbilities on the legislation now before the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Should we not only do that, but also give them time to make plans, in order that they may be prepared, should we not?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. President, how are we going to be adequately prepared? That is the problem which confronts us today. It has been pointed out in the debate again and again that we must take men who have wives and children, or we must take veterans, or we must take men below the age of 19. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington that it makes little difference to a young man whether he is called today or 3 months from today, since the bill proposes a system of priorities. The committee's carefully worked out provision for priorities, under which all men between the ages of 19 and 26 shall be taken first, and then the men under the age of 19, makes meaningless this quibbling over a period of 3 months?

Mr. President, none of us likes the idea of drafting our young men. It is no pleasant task to order any man, regardless of age, to military duty. I do not like it. None of us derives any satisfaction or happiness from it. I wish devoutly that we lived in times when our country did not face such needs; when we could disarm and forget militarism and war. But that is not the kind of a world we are in; we must face the bitter realities, the hard facts before us. If we do otherwise, we shall be false to our trust and unworthy of our responsibilities to the citizens of this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me another half minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield the Senator an additional half minute.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my contention that we cannot afford to play with the defense of the Nation. We dare not again face the contingency which we met in the last war. In considering this question I think it is useful to point out that the distinguished Senator from Ohio voted against the draft in 1940; and he voted against an extension of the draft, immediately prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor. Where would our country have been on building up a defense force had we followed the advice of the distinguished Senator from Ohio then?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I can tell the Senator where we would have been. We would have been exactly where we are today, because there was not in the Armed Forces on the day of the Pearl Harbor attack one man more than could have been obtained through voluntary enlistment. Under the figures which then existed, there was no evidence of the necessity for the draft at that time, and we would have done equally well without it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the subcommittee which wrote the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment now before the Senate.

I am opposed to the philosophy of this amendment; I am opposed to the purpose of this amendment; I am opposed to the results this amendment would produce; and I am most especially opposed to the inequities this amendment would write into law.

Let me emphasize that my opposition is directed wholly and solely at the amendment. Nothing I shall say is intended to reflect upon the sponsor of this amendment, for whom I hold the very highest esteem and respect—and whose courage and ability and tenacity I frequently envy.

As I understand this amendment—which would fix the age of service eligibility at 18½ years—really 18 years and 9 months—for our young men—its fundamental purpose is to reduce, rather than increase, the manpower available to the Armed Forces.

I cannot, at this hour in the world's history, lend my support to any legislative proposal which would deliberately reduce the number of men available for service in this Nation's fighting forces.

The whole purpose of this bill—S. 1—is to make certain that we, as a nation, have sufficient men available, when and if necessary, to meet the minimum defense requirements of our security. This is not a bill to force all men between the ages 18 and 25 into service and thus create and maintain a permanent large military force. That is not the purpose at all.

This is simply a bill to make available an adequate pool of manpower—a pool that can be tapped, as needed.

What does this amendment propose to do?

It proposes to make a muddy little puddle out of our manpower pool.

This amendment proposes that we write into the laws of this Nation an official and formal expression of our distrust of our military leaders—our own military leaders.

If all-out war—or some more apparent threat to our security materialized—the 18-year-olds might be called up a few weeks before 18½ years. But, even then, it is most unlikely, if not impossible, that any boy would go into service before he is 18 years and 3 months old.

That is what our military leaders have told us would take place. It is not merely a promise from them; it is not merely frosting on the cake. Anyone can look at the records of selective-service experience and reach the same conclusion, come up with the same facts.

Anyone could do that. But this amendment disregards the facts—scoffs at them, mocks them. This amendment says, loudly and brazenly, "General Marshall, General Bradley, General Collins, Admiral Sherman, General Vandenberg—gentlemen, the Senate of the United States; consider your recommendations no good; we don't trust you."

That is what this amendment says. If you believe that—and I, for one, do not—then I say you are wasting your time debating such a minor matter as the Morse amendment, as amended two or three times since it was first submitted.

If Senators believe we cannot trust General Marshall and General Bradley and all the other military leaders, then I tell them that they ought to be crying in alarm about the impending doom of the Republic.

The philosophy of this amendment goes deeper. It is an attempt to tie the military's hands—knowingly and deliberately. I was shocked when I heard expressed upon this floor the justification that Congress ought to limit the military to some fixed number of men lower than the military's own estimate of need. It was said that if we would deny the military the manpower they asked for, they might learn to get by on less.

How shocking. What are we trying to do here? Are we trying to make this Nation strong, or are we attempting to punish the military of our Nation?

Last July the military had fewer men than they needed in Korea. Divisions were stretched across the Korean hills with barely enough men to space two or three or four men per mile. Those man—those boys—learned a lot, perhaps; more than many of us here will ever know. But tens of thousands of those boys carried their education to the grave.

I did not hear these Chambers echoing last July and August—or even last December—with cries of "Don't send reinforcements to Korea; let our boys learn to fight against heavy odds." I heard no such cries, but that is just what we are hearing now.

Mr. President, there have been moments in history when we could indulge the beneficial course of reshaping, remolding, reforming, and reeducating our Armed Forces. Personally, I do not believe that this present moment is an opportune time to indulge such practices.

I want to face the people of my State and my Nation and say that I believe we have taken a wise course of action looking toward building up our strength against communism.

I am not at all interested—though some here may be—in returning home and saying, "We did a great thing in the Senate; we told the military they would have to get by with one-third less men than they need."

I do not conceive it to be my duty to engage in a war with the Pentagon over the fundamentals of our strength. I do conceive it to be my duty to make sure that the Pentagon has what is needed to engage in any war that may come with our sworn enemies.

That is why I oppose the philosophy of this amendment—a philosophy I consider to be destructive, not constructive. That is why I oppose the results of this amendment—results which add nothing to our national strength, but which do subtract from our strength.

There is another question about this amendment which I want to discuss. What would we be doing by giving 6 months to these 18-year-old youths? What would we be doing for the boy? We would not be giving him time to complete more college work. We would not be giving him time to become a skilled technician of any sort in any vital work. Of those things we can be sure.

Give him this 6 months, and we are only adding six more pointless months of waiting to his life. We are actually giving him nothing; we are taking from his life six useful months.

If he is 18, he is not going to find jobs easier to secure because we vote him 6 months of exemption from the draft. Indeed, by adding 6 months to the 18-year-old induction age, we would do a disservice to the youth—we would force upon him six frustrating, wasted months of waiting.

Let me add that we would not be doing anything for the parents, either. Let us not be misled about that. We would not be keeping the 18-year-old home by voting for this amendment, if that is the purpose. We would rather be voting for a hypocrisy which would haunt us if we tried to tell parents of 18-year-olds that we could keep their boys home. I sincerely believe our position would be more respected and more tenable if we took the boys at the clear and unmistakble age of 18, rather than to tack on the illusion of 6 months.

But my principal objection to this amendment is that I am unwilling to make a promise to these 18-year-old boys that I cannot make to the veterans of World War II. This amendment

promises the 18-year-old boy 6 months of freedom from service. This amendment says, "We don't want you to be disturbed at age 18; we want you to have time to cavort and play and have a good time and perhaps grow to maturity, so we are giving you 6 months."

While we are giving those boys those 6 months, keep in mind that because of that delay, because of our desire that these 18-year-olds enjoy themselves, we are very likely causing men 28 and 30 and 35 and older, men with families and important jobs and heavy debts to go into service again as Reserves and National Guard men. That would be the result.

We would be giving the 18-year-old 6 months to play; 6 months to have a good time; 6 months to make no worthwhile contribution to the Nation. At the same time, Senators, we would be tearing away from their homes, away from their families, away from their jobs, away from their hopes and achievements, men who have fought once, men who have already given generously of their lives.

Is it worth it? Are Senators willing to justify the necessity for this 6 months for 18-year-olds to the wives of the men 30 and 35 and 40 years old who will be writing us when their husbands are called back into service?

I say these things because I am anxious that the bill, in its final form, be an equitable, logical, forthright bill. I do not believe that this amendment would be fair. I do not believe it would serve the best interests of the Nation. I believe it is possible to institute reforms in the military without jeopardizing our security. I do not believe that the 18-year-old deserves special treatment by being shown favoritism we cannot extend the veterans in our Reserve and Guard units.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon, who has remaining 3 minutes, to be followed by the Senator from Georgia, who has 4 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I cannot quite figure out the position taken by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], whether he is for the military on those points on which he agrees with them, or whether he is with them in all respects, because the Senator from Texas laid great emphasis in the past debate on the parts of the bill in which he disagreed with Generals Marshall, Bradley, Eisenhower, and others.

Now I find myself subject to the criticism that because I think there are further disagreements which we ought to express, I am weakening the defenses of my country. What I am saying to the Senate today is, "Here is the opportunity to perform a necessary duty, namely, to exercise constitutional checks upon the military, and really to put into effect by this bill some of the checks which need to be put into effect if we are to have an efficient military establishment."

Incidentally, Mr. President, in this amendment I seek to put into effect the testimony of the military, given time and time again in the hearings, that they are not going to take boys until they are 18 years and 6 months old. They did not seem to want a provision to that effect written into the law as a check, but I think we should impose it upon them.

Next I wish to answer the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Arizone as to what is going to happen to the boys who are 18 years old, or 18 years and 6 months or 18 years and 9 months old. Many thousands of them will spend from 6 months to 9 months in school, which will be a school term. The testimoney shows that when we take a group of boys into the Army before they go to college, and compare them with boys who go into the Army after they have spent a term or two in college, a larger percentage of the latter group come back to college after the service than do the first group. So, Mr. President, to argue that the period of time before induction is going to be wasted cannot be reconciled with the record before us.

In my remaining moment I wish very quickly to say that my amendment provides a prohibition upon the military which will prevent them from inducting a boy until he reaches the age of 18 years and 6 months. My amendment will carry out what I think is a much needed check. My amendment coulld not have all the effects the proponents of the bill proclaim, because the military itself, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] have already pointed out in the debate again today, states that it does not contemplate taking the boys until sometime in 1952, and probably in July of that year.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that at the present time the military, if we give them this bill in toto, cannot begin to absorb the manpower to be provided for a great many months to come. Congress will be in session, and it is the duty of the Congress to maintain a periodic check upon the military by making them come before us and justify their demands. We should not give them the blanket discretionary power which the bill would give them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senate will do well to bear in mind that this amendment is one of a series offered by the Senator from Oregon to impose what he chooses to call "a constitutional check" upon the military. If we impose all the constitutional checks urged by the Senator from Oregon, we will check ourselves out of any army even one of the size of the forces he would approve, 3,100,000 men, unless we are willing to go back to the veterans who served in World War II and say to them, "You must come into the service, even though you served 4 years, commencing at the age of 18 years and 3 months, before any of your fellows below the age of 18½ can possible see service in the military forces at this time."

The Senator from Oregon has repeatedly condemned the statistics offered to the committee by the witnessess. He says they are not reliable; but he presents no comparable statistics of his own which would show the committee's statistics to be wrong.

He has expressed distrust of the military. He has repeated again and again that we must not let the military have a free rein. He well knows that the priorities established in the bill by the committee are contrary to the urgings of the military. We were trying to protect those 18 year of age until all those above that age had been called.

The Senator says the military have changed their position. I submit they have not changed their positions any oftener than the Senator from Oregon has changed his position on the amendment. On Friday the Senator from Oregon said on the floor of the Senate:

> I believe the so-called priorities offered by the committee do not mean anything in practice. I do not believe, they are practicable.

He was then asked the question specifically by the Senator from Texas:

> I understood the Senator to have felt all along that it was a mistake to put the priorities in the bill.

The Senator from Oregon stated:

> I still do.

That was Friday of last week, and today he embraced the priorities. So it is apparent, Mr. President, that both the Senator and those in the military need not stand in fear of being accused of having small minds, because consistency presents nothing in the way of a hobgoblin to them.

Mr. President, if we go about writing a bill for the defense of the Nation based on mistrust of the military leaders, I submit we should adopt a new philosophy instead of trying to rearm. We should begin schooling ourselves in Ghandi's civil-disobedience program rather than start a rearmament program under leaders in whom we have no faith. That will lead to certain defeat.

Why should we doubt Dwight D. Eisenhower? Has he served his Nation so ill that we should scorn his testimony when he comes as a witness? Why should we say that George C. Marshall's service to this Nation is such that we should be suspicious of every word he utters when he comes to advise with the committee charged with the responsibility of raising an army? Have men such as Bradley, men like Sherman, or Collins—has the service they rendered at a time when we were in dire peril—been of such a character that we should distrust them and say, "Oh, no; this is the issue, and the 'brass,' the military do not know what they are talking about."

We did not adopt every suggestion of the military in drafting this bill, but we do not offer it in a spirit of distrust. We offer it as a means of raising an armed force, to defend our America, under the leadership of men who have served us well and whom we trust. We must strengthen our defenses, and this is true whether our foreign policy be that proposed by Truman, Wherry, Eisenhower, Taft, or Hoover. If we start whittling at this bill with such

amendments as the Senator from Oregon proposes, we impair and endanger our defenses and all that we hold dear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, as modified.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Green | Malone |
| Anderson | Hayden | Martin |
| Bennett | Hendrickson | Maybank |
| Benton | Hennings | Millikin |
| Brewster | Hickenlooper | Monroney |
| Bricker | Hill | Morse |
| Butler, Md. | Hoey | Mundt |
| Butler, Nebr. | Holland | Neely |
| Byrd | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Cain | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Capehart | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Carlson | Jenner | Pastore |
| Case | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Connally | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Cordon | Kem | Smathers |
| Dirksen | Kerr | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Kilgore | Smith, N. C |
| Duff | Knowland | Stennis |
| Dworshak | Langer | Taft |
| Eastland | Lehman | Thye |
| Ecton | Lodge | Tobey |
| Ellender | Long | Watkins |
| Ferguson | McCarran | Welker |
| Flanders | McClellan | Wherry |
| Frear | McFarland | Williams |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Young |
| George | McMahon | |
| Gillette | Magnuson | |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is unavoidably absent because of illness. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is absent on important public business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—31

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Ferguson | Morse |
| Brewster | Gillette | Mundt |
| Bricker | Hendrickson | O'Conor |
| Butler, Md. | Hickenlooper | Taft |
| Butler, Nebr. | Ives | Watkins |
| Capehart | Jenner | Welker |
| Carlson | Johnston, S. C. | Wherry |
| Case | Kem | Williams |
| Dirksen | Kilgore | Young |
| Dworshak | Langer | |
| Ecton | Malone | |

NAYS—55

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hennings | Martin |
| Anderson | Hill | Maybank |
| Benton | Hoey | Millikin |
| Byrd | Holland | Monroney |
| Cain | Humphrey | Neely |
| Chapman | Hunt | Nixon |
| Chavez | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Connally | Johnson, Tex. | Pastore |
| Cordon | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Douglas | Kerr | Russell |
| Duff | Knowland | Saltonstall |
| Eastland | Lehman | Smathers |
| Ellender | Lodge | Smith, N. J. |
| Flanders | Long | Smith, N. C. |
| Frear | McClellan | Stennis |
| Fulbright | McFarland | Thye |
| George | McKellar | Tobey |
| Green | McMahon | |
| Hayden | Magnuson | |

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Murray | Vandenberg |
| Clements | Schoeppel | Wiley |
| McCarran | Smith, Maine | |
| McCarthy | Sparkman | |

So the amendment offered by Mr. MORSE, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment lettered "'B,' 2–27–51," star print, so it can be the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 73, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one."

On page 77, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 9.

On page 78, lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one."

On page 91, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(z) Section 21 of such act is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953."

## MESSAGE OF AFFECTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT TO SENATOR VANDENBERG

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished majority and minority leaders, and all other Members of the Senate who wish to be associated in sponsoring it, I send to the desk a resolution. The proposal is that the Senate express itself as hoping and praying for the early recovery and return of our great and eminent colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read and immediately considered. I ask further that permission be granted to all Senators who wish to be considered as cosponsors of the resolution to affix their names to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was read, as follows:

Whereas our well-beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, has recently been forced by illness to be absent from the sessions of this body to which he has long contributed so much in both leadership and statesmanship; and

Whereas the Senate, like the Nation, holds him in high and affectionate regard and hopes for his early return to the debates and deliberations to which he has always given so much of himself and of his constructive thought; and

Whereas the knowledge of the affection in which his colleagues hold him may speed his recovery and return: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the senior Senator from Michigan be informed of the full and fervent sense of the Senate that his complete and early recovery is hoped and prayed for; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to convey the sense of this resolution, suitably expressed and inscribed, to the senior Senator from Michigan, together with the best wishes and affectionate regards of the Members of this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the submission of the resolution by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is received.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New York will permit the names of the entire membership of the Senate to appear as cosponsors in the submission of the resolution. I am satisfied that every Member of the United States Senate agrees wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed in the resolution. I believe that if the distinguished Senator would amend his request so that all Members of the United States Senate might join as cosponsors, it would be a very fine thing to do for the Senator from Michigan. I am sure that the Senator from New York would extend to every other Member of the Senate the privilege of joining in the very fine sentiments expressed in the resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I accept that suggestion with a great deal of

pleasure. I had hoped that such a suggestion would be offered, and that every Member of the Senate might join.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair suggest that the resolution might be modified so as to show that the Senator who submits it does so not only for himself but for the entire membership of the Senate, without placing each individual name on the resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I accept that suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator modifying his resolution to that effect? The Chair hears none.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will, by unanimous vote, act immediately upon the resolution. I wish to say that I have been in communication with my senior colleague from Michigan, and from his letters I know he is in poor health at the present time. My colleague will greatly appreciate, as will his family, and all the people of my State, as well as the people of the other States of the Nation, the adoption of such a mark of affection toward my colleague as this resolution in which we express the hope for his speedy recovery and for his early return to the floor of the Senate where he is so greatly needed at the present moment in the world's crisis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I make the suggestion that the Senate, when it reaches the point of indicating its approval of this resolution, do so by a rising vote. I know that every Member of the Senate feels as I do, that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is one of the ablest, most useful, and influential Members of this body, a man of highest character and discernment, and that we all desire to honor him by a rising vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the vote being taken by a rising vote when it is taken? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeng to the resolution. [Putting the question.] The resolution is adopted unanimously by a rising vote.

### PROSPECTS FOR AN EASTER RECESS—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in a few moments I shall present a request for unanimous consent that routine business may be transacted. Before doing so, however, I wish to say that I am sincerely pleased that the junior Senator from New York has offered the resolution respecting the senior Senator from Michigan. Every Senator wishes to do or say something that may encourage the senior Senator from Michigan and help toward speedy recovery.

Mr. President, I have been asked whether the Senate would take an Easter recess. The Senate has a substantial program before it. But it is my hope we can work out an agenda which we can act upon in time to take an Easter recess in order that Senators who live near the Capital may return to their homes to attend to their affairs, and so that other Senators may catch up with work in their offices.

If we are to take such a recess, however, we must have the cooperation of the entire membership of the Senate, of Members on both sides of the aisle, in the little more than 2 weeks before Easter.

I compliment my friends on the other side of the aisle for the splendid manner in which they have cooperated with me as majority leader thus far. The spirit has been fine. I am sure it is the kind of spirit the people of the country want to see prevail in the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think all of us would like to know that after the Senate has disposed of the bill now pending, the next order of business will be the question of troops to be sent to Europe. Is it the plan to take up the resolution dealing with that subject next?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; but before that is done a few bills, none of which should take very much time, should be acted upon. However, the resolution dealing with troops for Europe will be the next major business to come before the Senate.

In a day or two I hope to submit to the majority policy committee for its approval an outline of what should be done before Easter and we will then submit the program to the minority for its approval. If we work out the schedule thus proposed and conform to it, the Senate can arrange an Easter vacation. Otherwise we shall have to continue working through the Easter holidays without a recess, as we have done in recent years.

Of course, the first consideration in adopting such a plan and thus permitting an Easter vacation to be taken is to expedite passage of the legislation now before us. The bill we are now debating is, as I have previously stated, very important. I do not want the Senate to limit anyone who wishes to speak or try to limit any particular line of debate. I want every Member of the Senate to have full opportunity of expressing himself upon the bill.

Nevertheless, in order to carry out the schedule we hope to submit and have an Easter vacation the Senate must expedite action on the bill before us. It may become necessary that the Senate sit longer hours in order to dispose of the legislative agenda which must be met before the end of this month. For that reason, I hope the Senate will be willing to work a little longer than usual today.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How long a vacation does the Senator have in mind?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will submit the proposal for a vacation together with the agenda of legislation. The House expects to take a recess of about 10 days. Whether the Senate can do as well will depend upon whether we can dispose of what is before us. The business of the Senate must, of course, come first. However, I believe that if we all put our shoulders to the wheel we can consider the legislation which must be disposed of and be ready to take a recess when the Easter holidays come. I shall submit a definite plan in a few days.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the distinguished majority leader have any definite plan with reference to the date of the next call of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my hope that we can call the calendar not later than next Monday. If I knew when the Senate would complete action on the pending bill, I could now make a definite announcement with respect to a date for the calendar call. I hope we can complete action on the pending bill by Wednesday evening or, at the latest, by Thursday evening. If I was certain the Senate would complete action on the bill on Wednesday, I would give notice now of a call of the calendar for next Thursday, but until we know when we will finish with the pending bill, I cannot give notice. Naturally every Senator would like to have a little advance notice of when the calendar will be called. At the latest, however, I would say the calendar will be called next Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Easter Sunday falls on the 25th of March. As I understand, the distinguished majority leader proposes to submit a plan, which will require action by the majority, for legislation to be acted upon in order that an Easter vacation may be had. If proposed legislation can be completed as scheduled is it proposed that a short Easter vacation shall be taken?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is what I would hope for.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the Senator's plan and the plan of the majority to submit to the majority Members such legislation as is to be taken up between now and the Easter holidays, that is between now and the weekend prior to Easter Sunday?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; and also to submit it to the Senator from Nebraska and the minority Members for their approval.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for giving us that much consideration. I also wish to acknowledge the flattering remarks made by the Senator from Arizona respecting the cooperation he has received from the Members on this side of the aisle. I wish to say to the distinguished majority leader that he has our cooperation. There might be some question as to the proposed schedule. That schedule must be referred for approval to the minority. We would be glad to have a plan submitted to us. But, after all, it is the responsibility of the majority leader to present and attempt to carry out a program for the Senate.

Whether some of us would like such a program or not, makes no difference. The majority leader must work out and present his plan. I assure the distinguished majority leader, however, that

he will receive our cooperation in attempting to deal with matters he presents to us for our attention. The majority leader now contemplates working out and presenting a plan for the Senate to act upon. I wish to commend him for making that proposal.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader. Of course, the plan for an Easter recess is contingent wholly upon the ability of the Senate to dispose of the legislation proposed under the schedule.

### AUDUBON CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona knows that about a week ago I addressed to him an inquiry, which I also addressed to the distinguished minority leader, as to whether they were willing to have called up Senate bill 248, Calendar No. 123, authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year, this being the one hundredth year since of death of John James Audubon. Both of them were kind enough to say that when the proper time was reached, they would be agreeable to having the bill called up.

I wish to serve notice that if there is no objection, I expect to call up that bill at the end of the transaction of routine business today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection, but I do not believe there will be a lull in our business today. I certainly hope there will not be; it is my hope that a great deal of business will be transacted today.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was excused from further attendance on the session of the Senate today.

### CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, March 2, 1951, on page 1834, in the middle column, the next to the last line be corrected by changing the figure 1,000,000 to 100,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The correction will be made.

### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have printed. I offered the amendment in the Armed Services Committee, and I shall offer it again if my 21 months' service amendment is defeated. This amendment calls for 24 months' service.

I should like to say good-naturedly to my friends who are supporting the bill and are opposing me that I think I have the votes to pass the 24 months' service amendment, and I may have the votes to adopt the 21 months' service amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the International Claims Commission of the United States, for the period ended December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ACCEPTANCE OF CONDITIONAL GIFTS FOR DEFENSE EFFORT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### REPEAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE LAWS RELATING TO POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the Post Office Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### REARMING OF GERMANY

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a letter from Josef Sprinzak, president of the Israel Knesseth, and a resolution adopted by the Israel Knesseth, relating to the rearming of Germany (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Credit Union Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### REPORT ON EFFECTS OF POLLUTION OF WATER ON WILDLIFE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the effects of domestic sewage, mining, petroleum, and industrial wastes, erosion silt, and other polluting substances on wildlife; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Housing Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relating to protection of private property in the construction of power transmission lines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MUNDT on March 2, 1951, p. 1807, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

An act of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"An act ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, relating to the terms of office of the President of the United States

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), propose the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, to become valid as part of the said Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States, in words as follows, to wit:

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President or acted as President for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"'"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:"'

Now, therefore,

"The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

"'SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America set out in the preamble to this act be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina.

"'SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and act be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State at

Under the terms of my joint resolution the Department of the Treasury would be in charge of the process of liquidation. During the period of the present emergency, certain Government loans may be necessary in connection with defense production. I believe that appropriate machinery should be set up in the Department of the Treasury to make such loans. There is no reason why the death agony of the RFC should be prolonged for this purpose.

The RFC was set up in 1932 as a temporary lending agency—to exist for just 1 year. But as in the case of so many temporary agencies here in Washington, the RFC has lived on and on. Like Topsy, it has grown bigger and bigger. At the same time it has become more and more corrupt.

Under the law the RFC is supposed to make loans to corporations and businessmen only if they cannot obtain financial help elsewhere on reasonable terms.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a brief comment?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to advise the Senator from Missouri that the RFC mortification has already set in. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. I propose that the death agony not be continued unduly.

As I was saying, Mr. President, under the law the RFC is supposed to make loans to corporations and businessmen only if they cannot obtain financial help elsewhere on reasonable terms. All loans must be in the public interest. There must be at least a reasonable chance of their being repaid.

The disclosures brought about by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] make it clear that as a result of political pressure, many unsound loans in large amounts have been made by the RFC. In many cases the intent of the Congress has been completely disregarded. The people have taken heavy losses.

The aromas emitting from RFC, this "royal fruit cake," indicate that it is spoiled through and through.

In the year 1948 I asked the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to look into the RFC. I had particularly in mind what seemed to be a flagrant case of a loan to the Aireon Manufacturing Co., of Kansas City. The request for this loan was disapproved by the Kansas City office of the RFC. The reason was simple: There did not appear to be a reasonable probability of repayment of the loan. This action was summarily reversed, and the loan was ordered to be made by the Washington office of the RFC. Aireon was a "war baby." At the termination of its war contracts, Aireon branched out into the manufacture of juke boxes, a field in which it had had no previous experience in either manufacturing or marketing. The timing is significant. On January 23, 1947, the RFC granted a loan in the sum of $2,000,000. In November 1947 the Aireon filed a petition of bankruptcy.

Mr. President, one of the fundamental principles of American constitutional government is that the control of the Federal purse strings should remain firmly in the hands of the elected representatives of the people in the Congress. The purse strings should not be turned over to power-grabbing, self-seeking bureaucrats who never are called on to answer to the people.

However, that is exactly what has taken place in the case of RFC. It has become a wide-open political grab bag for White House favorites.

I doubt that the plan to replace RFC's five-man board of directors with a single administrator would solve the problem. Congress cannot legislate honesty or good management in the executive branch of the Government. Congress cannot do away with favoritism and influence simply by passing a bill. That is the responsibility of the President. His duty is to carry out laws passed by the Congress honestly and efficiently. This he can do by appointing good men to office.

Since the President is apparently unwilling to clean up the RFC, Congress should do away with the agency altogether. It is intolerable for bureaucrats to be playing politics with the people's money while our young men fight and die in Korea.

## DISQUALIFICATION OF COMMUNIST ATTORNEYS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution favoring the disqualification of Communist attorneys to practice before Federal courts, and denying admission to practice in Federal courts of Communists, and I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas official findings of congressional committees and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and proceedings in recent trials in the Federal courts present an abundance of evidence showing the menace and the dangers of Communist activities in the United States and its possessions and Territories; and

Whereas the direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign nation; and

Whereas the security and safety of the United States and its Constitution require that protections and the integrity of our judicial system be maintained; and

Whereas the individual Communist has no loyalty to the United States but owes his allegiance to a foreign group which controls his every action and which, through the endeavors of Communist lawyers, threatens the rights of all American citizens; and

Whereas lawyers are officers of our courts, and take oaths to support the Constitution and laws of the United States, and as such have a particular and important responsibility toward upholding the judicial processes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that any member of the legal profession who is known or is proven to be a member of the Communist Party be disqualified from practice before any Federal court; and that admission to practice in any Federal court be denied any person known to be or proven to be a Communist.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, more and more it becomes apparent that the only way successfully to combat in this country the infiltration and propaganda tactics of communism, which have worked to the destruction of so many other nations and peoples, is to render powerless each Communist group which is working in the various phases of American life.

Members of the bar and the citizens generally have had particular occasion to note the sometimes devastating efficiency with which a few lawyers, indicating Communist tendencies, have been able to delay or obstruct efforts to enforce the laws with respect to subversive activities.

Under the Constitution of the United States every right of every person accused of any crime must be zealously protected. But such a spectacle as was enacted in New York when 11 leading Communists were tried amounted to nothing less than a travesty of justice.

Through the efforts of certain members of the bar, working in the interest of communism, the rights of millions of Americans were flouted to an extent that if permitted generally, would seriously jeopardize the American judicial processes.

And make no mistake about it, similar efforts on a less spectacular scale in various sections of the country give clear indication that the Communist lawyers, and those following the party line, are prepared to go to any and every length in order to impede or actually to prevent the application of our laws regarding treason and other subversive efforts. Obviously, to permit continuance of such a situation is to give aid and support to an enemy whose avowed purpose is the destruction of the American form of government.

It is impossible for a member of the Communist Party to adhere to the principles of that organization and at the same time live up to the oath he is required to take in being admitted to practice in the United States courts.

The oath which is administered to all prospective members of the bar stipulates that they stand ready to support the Constitution of the United States. No Communist can truthfully take that oath and live up to it as long as he remain true to the principles of the organization.

An attorney is an officer of the court. How illogical it is to vest a Communist with such a high responsibility when the tenets of his subversive organization are directly oppposed to every consideration upon which rests the majesty and dignity of the law, as enshrined in the judicial branch of our Government.

How contradictory it is for a lawyer to take an oath to uphold the judicial system of our country when the Communist movement of which he is a member has operated everywhere to destroy completely the rights of individuals and to make a mockery of judicial processes.

The Communist organization in the United States is definitely not simply a

political organization. It is a world conspiracy, dedicated to the overthrow of the American system of government and of American institutions by any means, violent or otherwise. Its agents, therefore, can never accord to any American institutions, judicial or otherwise, the loyalty which is so paramount in an officer of the very courts upon which the basis of American institutions depend.

### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CORDON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

### ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN AT CONFERENCE OF CIVIL LIBERTIES CLEARING HOUSE

[Mr. PASTORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LEHMAN at the conference of Civil Liberties Clearing House at Washington, D. C., on March 1, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### WE SHALL PREVAIL—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE RIBICOFF, OF CONNECTICUT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "We Shall Prevail," delivered by Representative A. A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, at convocation exercises, Hollins College, Virginia, on February 21, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

### ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR BATTLE OF VIRGINIA TO UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA ALUMNI

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Governor Battle of Virginia before the Washington Chapter, University of Virginia Alumni, on February 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### STATEMENT BY DR. LEV V. DOBRIANSKY

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding American participation in the defense of Europe, made by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, before a joint session of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, Tuesday, February 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### HOW TO WIN THE WAR OF IDEAS—EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY THOMAS DORGAN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the speech delivered by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of Suffolk Superior Civil Court, to members of the Dorchester Kiwanis Club on February 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### MOST COURAGEOUS COMEBACK IN HISTORY—ARTICLE BY PAUL HOFFMAN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Most Courageous Comeback in History," written by Paul Hoffman, and published in the February 5, 1950, issue of Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE TRAGEDY OF GEORGE MARSHALL—ARTICLE BY WALTER TROHAN

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Tragedy of George Marshall," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the American Mercury for March 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### TRIBUTE TO THOMAS A. EDISON—EDITORIAL FROM LAKE LAND (N. J.) NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Indomitable Spirit," published in the Lake Land (N. J.) News of February 5, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop Stoking Inflation," published in the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### HERBERT HOOVER: A PROPHET WITH VISION—EDITORIAL FROM HURON (S. DAK.) DAILY PLAINSMAN

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Prophet Without Proper Credit," published in the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

### POSTAL AIDE, TROLLEY LINE PLAN NEW ROAD HAZARDS—ARTICLE BY IVAN H. PETERMAN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Postal Aide, Trolly Line Plan New Road Hazards," written by Ivan H. Peterman, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirier, of February 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

### NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION ENDORSES RENEGOTIATION

[Mr. CASE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Renegotiation of Defense Contracts," by the Business Committee on National Policy of the National Planning Association, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

### DISCRIMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF LITERATURE

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Discrimination," published in the current issue of the Saturday Review of Literature, which appears in the Appendix.]

### KENNETH C. VIPOND

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Kenneth C. Vipond," published in the Washington Star of March 1, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### UNESCO AND THE CULTIVATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY RICHARD H. HEINDEL

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject UNESCO and the Cultivation of Human Rights, delivered by Richard H. Heindel, Deputy Director of the UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State, at the 1951 convention of the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, N. J., February 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE POSTAL SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fourth Class Service," published in the Chicago Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

### RAILROADS: A VITAL NATIONAL ASSET—ADDRESS BY HON. LEONIDAS C. DYER

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Railroads: A Vital National Asset, delivered by former Representative Leonidas C. Dyer, of St. Louis, Mo., at a meeting of the Missouri Pacific Club of St. Louis, on February 15, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be allowed to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I wonder whether the majority leader heard the request made by the Senator from South Carolina. I should like to protect the majority leader, who recently stated he was going to object to any committee meetings while the pending bill was before the Senate. He gave me that assurance, and I gave him the assurance that if he did not object, I would; so I shall help him out now, by objecting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard to the request.

### APPOINTMENT OF RALPH VOSSERINK, A KNOWN COMMUNIST, TO AN OFFICIAL POSITION IN HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent, first of all, to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Occasion for Sympathy and Pity." The editorial appeared in the Honolulu Star Bulletin on February 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OCCASION FOR SYMPATHY AND PITY

Mayor Wilson's proposal to appoint one of the "reluctant 39" to the city traffic safety commission is an occasion for sympathy and pity rather than for acrid criticism.

Ralph Vossbrink is the man. He refused, before the Walter committee on un-Americanism here last spring, to answer committee questions concerning Communist affiliation.

The stand of the "reluctant 39" and other unresponsive witnesses has been upheld by a Supreme Court decision. The Court's reasoning is simple—that they were within their rights in refusing to answer questions if they felt that their answers would tend to incriminate them.

But the Court decision did not remove from them the record that they had been held in contempt of Congress for their refusal to answer the congressional committee's inquiries.

In 1948 the American manufacturers imposed their own embargo on India and refused to export the thorium products to India. The New Delhi Government complained to the State Department that the action of the American manufacturers would plunge India into darkness. The State Department contacted the industrialists and hinted very strongly that unless the export of the thorium product was resumed, reprisals would be taken. Since the manufacturers deal principally with the Government, they accepted the State Department's strong hints and resumed exports to India.

When President Truman requested Congress not to play politics with human suffering and to appropriate $200,000,000 to save the Indian people from famine, American industrialists once more approached the State Department. They pointed out that while relief for India should not be subjected to political or economic considerations, or to any quid pro quo, it might be useful to ask the New Delhi Government to reconsider its embargo on monozite sands.

American industry pointed out that since 1946 India had been losing at least $3,500,000 a year from the export of that material; that India now has a stockpile of at least 10,000 tons of the sands, while the American Government now has only 1 percent of the stockpile it needs; and, finally, that American importers were willing to pay cash on the barrelhead for every ton of sand purchased from India.

The top State Department officials listened sympathetically to the industrialists' arguments. But they pointed out that it would not be ethical and would be prejudicial to our foreign policy if our Government made friendly, direct representations to New Delhi on such a commercial matter at this time.

Evidently our policy makers were afraid that America would be accused of colonialism if we urged a friendly government, to whom we are expected to hand out a large dole, to let us buy some of its vast surplus of monozite.

Congress now intends to look into the matter.

KARL MARX ON FREE TRADE—1848

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a quotation from Karl Marx on free trade, dated 1848.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KARL MARX ON FREE TRADE—1848

Karl Marx, the outstanding Communist revolutionist of all time, made a very significant address more than 102 years ago on the subject of free trade before the "Democratic Club, Brussels, Belgium, January 9, 1848." He said at that time:

"In his celebrated work upon political economy he (Ricardo, the leading economist of his time) says: 'If instead of growing our own corn * * * we discover a new market from which we can supply ourselves * * *, at a cheaper price, wages will fall and profits rise. The fall in the price of agricultural produce reduces the wages, not only of the laborer employed in cultivating the soil, but also of all those employed in commerce or manufacture.'

"Besides this, the protective system helps to develop free competition within a nation. Hence we see that in countries where the bourgeoisie is beginning to make itself felt as a class, in Germany for example, it makes great efforts to obtain protective duties. They serve the bourgeoisie as weapons against feudalism and absolute monarchy, as a means for the concentration of its own powers for the realization of free trade within the country.

"But, generally speaking, the protective system in these days is conservative, while the free trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the free trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade."

The principle has not changed in the 102 years since the outstanding Communist of all time said in effect that free trade destroys the workingman, and now, since the investment in industry has rised from a few dollars per employed man to an average of approximately $10,000, the investor is an equal victim.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, which has been stated.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on August 29, 1950, in a speech in the Senate, I made the following statement:

We should not leave Washington until we have amended the Selective Service Act so that it can provide an army of at least 30 divisions * * *. The present law is not intended to carry a manpower procurement load above 2,500,000 men. We should set up the legal machinery now. It is better to have it and not need it than to need it and not have it.

On September 8, 1950, I stated on the Senate floor:

All that we have in the way af a Presidential announcement is that there must be 3,000,000 men in the Armed Forces as a whole, which would be a good start if we are to have them all by June 30, 1951. But the President's message carefully did not specify the year by which these 3,000,000 men would have to be in the service.

And Congress, the body of which we are members, has not even amended the Selective Service Act so as to make possible the procurement of enough manpower for a 3,000-000-man Armed Force. Present law still effectively limits us to a total not exceeding 2,500,000 men, regardless of certain gestures to the contrary. We have taken off the numerical limit, but actually the law was never designed to yield more than 2,500,000 men, and the best experts I can find think that it will not.

Obviously we should have taken steps last summer to increase the amount of available military manpower, and our failure to do so has seriously weakened our efforts in Korea. Proof of this is found in the testimony of Secretary of Defense Marshall before the House Armed Services Committee on January 23, 1951. I should like now to make a fairly extended quotation from the statement of Secretary Marshall to the House Committee on Armed Services:

In that dilemma, General MacArthur made a very courageous decision and moved into the ranks of those divisions—and there were only four to five, four to start with and later a fifth one, but largely into those four divisions—some 30,000 Koreans. So in order to save ourselves in that situation of combat, we had to depend on men that had only had three weeks of training and some with no training and put them into American units to a tune of some 36 percent. And as late as November when I came into the Defense Department, I found that those units were still 20 percent short in American manpower in their ranks. In addition to that, they created a great many of these South Korean units, maybe 10 divisions. We undertook to create one every four weeks. Well, when it took us almost 2 years to get our divisions ready for heavy fighting in Europe and in the Southwest Pacific, you can realize what it was to turn out a division of South Koreans with their difficulty of understanding our weapons and our conceptions of discipline and tactics in only 4 weeks' time. Nevertheless, that was done and we made the fight on that basis.

Now the interesting thing I would like to explain to you now is that we still have not made up the deficiencies. And I am informed, when I have checked through all the records, it will be until the 1st of April before we make good on the men required to put General MacArthur's existing forces up to its strength.

I ask Senators to underline the first of April. I now continue the quotation from General Marshall's statement before the House committee:

I find in going back through the development that throughout the months of September, October and November, practically all the selective-service men were being put into the ranks of units in this country to meet the continued draft on those ranks for men to be sent to Korea. So it was not until in October that the first small beginning was made to put men into normal basic training, to provide the manpower that we needed. But it could only be a small beginning. They increased the number of camps from 4 to 19. Nine of those I think were the basic camps where you deal with the first 6 weeks and the others were the camps where the men took the final 8 weeks in whatever their arm was—Artillery, Engineers, Signal Corps, the tanks, and so on—to complete the 14 weeks' training. They held on to the proposition throughout that no men should be sent of that selective-service draft who had not had 14 weeks' training. But that meant that we had to put these men in units in this country, take the men out of the units in this country and ship them to General MacArthur.

I interpolate there, in the middle of this quotation of General Marshall to point out what a difference it makes to the soldier between fighting as an individual and being sent as an individual to some unit where he is a stranger, on the one hand, and on the other hand, going into the combat zone as a member of the unit, surrounded by people he knows, and who know him. It is putting a man at a very grave disadvantage if, because of our unpreparedness, we compel him to go as an individual replacement, instead of going as part of a team. But that is what we have had to do and what we are still doing. I continue reading from General Marshall's statement:

His needs have averaged along from month to month here about 15,000 a month—not new units, but replacements. As I say, under the present situation, it appears to be about the 1st of April when they will have fully filled the ranks with American soldiers in American units in Korea.

To give you one division of his, for example, the Seventh Division, there were 7,800 Koreans put into its ranks before it left Japan and went into Korea. That is a very large percentage of the whole and that was quite a predicament in which

the United States Government should find itself regarding its men.

I interpolate at that point, indeed, yes, it is quite a predicament that this great country should have been in such a situation that it could not support its own people overseas in a more effective way. The defense authorities did the best they could at the time, but the situation showed how unprepared we were.

I proceed with the quotation:

Those things I think are lost sight of in the debate of why we did this and why we did that. What I am talking about exclusively are the military factors of why we were in this predicament in connection with our military force and how we can avoid its repetition in the future, along with the authorization that permits us to build up as rapidly as possible at the present time.

Now, on the 1st of December they began going into these training camps for basic training in larger numbers. I think the September quota that went directly into those camps was some 40-odd thousand. But the interesting thing to me is that the first normal graduates of that basic training will not come out until the last week in January. Under the present situation—I am rather hesitant about talking about this publicly, but I think it is better to do it because the manpower bill is so important to us that we should have as complete an understanding as possible in your minds. But the product of normal basic training, which is the foundation of any unit, will be about 5,000 at the end of January, 6,000 in February, something like 12,000, I think, in March, 22,000 in April, 30,000 in May, and 40,000 in June and July, and finally in August we reach 50,000. Yet at the same time we will have been taking during January, February and March—that is as far as we have gone in announcements—80,000 men a month.

That is the end of the quotation from General Marshall.

It is clear from General Marshall's testimony that General MacArthur's forces will not be up to strength until April 1. Who can doubt that if we had changed the Selective Service Act last summer, as we should have done, that his forces would have been brought up to strength much sooner?

There are those who say that there is no use crying over spilt milk, but I believe it is very definitely the duty of a Senator to cry over spilt milk and to do so somewhat vociferously so that we can learn by our mistakes, and not repeat them, and not pretend we did not know anything about them, but be prepared so that we may not repeat them. Our omission of last summer has now been remedied. The bill before us is one which I support. The committee is to be congratulated for an honest, democratic, and efficient effort to meet the Soviet threat. It seems to meet the needs of the times. It will give us the military manpower which is the indispensable base for the rebuilding of all strength in the free world—military, economic, political, and spiritual. It is fair and democratic in the way it obtains the manpower and does not require those who have already fought in World War II, including those who went into World War II as very young boys, to carry the load in our present alert once again. It will confront many young men in America with many a disagreeable prospect, which is inevitable. Regardless of how the bill is drawn, the bringing of men into the armed services is a disagreeable and unhappy business. But it is worth engaging in a disagreeable and unhappy business if by so doing we can avoid the tragedy of all-out war.

The bill contains one title in which I am particularly interested. This is title II, which increases to 25,000 men per year for 5 years the selected aliens already authorized under the terms of the Lodge-Philbin Act, which became law last summer. There is still a great opportunity to obtain the services of highly selected men who can help us both in a strictly military sense and by their knowledge of foreign languages and cultures. After 5 years, these men should make excellent citizens. They should provide the nucleus around which other and larger units could be built. They can be an important factor in the encouragement which I hope we shall give to the attempts of the free world to throw off the yoke of Communist dictatorship and domination. It is a pity that although the Lodge-Philbin Act has been on the books since June 1950 that as of last week not one single man has been enlisted under its provisions. Congress passes laws, but the Executive must administer them, and all I can do is to reiterate once again my prayers that the executive branch will not continue to think of these problems in the old-fashioned, wooden, dry-as-dust terms; that they will meet the challenge which these alien young men present and meet it with imagination and energy; and that they will realize that individual allies who fight on our side, in our uniform and under our flag, are every bit as good as allies who fight in their uniform and under their flag by our side.

Mr. President, these young men would not make it unnecessary for our own young men to be drafted. But they may some time make it possible to avoid the tragic necessity of some of our young men being killed. That is a good deal better.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I am an enthusiastic supporter of his amendment. However, I wish to know whether I correctly understood an observation which he made a few moments ago. Am I correct in understanding that on the statute books today there is a law which permits the enlistment of qualified aliens to a total number of 2,500?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; 2,500.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator tell us how long the law has been on the statute books?

Mr. LODGE. Since June 1950. Let me say that there is not another Member of the Senate who has seen the potentialities of this subject better than has the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's comment. My interest lies in the fact that I believe the provision to be one of the best ways of winning freedom abroad and of inculcating in foreign countries some of the basic principles of our democratic way of life.

So that the RECORD may be perfectly clear I should like to ask the Senator whether I am to understand that the military has yet to enlist the first man under a law which has been on the statute books since June 1950.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I shall dwell on that point in my own time and in my own way at a later time. Suffice it to say that it is another good example of what I had in mind when I spoke of the wasteful manpower practices of the military. It represents another example of waste.

Mr. LODGE. I should point out that I have been following up the administration of the law. I received a letter from the Secretary of the Army some time ago stating that the reason the Army was not enlisting men was because the clearance of the State Department and the Department of Justice had not been obtained. I found later that clearance by the State Department had been given and that the whole matter was being held up by the Department of Justice. Four or five days ago I received word that the Department of Justice was no longer interposing any objection. As to why no men are being enlisted now, the Senator from Oregon can guess as well as I can.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say that I supported the Senator's amendment, which has now been a law of the land since last June. I think the Senator made a very fine contribution to our military effort by sponsoring the act. I hope it will be possible to take in more such men, if it is possible to get them. Would the Senator be willing to inform the Senate where such men can be obtained? In other words, where are such men available for enlistment?

Mr. LODGE. The program I have in mind is not limited to any one country or to any one race. Undoubtedly, there are many such men in the Far East. They could be obtained for service in the Far East. I have not made a study of the subject so far as the Far East is concerned to the extent that I have studied the subject in Europe. However, the principle is good, whether it is applied to the Far East or to Europe. That is why I feel we should take for service Chinese guerrillas and Nationalist Chinese, or anyone else, to help carry the load of combat in the Orient. Insofar as Europe is concerned, the best estimate I can get is that there exists a manpower pool of men of effective military age which runs as high as 2,000,000 men. They could be found in many countries. They could be found in countries behind the iron curtain, in displaced-persons camps, and on this side of the iron curtain. They would embrace Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, stateless Russians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians.

To describe them briefly, they would be young stateless Slavs.

Mr. WATKINS. Are such men located in displaced persons camps?

Mr. LODGE. Not all of them, but it is believed that they would come from wherever they are if they had some assurance that they would have an army in which to be received and given a chance to serve in the struggle against communism.

Mr. WATKINS. Are any of them in Atlantic Pact countries?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think so. They would supplement the efforts of the Atlantic Pact nations. Atlantic Pact countries are nations themselves, and they have armies of their own. The purpose of the amendment is to provide an army for men who want to be on our side and who have not an army of their own to join.

Mr. WATKINS. Could not such a man join an army of an Atlantic Pact nation as well as he could join our Army?

Mr. LODGE. He could not do so now.

Mr. WATKINS. Why not?

Mr. LODGE. Because there is not a European army, as such, in existence. I am hopeful that one will be created. When that time comes, which I hope will be soon, or at least within a year, I would favor taking the bulk of such men into a European army.

Mr. WATKINS. Do any of the Atlantic Pact nations have a law under which such men could enlist in a so-called foreign legion?

Mr. LODGE. The French have had a foreign legion for a great many years. I believe the British now have a law under which certain selected aliens could be enlisted in the British Army.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator know how France and England are getting along in that regard? Are any men being enlisted in their foreign legions?

Mr. LODGE. The French have had a foreign legion for many years. It is very much of a going concern. It is fighting in Indochina and it is serving in North Africa. It is a very efficient organization. I was close to it at one time. I think anyone who has ever served close to it will agree that on the battlefield it is a very efficient outfit.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator know the size of the French Foreign Legion?

Mr. LODGE. I would have to guess as to its size. I think it consists of less than a hundred thousand men.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator know how the English law operates? Are the British getting any enlistments in the foreign legion?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know. I would have to look it up.

Mr. WATKINS. What is giving me some concern is why some of the Atlantic Pact nations do not pass laws which would make it possible to place such men in their armies. The European nations are very much closer to the homes of the men. The men would not have to travel all the way to the United States. They would be able to stay near to their homes.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say that, of course, the classification of aliens which is provided for in the pending bill would embrace men who would come to this country, because they would be very highly selected men, who would be, we hope, material for officer and non-commissioned officer grades, and would have an eligibility for citizenship at the end of 5 years. The second category of people that I have in mind would never come to this country. They would be enlisted abroad, serve abroad, and be discharged abroad. They would serve for 2 years, and they would not be eligible for citizenship. As to why nations in Europe do not enlist such men I can only say that the nations over there have only recently started building up their military strength. The reason they did not build up their military strength before this time is in part because we told them not to do so, but to concentrate, instead, on building up their economic strength. The Senator knows that history as well as I do. The French are taking the leadership in setting up a European army which, instead of being under the civilian government of any one of the countries involved, would be under the defense ministers of the countries. It would be an army of Europe. I hope something is done with it. If so, the countries over there will be in a position to take some of these young aliens.

The whole object of everything I am trying to do in the field of military and foreign policy is to make it possible to get effective partners so that they can share with us as much of the responsibility and expense as possible.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I had in mind when I asked the Senator if he had any information which indicated that the Atlantic Pact nations, our allies, are making it possible for the people without homes—they might be termed displaced persons—to enlist in their armies nearby.

Mr. LODGE. The short answer is "Yes," they are making plans to do so, but at the present time, if the Senator were a young stateless anti-Communist Slav and wanted to get himself in line to carry part of this load, he would say to himself, "The best organization that I know of that can take me and give me my inoculations against typhoid, give me a pair of pants and a good pair of shoes, put a gun in my hands and train me, house me, feed me, and lead me in combat is the United States Army." That is the realism of the situation. When a man is thinking about entrusting his life to some military organization, he wants to join something that is real, and not some paper organization which is being discussed by the politicians.

Mr. WATKINS. I am talking about the national forces of the Atlantic Pact nations, not an international army. Why is it that the British, the French, the Belgians, the Dutch, the Norwegians, and the Danes cannot have a similar program?

Mr. LODGE. I do not believe that the trouble in Europe, any more than in this country at the present time, is a manpower shortage. The trouble is that the nations have not been oriented toward building military strength. The thing that is lagging now in most of those countries is not the availability of manpower. It is the availability of equipment, matériel, supplies, and so forth.

Mr. WATKINS. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago that this country—and particularly the administration, I assume—advised them not to build up their defense forces, but to concentrate their efforts on economic development.

Mr. LODGE. During the last 3 years of the Marshall plan.

Mr. WATKINS. Including the last 2 years, since the Atlantic Pact was approved.

Mr. LODGE. None of us has been doing very much in a military way; and that goes for the United States.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish the Senator would answer the question as to whether or not since the pact was approved we have advised our Atlantic Pact partners to concentrate on economic progress rather than to build up their defenses.

Mr. LODGE. I know no secrets. I know nothing that is not available to the Senator from Utah. However, I will say that in the past few months we have very definitely made it clear that we expect those nations to make a full and realistic effort at arming themselves. I do not think any of them is in any doubt about it at all. If they could read the remarks made in the United States Senate, I am sure they would be in even less doubt. That is what we expect them to do, and I think that is what they expect to do. My whole point is that, taking the thing in proportion, they are doing about as well as we are doing, making allowance for the fact that we are bigger than they are.

Mr. WATKINS. That does not happen to be an answer to the question which I asked.

Mr. LODGE. I want to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to know if the administration has given the instructions which the Senator seems to say it has given to the Atlantic Pact nations, to build up their economic programs rather than to build up their defense forces. If that has been done since the approval of the Atlantic Pact nearly 2 years ago, I think we should know it. If the Senator has any information on that point, I shall be very happy to have it.

Mr. LODGE. My belief is that we continued to tell them to stress their economic development after the Atlantic Pact was written. Last year I felt that we ought to begin to work the Marshall plan into the rearmament program. I proposed certain language for the ECA Act, and we had a hearing on it. That language would have provided that the counterpart funds in those countries be used for building military equipment. There was some difference of opinion with me on that subject at that time. I think we have been a little late in telling them to change over. I think we have been very late in changing over ourselves. That is the whole burden of my speech this afternoon—that what we are doing now we should have done a long time ago.

Mr. WATKINS. I realize that; but we were told during the consideration of the Atlantic Pact that time was of the essence, and that the pact had to be ratified so that our European allies would get busy and build up their forces, and we could send equipment to them. We appropriated some $1,300,000,000 to do the job.. But in spite of all that, apparently someone in authority here has told the other members of the pact to concentrate on economic development and not pay so much attention to building up their defense forces.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think there is any mystery as to who it was. It was the ECA.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the ECA have authority to pass upon matters of defense?

Mr. LODGE. I think the ECA told them, "We expect you to build up your economic strength." There must be economic strength if we are to have a strong military system.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that.

Mr. LODGE. The two are related. I have felt that the ECA should have shifted emphasis to the military long before it did, and I have said so.

Mr. WATKINS. I am glad that the Senator agrees. I recall that during the debate on the Atlantic Pact we were told that time was of the essence, and that we had to act promptly to ratify the pact and get them the money, the means, so that they could go ahead and build up their forces. If the Senator is correct in the assumption that we placed emphasis on something else, perhaps we are responsible for the present condition of Western European defense, which is practically nothing against any possible Russian onslaught in the immediate future.

Mr. LODGE. We are partly responsible.

Mr. WATKINS. That is another item on the list.

Mr. LODGE. It is a very long list. That certainly is an item on it.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator does not agree with that policy. I take it from what he has said that he does not agree with the policy of the administration, which places emphasis, through the ECA, on economic recovery rather than on building up their armed forces to defend themselves.

Mr. LODGE. The Marshall plan has been a great success. Without the Marshall plan we could not have military strength at all. We cannot build military strength in a country where there is no morale, and where the civilian population is hardly eating. That is obvious. I do not believe that the Senator is trying to get me to admit that either we do economic work or we do military work, and that we were wrong not to do military work exclusively. The Senator is too intelligent to want me to make an admission like that. I certainly would not make it.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe that some members of the Foreign Relations Committee told us on the floor of the Senate that it was time to get the question settled, so that the other nations could build up their armed forces. I am quite disillusioned when I learn that, after all, probably it was not so important, and that we emphasized economic recovery, rather than getting the Western European people busy to defend themselves.

Now we are requested to pass a draft bill to take the 18-year-old boys, to make up, apparently, for the lack of interest of those countries, or probably their policy, following our advice, of not getting ready to defend themselves. That is a thing which the American people ought to know. I did not know that that was actually the fact. I have suspected it. This is the first time I have heard anyone on the floor of the Senate, more or less officially from the Foreign Relations Committee, admit that that was what happened.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I am not official, any more than he is.

Mr. WATKINS. At least the Senator is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am not.

Mr. LODGE. I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but I am not at all official in the sense in which the Senator uses that term. I have said for years that we have been late, and that we have dragged our feet. We have lacked vision. We have thrown away the initiative which we had won by force of arms. We have made a series of tragic miscalculations, any one of which might have resulted in disaster. I hope and believe that we are going to work out of it, and that we are going to regain the initiative which we threw away. But there is no doubt that our leadership was dreadfully lacking in vision and foresight in 1945 and 1946 and at other times.

Mr. WATKINS. But we are still asked to follow that same leadership at the present time, are we not?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know who is asking the Senator to do what.

Mr. WATKINS. I mean the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. It is more a case of prodding them to do the right thing than it is of following them. I think they are often too little and too late. I do not believe that we should try to put obstacles in their path at those times when they happen to do the right thing. On the contrary, I think we ought to be urging them on to greater efforts. I will join the Senator from Utah at any time in urging the administration to go faster and do more. Will the Senator join with me?

Mr. WATKINS. I certainly will join with the Senator. I have been working on the problem for several years. However, it seems that we should have started 10 years ago to get immediate action. After all the arguments which have been made, we have taken action and have voted appropriations. After appropriating something like $60,000,000,000 for our own defense, and for the purpose of getting armaments to the other nations, we learn that they are practically without any defense.

We now say, "Well, they are doing as well as we are, because, after all, we advised them, laid emphasis on economic recovery, and did not pay too much attention to defense." It seems to me that kind of leadership does not merit the confidence of the American people. I do not believe the Senator from Massachusetts or any of the others of us are going to get anywhere in following that kind of leadership. Since we cannot receive such leadership, we as Members of the Senate should provide the leadership.

Mr. LODGE. Since the leadership does not go out of office until January 1953 under the Constitution, we cannot expect any change until then.

Mr. WATKINS. The administration is not leading. The people are far out in front, and the Congress should come somewhere up near to the point where the people are now.

Mr. LODGE. I am 100 percent with the Senator from Utah that public opinion has been far ahead of the Government on many an occasion. As one of the first Members of this body to point out the tragic errors of those who are in power, I cannot but agree with the Senator when he adverts to those errors.

I now yield the floor.

## COST OF LIVING AND ROLL-BACK OF PRICES—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR LODGE AND ERIC A. JOHNSTON

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence which I have had with Mr. Eric A. Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, concerning the present cost of living and the need for rolling back prices of the necessities of life to the June 1950 level.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

ERIC A. JOHNSTON,
*Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: Information furnished to me by the Library of Congress indicates that the Consumer's Price Index for moderate income families in large cities has increased since June 15, 1950, by more than 11 percent in food and clothing, more than 5 percent in fuel, electricity and refrigeration and almost 20 percent on house furnishings.

I very much doubt that the incomes, wages, and salaries of consumers have had a corresponding increase and I would like to ask you, therefore, to use your authority at Price Administrator to roll back the prices to the level which prevailed on June 15.

I would like very much to have your response to this request.

Very sincerely yours,
HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
*United States Senator.*

---

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY,
*Washington, D. C., February 27, 1951.*

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: With further reference to your letters of February 6 and February 15, let me say that I feel as keenly as you do about the hardships endured by consumers as a consequence of the rapid rise in prices since last June. As an initial measure to stop this upward spiral we undertook the drastic move of a general price-wage freeze a month ago. You are fully conscious, I am sure, of the enormous complexity of our economy and of the need to keep it functioning as smoothly as possible in order to

maintain a maximum flow of goods and services. In taking rapid and across-the-board action to stop inflation, therefore, we must proceed in ways which do not defeat the major objectives of our national policy. Had we attempted to turn the clock back suddenly and without regard to the extent to which price and wage changes over a period of 8 months had developed throughout the economy, we would have inevitably brought on severe dislocations, inequities, and stoppages of production at greater cost to our defense effort.

We are now engaged in bringing inflation to a full halt by the development of policies and standards in every field which are consistent with a stable price level and by making our controls effective through the construction of regulations tailored to meet specific areas. In this process we shall make every effort to achieve roll-backs in prices where they are practicable and justifiable. I am glad to know from your letter that you recognize the need for roll-backs and will support us in our efforts to achieve them.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC A. JOHNSTON.

## AUDUBON CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to notice which I gave earlier this afternoon I now ask unanimous consent to have considered, out of order, Calendar No. 123, Senate bill 248, authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year. I should say that about a week ago, realizing that the year is rapidly passing—the year which is sought to be proclaimed as the year of observance of the Audubon Centennial honoring this great naturalist and artist, I approached the majority and minority leaders and obtained from them the assurance that they would have no objection to having this bill considered at the first possible opportunity when there was a lull in the Senate proceedings. I believe there will be no debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 248) authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 248), which is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year in observance of the one-hundredth anniversary of the death of John James Audubon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask leave to address the Senate for 2 minutes upon this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would gladly permit the bill to be passed without any discussion at all, except for the fact that I think the bill relates to an historical occasion which deserves mention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

John James Audubon was not only one of the world's greatest naturalists and the greatest painter of birds and animals we have ever had in America, but he made his hundreds of paintings which constitute by far the greatest collection of such paintings in existence, from natural life, as found by him from Labrador to the Florida keys and from Pennsylvania to Texas. He had to undertake much traveling at a time when travel was very difficult. He did his very valuable work when there were no mounted specimens and no pictures, when he had to observe the birds in their natural habitat in order to preserve for mankind and for all time the beautiful pictures of American bird life as our birds then existed in profusion.

Unfortunately, quite a number of the birds which he portrayed have now become extinct. Fortunately, he faithfully portrayed and preserved their beauty for all of us for all time.

Mr. President, without saying more on the general subject, I should like to add that in Florida we have particular reason to be grateful to the great society which bears the name of Audubon, through a period of service of more than 40 years that society alone was able to preserve from destruction and probable extinction certain rare varieties of birds and the other animal and vegetable life now protected by our Government in the Everglades National Park. That service of love was rendered, notwithstanding the slaying of one of the wardens, the numerous hardships and difficulties and the great expense which was entailed. I am sure that all lovers of nature in the United States would want tribute to be here given to the Audubon Society, which is carrying on so nobly in the traditions of John James Audubon.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I was a member of the committee which heard the evidence in support of the bill. I wish to be associated with the Senator from Florida in the comments he has so eloquently made with respect to the objectives of the bill and the work which has been done by the Audubon Society and the one for whom it was named. I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that this bill does not propose an appropriation or call for the payment of any money. It is one of those rare measures which sometimes come before the Senate. Therefore I am most heartily in favor of its immediate passage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a New Englander, I wish to add a word in favor of the measure providing for an Audubon centennial year. Audubon painted many New England birds and animals. He was in New England for a considerable time. As the proud possessor of a volume of his paintings, I certainly am very happy to join in urging the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 248) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly respecting my amendment lettered B, the pending amendment before the Senate. I wish to advert for a moment to the history of the amendment in the committee. After thorough discussion, I was delighted with the fact that when the roll was called my very good friend, the very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], voted with me in support of the 21-month service amendment. We stood alone. But I do not think that is a new experience for either one of us. I then offered, in committee, as I now have pending at the desk, Mr. President, an amendment to limit the period of service to 24 months. Once again the very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] voted with me on that amendment. Again we stood alone. But if the Senator from Georgia has had the same experience that the junior Senator from Oregon had in his conversations with colleagues on the committee he probably knows that some colleagues on the committee said that although they voted against me and against him, they thought there was a great deal of merit in both the 21-month service amendment and the 24-month service amendment. I make these comments about my plan to offer a 24-month service amendment if I lose on the 21-month amendment because I wish to get the record straight, at least. If I should lose in my effort to secure the adoption of the 21-month service amendment, and then were to offer my 24-month service amendment, I suppose I would then be charged with inconsistency, as I was charged the other day, and as I was charged again today—simply because I try to be a practical legislator and take into account the parliamentary situation which confronts us on the floor of the Senate as we come to vote on various proposals. The other day I explained all of this in the RECORD in some detail, so I shall not dwell on it very long today, other than to say that when I am found agreeing to modify a proposal or to perfect one of my amendments, it is usually the result of one of two things which has happened on the floor of the Senate: either I have become convinced that on the merits, I should have had the modification in the amendment in the first sentence; or, second, I shall be frank to say, as I was last Friday—for which I have today been charged with inconsistency—that although I am still of the opinion that the proposed modification does not fully coincide with my view in the matter, nevertheless I would be willing to accept the modification of the final result would be better than what was proposed in the bill then before the Senate.

Mr. President, let the first among us who has not followed the same parliamentary course of action, stand up and profess his innocence regarding never yielding to the necessary legislative process of going along with conscionable

compromises in order to win, if he can, a majority vote for a final result which he thinks will be better than what is proposed on the floor of the Senate by the proponents of a bill which he seeks to have modified.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The amendment B, which is now before us, calls for 21 months of service. I understood the able Senator from Oregon to say that he also has an amendment calling for 24 months of service.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will permit me to make a comment at this point, I should first like to ask a question in connection with the comment. One point which occurs to me, as I hear the amendment explained, is that I have understood that the 26-month period which has been referred to has been selected primarily for the purpose of making it possible for each person inducted to have 1 month of annual leave each year. In other words, the figure 26 months is arrived at by adding 2 months for such annual leave to the period of service for 24 months. I further understand that if the taking of annual leave were optional, the inductees could then be discharged after 24 months of service, if they chose not to take their annual leave during each of the 2 years; or they could be discharged after 24 months of service if they chose not to take their leave. I should like to ask the Senator whether my understanding of that matter is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator mean that he is correct, in that that is what we are told will happen?

Mr. THYE. At least that was the explanation given as to the committee's opinion in regard to the question asked in that connection, when it was explained that if the boy wished to forego his annual leave, he could obtain his discharge after 24 months, and thereupon could enter school or college, and that the taking of annual leave would be optional.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that is part of the explanation given by the majority for the proposed 26-month term of service which would result from the enactment of this bill; but it is completely unsatisfactory to me, as I shall explain in some little detail as I proceed with my remarks when I reach that point in my speech.

Suffice it to say now that I think that is a part of the come-on or of what I call the sales talk for this bill. However, I think it creates great administrative difficulties, and I think it is a very unsound basis on which to try to sell this bill to the American people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me say to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon that I think he is entirely correct, namely, that so far as the young men of this country are concerned, in most cases they would take their annual leave as it accrued, and thus would have to remain in the service for 26 months. Certainly if I were in such a position, I would take my annual leave as fast as I earned it. That was my experience when I was in the service. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who now is the Presiding Officer of the Senate, was in the service during World War I; and if he were now in the service, I am sure he would take his annual leave as fast as he earned it.

However, I now understand that it is the assumption that if the inductees did not take their annual leave they would be out of the service sooner than 26 months.

On the other hand, I believe the young men will take their annual leave. If they do, under the provisions of the bill they would serve for 26 months. If they serve for 26 months, the question of whether they would be back in college at the beginning of the college year is one with which the committee should concern itself, because I believe we should expect the boys who are inducted to take their annual leave. Certainly, the boys who are inducted now will take their annual leave as rapidly as they earn it. It accrues at the rate of 2½ days for each month of service, as I understand. Does the Senator agree that that is correct?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. THYE. The boys now in the service are being treated differently from the way we propose to treat those who are inducted under this measure. I say to the Senator from Oregon that it is my conviction that he is right in regard to his 24 months' service amendment. It is not my conviction, if I may state my conviction now, that I would agree to his amendment which calls for 21 months of service.

Mr. MORSE. I only ask the Senator to hear me through, as I am sure he will.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator from Minnesota so well that I know that if I could make an argument which he could not answer, in regard to my 21 months' service amendment, he would then come over to my side; in other words, he would then favor the adoption of my amendment calling for 21 months of service.

Mr. THYE. I would be apt to.

Mr. MORSE. Not only would the Senator from Minnesota be apt to, but I know he would then favor the amendment.

Mr. THYE. After all, the purpose of debate is to enable us to obtain all possible information, and particularly on the basis of questions which we may ask.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I did not intend to discuss the leave matter at this point of my speech. However, I shall discuss it at this point because I think in the interest of having continuity on this question in the RECORD we should complete our discussion of it at this point.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in line with what I was just saying, as soon as I finish yielding to the Senator from South Dakota I shall take up the leave issue.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon in yielding to me.

It seems to me that when we take up the question of leave, we come to the question of longevity pay, and then a very interesting question arises, namely, if 26 months is decided upon as the term of service, but if those who serve forego their annual leave, and thus serve for only 24 months, will 24 months or 26 months be used as the basis for computing longevity pay?

Mr. MORSE. Twenty-six months.

Mr. CASE. Is that set forth in the bill?

Mr. MORSE. No, it is not set out in the bill; I think it should have been.

Mr. CASE. It should be spelled out, I believe; because if an inductee serves for 24 months, and then has 2 months of annual leave, which he takes, he would get credit for 26 months of service, which would be 2 more months than he actually served; and in connection with longevity pay, he would receive credit for the full 26 months.

Mr. MORSE. The purpose is that such persons who serve shall receive all the benefits accruing to any other servicemen—benefits such as family assistance and other benefits which would accrue to any serviceman during the period of terminal leave. That is if he gets out at the end of 24 months he would still receive his pay and benefits for 26 months.

Mr. CASE. So that if the man only serves the 24 months of active duty he still has the benefit of the 26 months' service?

Mr. MORSE. He still gets the benefit of 26 months' service, and I think it figures out 26 months and 1 week.

Mr. President, I desire to say this about the matter of leave, one of the things, indeed, which I think wrong with this compromise. Let us not fool ourselves. This is another one of these little "come-ons" put into the bill, to give the public the impression that things are not so bad; but I want to say this kind of provision in the bill disturbs me very very much, as to the tone of the entire bill. I think we ought to do things very directly. I think this leave provision which is provided for in this bill is going to permit a great deal of indirection and cause considerable confusion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MORSE. No; I am going to finish my explanation of this. I shall then be very happy to yield. I think this leave provision which is provided for in this bill is going to cause a great deal of confusion and a great deal of misleading of these boys. I do not want to be a party to it.

The second point I want to make is that a leave system in the Military Establishment is either desirable for the boy or it is not desirable for the boy. This system we have worked out, of 2½ days a month leave for the boy, much of which we know is accumulated as his period of service goes by, has either been placed in the bill by the military because they think it is helpful to the morale and health of the boy in the service, or there is no reason for it. I know of no other justification for it.

Then, Mr. President, I say it is wrong to say to the boy, while he is serving under all those pressures which go along with military service, "We are just going to leave it up to your individual discretion and your own judgment." In actual practice, the boy is not going to have much discretion, because it does not work out in the Army or in any other branch of the military service that the boy is going to exercise very much discretion about these things.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator point out what he is talking about regarding the leave provision?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Texas just walked through the door, and did not get my introductory remarks. Had he been here from the beginning, I do not think he would have to ask me what I am talking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator entered the door and heard the Senator from Oregon talking about the leave provision. It is the opinion of the Senator from Texas that the Senator from Oregon does not remember that the leave provision was stricken from the bill by the full committee and that there is no such provision in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator refer me to the page.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will turn to page 73——

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that under the present bill which is before the Senate, the term of service has been cut down to 26 months, with the understanding that the boy can take his leave or accumulate it. It is my understanding that in actual practice if he accumulates his leave his service would amount to the equivalent of 26 months and 1 week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will yield for an explanation, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] offered an amendment in the full committee which resulted in striking out the leave provision of 26 months and 1 week.

If the Senator will turn to page 73, line 19, the Senator will discover the following language:

(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of 26 consecutive months——

Mr. MORSE. How about his leave?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is no leave in it. When he wants to take leave, he takes it. The effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was to strike out the subcommittee's provision. The Senator from Oregon has been speaking for several days about a provision which was stricken out in the full committee. I thank the Senator for having yielded to me, so I could get him straight on it.

Mr. MORSE. Let us see whether we are straight on it. Under the bill in its present form, does the Senator from Texas think it possible for the boy to accumulate his leave and get out sooner?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas thinks it is possible for the boy to get what the law allows him under another statute, namely, 2½ days a month.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator to tell the Senate what the majority thinks the boy can get under the present law, along with this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority thinks the boy will get 2½ days' leave a month, whenever he desires to take it, just as he would under the Senator's 21, or under the Senator's 24, but not as the subcommittee originally recommended, 26 months and 1 week.

Mr. MORSE. And what does the majority of the committee think the boy will be allowed to do under the present wording of the bill, as far as accumulating his leave, so he can get out in the 24 months? The Senator from Oregon wants it distinctly understood in the RECORD that the reason, in his opinion, that there is nothing in the bill about leave is that, after there was discussion in the committee about the subject of leave, it was felt that it could be cut down to the 26 months' figure, and then the boy could accumulate his leave and get out in 24 months, and that the impression will still be left with the country that the committee has reported a 26 months' bill, under which the boy may accumulate his leave and can get out in 24 months. That is the position of the junior Senator from Oregon and his interpretation of what the committee is seeking to accomplish. What I want the RECORD to show is that I think this is a bill for 26 months of military service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. And that, no matter what is done about the leave, in the overwhelming majority of cases, under the pressures of the officers and his colleagues in the service, the boy himself not knowing what is going to be ahead of him for the next year, is going to take the leave as it arises, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But does not the Senator want his colleagues to understand that the only difference between the committee bill and the Senator's amendment is that the committee bill provides 26 months, and the Senator's amendment provides 21 months, and the leave applies to both at the rate of 2½ days a month?

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The chairman of the subcommittee thinks the boy can take his 2½ days' leave per month whenever he chooses. If he chooses to let it accumulate, he may do so, just as he can under the Senator's 21 months, and just as he can under the Senator's 24 months. But the bill says nothing about accumulation of leave, and says nothing about 26 months and 1 week. The Senator has been talking about 26 months and 1 week, and it was stricken out by the full committee.

Mr. MORSE. I want to discuss it with the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. No, I want to discuss this with the Senator from Texas. And does the Senator from Texas recall that, when the Senator from Virginia talked about accumulating the leave, the consensus around the table was that that end could be accomplished without putting that language in the bill, and that, therefore, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in regard to leave would not be necessary, because, as the bill is presently worded, and under the existing law, he thought he might be allowed to accumulate that leave?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has the same recollection as the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. It has been my understanding that the 26-month term was adopted by the majority because they believed their plan for accumulating leave would be accomplished just as well that way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But that can be done under existing law. There is no one thing in this bill about leave. The Senator is talking about 26 months and 1 week, and the Senator from Texas was hoping that the Senator would admit that it had been stricken out from the bill. If the Senator does not wish to admit it, and if he wants to continue to leave the impression that the bill provides for 26 months and 1 week, it is up to the Senator from Oregon. But the Senator from Texas wants the RECORD to show that it was stricken out of the bill in the full committee, and that there is no language in the bill at the present time which refers to leave.

That is all the Senator from Texas wants the RECORD to show.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about that, but the Senator from Oregon does want the Senate to understand the history of this bill and to understand that the committee first had a so-called leave provision in it, and it was then stricken out because the committee's position was, "It is surplusage, anyway, because a man can get out in 24 months if he exercises his accumulated leave privilege."

Furthermore I thought and still do that under item C beginning on line 20 of page 77 of the bill the President could by executive order decrease the period of active service by providing for some

such leave plan as the committee had under consideration and that therefore the original language in the bill as reported by the subcommittee was no longer needed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One more thing. The Senator will admit, if he will turn to page 33 of the report, that there is no provision in the bill for 26 months and 5 days service.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that the total amount of service the boy would be subject to, if he does not take his leave, will be the equivalent of 26 months and 1 week, and if I am in error, I should be very glad to be corrected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is in error, and he has been in error ever since the Byrd amendment was voted on. The Senator from Texas has attempted to point out that error. If the Senator will read the language again, he will not find the 1-week provision included, except in his conversation. The bill says 26 consecutive months.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon has based his comments on his understanding of the last discussion we had in executive session as to what the effect of the provision would be on a boy, and we will have to get the minutes of that meeting, if minutes there are. If there are minutes, I think they will show that, under discussion with the Senator from Oregon, it was demonstrated that the total time was to be 26 months and 1 week. If I am in error about that, I shall be very happy to get the record corrected. However, I shall continue to press for my 21 months service amendment, because I think it is preferable to the 26 months flat proposal of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will look at page 33 of the report, great lawyer that the Senator is, I have no doubt he will know that the period is 26 months.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon is not a very good lawyer, but he is good enough of a country lawyer to know that it is necessary to get behind the language of a bill to find out what it really means in administration. What I am going to keep on trying to find out is what the 26 months in the bill means in application when it comes to the matter of leave. When we get the record of the discussion we had in the committee about the leave matter, as the committee decided they would strike the language about leave because the rest of the language of the bill would accomplish the same end and I think will show the basis of my understanding about this problem. I say again that I believe the 26 months is entirely too long a service period to accomplish the purpose to which I shall address myself in a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Regardless of what the evaluation of the Senator is of himself, and his capacity as a lawyer, the Senator from Texas has every confidence in the legal ability of the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Texas is very confident that if the Senator from Oregon will turn to page 33 of the report he will realize that the period of service is to be 26 consecutive months.

The Senator from Oregon correctly states the position of the subcommittee, but when we got to the full committee the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] took the position that the whole matter of leave was confusing. He said the subcommittee recommended 26 months and 1 week, but that we should cut that out and leave it at 26 months. After some discussion it was decided that we would leave the period of service at 26 months. That is the way the language reads, and that is what the minutes show. I wanted to clarify the Senator on this matter, and now that his thinking has been clarified he knows it is 26 months.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit my argument as to why 21 months would be better than 26, with the understanding that the Armed Services Committee thought that they could accomplish the same leave objective on the 26th month's basis as they could on the basis of the language of the bill as it came from the subcommittee. I shall not lose sight of the fact that that is one of the effects they tried to accomplish in the bill.

Mr. CASE and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CASE. Would it help any to ask whether, if a soldier should serve without taking any leave, he could serve for 24 months and then be entitled to leave on the basis of 26 months? If he had leave for 26 months at 2½ days a month, that would amount to 65 days. So, is it fair to say that one might serve 24 consecutive months without taking any leave, and have 65 days of service leave coming?

Mr. MORSE. That was my understanding, but unless I misunderstood the Senator from Texas, I do not believe that is his understanding. I shall look into that matter further when I get off the floor, but my understanding is exactly the same as that of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The question occurs to me, how did the Senator arrive at 26 months? Perhaps this question should be directed to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas. Why was the figure of 26 months arrived at? Why did the committee not select an even 2-year period?

Mr. MORSE. I would prefer to have the Senator ask that of the Senator from Texas when he is making his explanation of the bill. I want the RECORD to show why I think it was done, and I want to be perfectly fair to the Senator from Texas. I want him in his time to give his explanation of the bill in respect to its relation to my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will yield, I do not wish to explain it, but I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to page 33 of the report, where he will find the information as to why the committee arrived at the figure about which he inquired.

Mr. THYE. Page 33 of the report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is the part of the committee report which sets forth the majority's explanation. It does not change my opinion as to why I think the provision is in the bill.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield further, I may say that I have studied the report and have found a great deal of language in the report which is just so many words. That is what led me to ask the question. I have studied the report, and I have found more large words in it that are not commonly used than I have read in quite a while in any report, and that is what led me to ask the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas apologizes to the Senator for using the language employed in the report. If the Senator will give us the kind of language he would like to have used, the next report will be consonant with his wishes.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Oregon will allow me, I realize that the committee which writes a report is responsible for writing the report. I am just as much concerned about our national defense, possibly, as is any other Senator on this floor, and I read this report for the sole purpose of attempting to make up my mind as to what my position would be on the various amendments which would come before the Senate. As I read the report, I could not help realizing that in view of some of the language in the report, one had to be a Philadelphia lawyer before he could understand the intent of the language. I am sorry if I happen to come from a section of the country where we are not quite as qualified to understand the big words which may sometimes be used as others are; but I may say that in Minnesota there are some very intelligent people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the language which the Senator from Minnesota cannot understand? I have before me page 33 of the report. I am not a Philadelphia lawyer or any other kind of a lawyer, but if there is anything on page 33 which the Senator from Minnesota cannot understand, I should like to have him tell me what it is, and I shall try to explain it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Texas and the Senator from Minnesota will retire to the cloakroom and discuss the matter, I am sure they can clear up their views about the report very quickly. I may say that I thought the report was a very good report in presenting the point of view of the Senator from Texas and the majority of the committee, and I congratulate the Senator from Texas on the report. I merely wish to take certain exceptions to the report, that is all.

Mr. President, my interpretation as to why the provision for 26 months was adopted, was that there was a desire to work out a compromise in the committee. That was a perfectly proper desire,

and the procedure was perfectly proper. We follow said procedure all the time. We have to get different points of view together, in order to get a majority vote and get a bill out at all. I think that is exactly what happened in this case.

Mr. President, I think there was a recognition on the part of the majority of the committee that the 27 months' case was not very effectively made by the military. I think also that the majority was a little uncertain about supporting a 27 months' program, when General Eisenhower himself, in testifying before the committee—and I do not quote him verbatim, but I am sure I am quoting his meaning exactly—said that in his personal calculations—and he was very careful to point out that he had not discussed the subject with the people in the Pentagon—he had struck upon the figure of 25 months. As committees operate, the majority was then confronted with answering the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon in asking for 21 months. I think the greatest influence upon the committee was the fact that the very able chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], made perfectly clear that he was voting for 21 months, which he did, and that failing to have 21 months adopted he would vote for 24 months, which he did. My personal opinion is that the majority felt that they would be in a stronger position on the floor of the Senate if they did not take exactly what the military had asked for, but cut the time down a little. So they none too generously cut off a month, and left it at 26 months. That is my interpretation of how we got the figure of 26. It was all a part of the compromise procedure which characterizes committees working on a bill.

Why do I think 21 months would be better than either 27 months, which was the period asked for by the military, or 26 months, the period asked by the committee? It is because the military has convinced me for some years now that it is very important for the security of our country that we build up as fast as we can the largest possible pool of militaryily trained manpower. Furthermore, Mr. President, I have been convinced by the military in that regard by the argument that if we do not have such a pool of trained manpower, the military will have to draw heavily on the Reserves, many of whom are veterans, or upon the veterans themselves, who have already served a considerable period of time in World War II, to go into service immediately in case a sudden emergency, calling for an increase of our manpower, should be visited upon us. I do not think it is fair to make such a heavy call upon the Reserves or upon the veterans, when we have the opportunity in this country of turning to a very large pool of manpower, which under a 21-month training period is capable thereafter of being called upon first in case of a sudden emergency.

Mr. President, I am not going to argue at great length this afternoon in support of my amendment because I think very little argument is needed. There cannot be any denying the fact that if it is true, as the military has kept insisting before the committee, that the period of greatest emergency for our country is the next 4-year period, then we must train men as fast as we can. The military officials keep telling us that if we can only get through the next 4-year period we will have a good chance of averting world war III. I believe that to be true. Therefore, it should not take much argument to prove that we could train many more men under a 21-month training period than we could under a 27- month or 26-month program, the first proposed by the military, and the second proposed by way of a compromise by the majority of the committee. I think it is important that we do so, Mr. President. I want to see to it that we train as many people as we can during the next 4 years. It is necessary that we give as many people as we can some basic training, and some practice in the field. As I said earlier this afternoon, one of my reasons for being such an ardent proponent of universal military training is that I think such a program—and it should have been started many years ago—would have given us a reservoir of men in this country who had received basic training in the use of weapons and in the various problems that go into a 4- to 6-month basic training program. We need such trained men for use to us in case of a sudden emergency, and those not called for combat service could be used on the home front for civilian defense purposes. One of the reasons for my believing in a universal military training program is that, aside from giving our men basic training, which they would need as a basis for further training for combat, it would give them the kind of basic training which would be of very great assistance in civilian defense in the various target areas of the United States. Let there be no mistake about it that if war should come with Russia as soon as next week our military experts are agreed that some of the target areas in the United States would be hit. In such event, we would need a trained manpower on the home front to take over immediately the whole problem of civilian defense. That is one of the reasons I wanted for some years to have a universal military training program in force, so that we could get the largest possible pool of trained manpower.

Mr. President, what are the facts in regard to the kind of training a man would receive under a 21-month program? In discussing the question, we must keep in mind that we have two bodies of military manpower. We have enlistees and we have draftees. We are talking today about draftees. Enlistees go in for a longer period of service than draftees. As another amendment of mine discloses, I think we take men for too long a period of enlistment. Unless we can work out a ratio under which the services, including the Navy and the Air Force, would be required to take a proportionate share of the inductees our selective-service procedure is unfair to the inductee. I think that we are taking too many enlistees in the Navy and Air Force under the terrific pressure which is brought to bear on the young men, that if they do not enlist in the Air Force or the Navy they are likely to be drafted into the infantry. If we keep in mind the distinction between the enlistee group and the draftee group, we will find that for the most part the trainees for the highly technical jobs in the Military Establishment are selected, if possible, from the ranks of the enlistees, in the first instance. Not all such jobs are filled in that way. I want it to be perfectly clear in the RECORD that the junior Senator from Oregon understands, as do other members of the committee, that there are some jobs in the Army which call for training in excess of the basic period of 4 to 6 months, but that they are small in number compared with the total manpower force in the Army. Furthermore, Mr. President, if the Selective Service Act operates efficiently, and these men are placed in accordance with their special aptitudes and backgrounds, the period of training for so-called specialty jobs would be much shorter than is thought to be necessary on the basis of taking all men who have never had any experience whatsoever with the type of work performed in such jobs. For example, take the case of a mechanic. I am not arguing that a mechanic for service on Army tanks, Army trucks, or other Army mechanical equipment, can be trained in a few months. However, I am saying that of the total number of inductees who are to be taken through the draft, if an efficient job has been done in classifying them in accordance with their past experience and their aptitudes and training, among those draftees a large body of mechanics, or men with mechanical training can be assigned to the so-called mechanic specialty jobs. Thus the period of time for their training will be much shorter than some of my friends on the majority side of this issue would lead us to believe.

But with respect to the overwhelming majority of the inductees, the hearings of the committee leave no room for doubt that the basic training necessary to make combat soldiers of them will require from 4 to 6 months. That is the base statistic which I do not wish to lose sight of in this debate on the length-of-service issue.

If that be true—and it is true, because in all our discussion of the universal military training program, the period of basic training has been assumed to be from 4 to 6 months—we must eliminate that period from any calculation as to the amount of time these men will be available for assignment in the field, although it must not be forgotten that when we are training a great many of those men in continental United States, during the basic training period we have a substantial number of men in this country for so-called domestic defense, leaving our foreign assignments for the men who have already received the basic training.

But I say, if it is true—and it certainly is—that they can get this training in from 4 to 6 months, we must add to this figure of 4 to 6 months the time required

for transporting these men back and forth to their assignments. The military should be required to eliminate some of the time which the men spend standing around waiting for the cumbersome military red tape to spin itself. That process is wasteful of a great amount of time. The majority have said that in round numbers we must count on another 2 months for waiting and travel time. So that brings us up to 6 to 8 months. Then they talk about 2 months' leave. As I say, Mr. President, that leave is not going to be taken all in one chunk. If the leave service is properly administered in the Military Establishment, the leave will be periodic, so that it can be helpful to the boy from the standpoint of his morale and health. However, I will lump in that 2 months' time in these calculations.

That gets us up to 8 to 10 months. Thus, giving to the military all the benefit of the time element in its favor, my amendment would leave 11 to 13 months, after the man has been trained, for actual field practice and service. I think that is long enough, as of now, in view of any plans which have been presented by the military to date in regard to their future use of manpower abroad, either in Europe or in Korea. When they want to come before us and frankly tell us what their plan is, if any, for any extension of the number of men in Europe or any extension of the number of men in Korea, I will then be willing to consider what additional legislation they need to supply additional manpower.

But I am not going to vote on legislation in terms of some possible conjecturing on the part of the military, or on the basis of any such vague statement as General Marshall made the other day before the House committee, in respect to this manpower bill not leaving the military in a position so that it can increase its ceiling beyond four million if it decides all of a sudden that it wishes to do so. As to that, I simply say that General Marshall should be required to come before the Congress and prove the military need, because, as I said before, that is one of the constitutional checks which we should exercise upon the military.

So when we give the benefit of the doubt to the military in respect to the time element, it is not true that the amendment of the junior Senator from Oregon cripples the military. We have been operating under a 21-month service provision for quite some time. It is rather interesting that the military, in their testimony, did not say anything particularly negative about the 21-month program under which we have been operating. Certainly they would like to have 27 months, but they were not heard to say before us that they have not been doing a good job of training these men under a 21-month program. To the contrary, the impression that they left with the committee, or at least left with me—and I speak only for myself—is that they are rather proud of the job they have been doing under a 21-month service program.

I was not surprised that they wanted more time. I am never surprised when the military wants more of anything, because my experience with them is that they always want more of everything that they think they can get out of the Congress. But I am satisfied that it is very important that we keep some limitations or checks upon them, in view of the fact that they are not going to send more than 100,000 men to Europe for some time in the future, subject to the understanding that the State Department and Defense Department intentions will remain somewhat the same as they are at the present time. The Defense Department has not told us in committee that they have any plans for a large increase in the operations in Korea. I would that they either would have such plans or follow a course of action which would stop the large number of casualties which we are suffering in Korea, by falling back to a line of defense which would save us those casualties until the international diplomats, the administration, the State Department, and the military can get together on some blueprint of action in Asia. Therefore I say that in view of the representations which the military have made to us, I do not believe that they have made a case for more than 21 months of service, as of now.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think it is very unfair, as I stated the other day, to take men into the armed services, particularly the 24- and 25-year-old men, who are being taken out of their grocery stores, their accounting offices, and their various economic enterprises, for any period of time longer than is necessary to give them the training they need to defend this country in case of an all-out war, and to put that training into field service practice for a reasonable period of time. I say that an amendment which provides for approximately a year of field service after basic training is a pretty fair and reasonable proposal. I think it could provide for a year of such service if the military were to improve some of its operations so as to cut down some of the loss of time caused by its wasteful practices, I say that any proposal which gives the inductees a year of field training, in view of present tensions, is fair and reasonable.

Then, Mr. President, I am thinking, as I have said so many times in the hearings and in the executive sessions of the committee, of those boys who will not get any training at all if 3 years from now, for example, an all-out war breaks with Russia. We know that then men eligible for military service in this country, who have not had any training at all, will find themselves lucky indeed if they do not get into combat within 3 or 4 months after the outbreak of that war. We have done that in the past, Mr. President. It has been unfair to thousands of American boys who have found themselves in the front line with less than 4 months' training. Now we have a chance of training a much larger number of boys in the time that apparently is being allowed us before the possibilities of an all-out war develops, by adopting a 21 months' service program. I think we ought to adopt it.

I think the Senator from Texas knows from conversations I have had with him, that I am in some doubt, although I have not given up all hope as to whether or not the Senate will go for 21 months. I am going to give the Members of the Senate a chance to do so unless it seems wise to work out a compromise. But if I fail to receive a majority for the 21 months' period provision, I am going to offer my next amendment, which is for 24 months' service, and I am very hopeful, on the basis of a considerable number of conversations I have had with Members of the Senate today in the cloakroom, that the yea-and-nay vote on that amendment will show that I have the votes for 24 months, and that, in my opinion, of course, is better than 26 months. That will enable us to train some more men than can be trained under the 26 months' program. Although it is not what I would like to see the Senate adopt, if I lose on the 21 months' provision I will, on the old legislative theory that part of a loaf is better than none, push the 24 months' amendment. However, I might consider a compromise on 24 months before we vote on 21 months if such an agreement can be reached among us.

As far as I am concerned, I have now made the argument—supplementing the argument I have made twice before on the floor of the Senate—on the 21 months' amendment, and I hope we can have an early roll-call vote.

Before I yield the floor I want to say in good nature that I hope the majority leader has already discovered that it would have been a good timesaver if we had adopted the unanimous-consent agreement I was willing to go along with the other day for a final vote on the bill next Wednesday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from Oregon is not endeavoring to make the majority leader sorry because he did not agree to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. No, no. I have been talking about 30 minutes and am about through discussing this particular amendment. I wish to say to my good friend from Georgia that I went along with the request for unanimous consent on the time to vote on my first amendment. Although I do not like unanimous-consent agreements, I will say that whenever my amendments are involved before the Senate, I do not think it would be very sporting of me to let my attitude on a general policy or procedure in the Senate cause me to block unanimous-consent voting agreements on my own amendments. I am perfectly willing to enter into a unanimous-consent voting agreement now this afternoon on the pending amendment or on the bill, but I just want the RECORD to show that the responsibility for not having a unanimous-consent voting agreement will have to be placed at the doorstep of the majority leader. If there is any rule of germaneness that it is desired to have included in the unanimous-consent request to vote on a certain hour, I should like to have the Senator from Georgia write it out, because I know that if he writes it out, he will have it to his com-

plete saisfaction so far as the rule of germaneness is concerned. I said the other day that any provision with respect to germaneness that Senators wanted to place in the unanimous-consent request could be placed in it. So I do not want to hear even a whisper that my unanimous-consent agreement has some "sleeper" in it about some role of germaneness. Let the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle write in the agreement the rule of germaneness and I will accept it. I will pass judgment on the rest of it, as to whether or not the proposed agreement permits of adequate debate on the amendments as they come along.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my close and personal friend, the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did I understand the Senator from Oregon to say that he would be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement now on the amendment he has offered and which is now pending?

Mr. MORSE. Yes and all other amendments I may offer. I do not want the Senator from Texas to continue with the assumption which, based upon his arguments, I feel he has been making, along with my good friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], that I am going to call up all my amendments. The amendments I shall call up depend upon what happens to my earlier amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What time would the Senator from Oregon suggest as the time for a vote?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator from Texas make any suggestion respecting time. I can almost give him the assurance that I will go along with him respecting the time, because I am ready to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How many amendments does the Senator from Oregon propose to call up?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know how many amendments I may call up. That does not make any difference, however, from the standpoint of fixing the time to vote. If the Senator will suggest a time for voting, I will be able to call up the amendments I may wish to call up during that period of time.

I hope, as I yield the floor now and somebody else proceeds to discuss my amendment, that some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle will give me an invitation to step out into the cloak room with them and we will discuss proposals for an unanimous-consent agreement to vote, because I am ready and willing, and I have been ever since the other afternoon when I offered my unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Wednesday.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this amendment would provide that there be no change in the present 21-month period of service for men inducted through selective service and for members of the reserve component who are ordered to active duty.

In the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee, it is merely another method of hacking at our armed forces at a time when the danger is overwhelming and the need is great.

What would it do?

First, it would add approximately 20 percent to our manpower requirements for one of the major segments of our active duty personnel. Second, it would seriously—perhaps disastrously—reduce the combat effectiveness of all three of the services by depriving them, during the next 2 years alone, of 5 months of the most productive and effective service of nearly a million and a half men.

Third, beginning in June 1952, it would impose upon us an additional manpower requirement which would claw far more deeply into the 18-year-old group than the plan which the committee formulated.

Fourth, if the period of service were reduced from 26 months to 21 months, it would mean that during the next 2 years alone we would be required to replace, 5 months ahead of present schedule, all of the men who have been inducted or ordered to active duty from the reserves—even those who have had no previous service and are not veterans.

Fifth, it will make it completely impossible to screen out the deserving veterans from the reserve components now on active duty—men who have sacrificed much in combat during World War II—men who have family responsibilities, many of whom were themselves inducted at the age of 18 during World War II. Under the committee's recommendations, it might well be possible that many of these men could return to their homes before their full tour of duty had expired.

Count them up. One, two, three, four, five. This amendment strikes 5 telling blows at our national security. This might well be called the 5-in-1 amendment.

This amendment would mean that in the next 2 years alone we would have to provide 300,000 additional men, 150,000 each year. The only place to find these men would be to call up additional veterans, rip apart the existing National Guard units and call them into the service as individuals, or to grab additional men from the 18-year-old group.

Beginning in June, 1952, the date when the annual turnover will begin to stabilize at approximately 900,000 minimum under the bill as recommended by the committee, we would be confronted with an annual manpower requirement which would be impossible to sustain.

It is well to remember that in this world, over which hangs the ever-present hammer and sickle of the Red Nazis, combat effectiveness is essential. We need it now—not tomorrow. We do not want to wait until tomrrow or the day after tomorrow.

Reducing the period of service from 26 months to 21 months will, according to the testimony of the Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, reduce the military effectiveness of our overseas combat forces by almost 50 percent.

Of the 3,500,000-man Armed Force which is anticipated, a certain minimum of men must be in combat units. If we reduce the term of service, it will mean that we shall have more men coming into training, and thus shall require that more men be withdrawn from our combat forces, for training purposes. It will also require that more men be withdrawn from our combat forces, for the purpose of running the pipeline overseas and back. What is the significance of this? It is simply that we shall have to increase the over-all strength of our Armed Forces in order to maintain the necessary combat strength.

This means a further drain on our manpower pool. Senators can readily see that this amendment effectively pulls the plug out of our manpower pool, permitting our precious manpower to disappear needlessly down the drain.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts very expertly analyzed this problem during the course of his remarks on the opening day of the consideration of the pending bill. No one is more hopeful than I am of seeing the period of service reduced from 26 months to 21 months or 18 months or even less; but the inescapable fact is that we cannot sustain a force of 3,500,000 men on a basis of 21 months of service, unless we call upon far greater numbers of 18-year-olds than are contemplated under the terms of this bill.

We cannot compromise with uncompromising facts, Mr. President. We must meet this issue head-on. We cannot maintain the force which is necessary for our Nation's security, and at the same time retain the induction period at 21 months. The bill contains ample provision by which this period can be reduced overnight, either by the President or, if he fails to do that, by the Congress.

I recommend that this amendment, with its five strikes against security, be rejected.

Mr. President, I would point out to the Senate at this time that by the series of amendments offered, including the one calling for service by those 18 years and 9 months of age, which amendment was defeated so overwhelmingly earlier in the day, the Senator from Oregon would eliminate from the manpower pool 1,273,000 persons. However, the bill, as it relates to 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds, would make eligible and available for the manpower pool only 545,000 men. Yet by the amendments of the Senator from Oregon alone, more than 1,273,000 would be eliminated. So if the amendments of the Senator from Oregon should prevail, it would have been better to merely have extended the present act, instead of bringing in any recommendations whatever.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon, in opening his discussion on this amendment, stated—and correctly—that when this matter was considered in the Armed Services Committee, there were two votes in favor of a 21 months' service limitation, and and that I was one of those who voted

for that limitation. I did so, Mr. President, in the belief that men who were inducted into the services—all into the Army, and almost all of them into the infantry—should have a break and a shorter service than those who willingly and by their own choice enlist in the Air Force or in the Navy.

I have somewhat modified my view since the occasion to which the distinguished Senator from Oregon has referred. If it is any consolation to him, I am perfectly willing to join him in a little inconsistency. I do not do so in the hope that I can share the credit for having a great mind which would not fear the hobgoblin of inconsistency, but I do so because I have met the hard facts in this case and have concluded that a 21-month period is too short to enable us to meet our manpower requirements, particularly because they have been somewhat raised since the bill was reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel that 26 months is too long a period of service at a time when we are not engaged in an all-out war; and I wish here and now to express my deep regret—regret even to the extent of real embarrassment—that my views on this subject are divergent from those of the overwhelming majority of the committee over which I am honored to preside. I never suffered much more anguish of spirit and soul over any matter than I have over this question of the length of service.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The able and distinguished Senator has just touched on the question of whether the period of service shall be 26 months or whether it shall be a lesser number of months. My own feeling was that there should be a lesser number, such as 24. Assume that a boy will graduate from high school in June, and immediately will either enlist or be drafted. If he serves 24 months and then is discharged, under such circumstances, probably he will return to his community in either June or July. Then he will have a month or 6 weeks in which to make a selection of the college in which he would like to enroll. That is not too long a time, because that boy would like to have a few leisure days, and he would be justly entitled to them, after 24 months of service.

For that reason I felt that possibly we would be doing the youths we are taking into the military service greater justice if we provided for 24 months of service, rather than 26 months. If young men go into the service immediately upon the completion of their high-school courses, they will return from service just in time to enroll at the beginning of the college year, inasmuch as the college terms begin in the fall of the year. That is why I felt that it is better to provide for 24 months of service, rather than 26 months.

So I asked why the committee selected the 26-month figure, and why the committee did not select 24 months. I said to my very able and much admired friend, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that I would agree with him if he would offer his 24-month amendment and would drop his 21-month amendment. I said that then I would immediately support him in regard to the 24-month provision.

I am very happy to hear that the chairman of the committee himself is of the conviction that a 24-month period is better than a 26-month period.

I should like to ask the able Senator from Oregon whether he will lay aside his 21-month amendment and will work on his 24-month amendment. Then let us see whether we can arrive at an agreement as to 24 months, instead of 26 months.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Chair and also the Senator from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course what the Senator from Minnesota has said has much meat.

There is another reason why, in my opinion—and this is a very frank statement—the 24-month period is preferable to the 26-month period, namely, that today there is a very decided disposition on the part of the young men who are reaching the age of military service to avoid service in the Ground Forces of the Nation. There has been a tremendous rush of enlistments into the Air Force and into the Navy. Many young men are willing to enlist for terms of 3 years, or 4 years, or 5 years of service in those branches, rather than take their chances upon induction into the Army. Therefore, the Army should be made a little more attractive than this bill proposes to make it. That is another reason why I favor the 24 months of service. If we provide a slightly shorter term of service, more young men will present themselves for induction into the Army, and the Army will be given some of the cream, at least in numbers, of the men who have been enlisting in the Air Force and in the Navy.

The Senator from Minnesota has asked why the committee took this action. The reason is very simple. The action was taken because the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of a period of service of 27 months, and there was very strong argument made to the committee for a period of 30 months.

Mr. President, I had hoped that someone else would offer the amendment I am about to propose to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I have sat here until the Chair called for a vote upon the amendment. No one else has offered it, and so, if it is in order, I desire to propose an amedment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, to strike out, wherever they may appear, the words "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-four." In my opinion, it will save us a great deal of time.

To be perfectly candid with my friend from Oregon, I do not think there is even a remote possibility that he will have the votes which would shorten the period to 21 months. I say that, as one who has changed his mind, and who thinks it would be unwise at this time to have the 21 months' period of service, but who does believe that 24 months of required service under the terms of this bill would be sufficient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. MORSE, wherever they appear, it is proposed to strike out the words "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-four."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I don't think the Senator should be too sure that there is no possibility of my amendment passing. I think it has a chance of passing but not as good a chance as my 24 months' service proposal. I can still count, and I think the Senator from Georgia is correct in saying that, if we were to count noses now, I would not get a majority for the 21 months' proposal.

As I said earlier, after a vote on my 21 months' amendment, on which I surmised I may be defeated, I intend, as evidenced by the fact that I already have an amendment for 24 months at the desk, to call it up. If my amendment, as proposed to be amended by the Senator from Georga were voted down, my next move would be for 24 months. I do not know what assurance the Senator from Georgia can give me, but I should like to try to find out. If he thinks that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and other members of the committee would permit the substitution of "24" for "21" and take the matter to conference, where there would be a chance to discuss it, and if he wants to make that suggestion, I would be very glad to substitute "24" for "21," and have it go to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not in a position to give the Senator any assurance whatever, except that he will get the vote of the Senator from Georgia for 24 months, but will not get it for 21. I understood the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] had made a similar statement, that he would support the 24-month period, but could not support the 21; so there are two votes for the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I could tell the Senator of many more.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has offered his amendment, has he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the thing to do is to vote on it. If we vote on the amendment now, the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will probably prevail, and we shall make some progress; but if we talk for another day, we may not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after a conference with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I have agreed to withdrawing the quorum call and to the substitution in my amendment of 24 months in place of 21 months. I suggest that the amendment as thus modified, incorporating the amendment of the Senator from Georgia with mine, be put to a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Does the Senator from Georgia withdraw his amendment thereto?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; I do not.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was unaware of the fact that the Senator from Georgia had stepped out of the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to modify his own amendment?

Mr. MORSE. It makes no difference to me as to which way it is done.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is perfectly agreeable to me. I simply did not understand the parliamentary situation when I returned to the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator was not on the floor as I thought he was. I said that I would agree to withdraw the quorum call and proceed to vote on the amendment calling for 24 months, and that I was perfectly willing to have my amendment so modified.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is perfectly agreeable to me. I am seeking objectives, Mr. President. I am trying to get somewhere on this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to call up my amendment limiting to 18 months the term of service of veterans who have had 6 months' service. It is identified as amendment C.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 91, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 13 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(z) Section 21 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. Until July 1, 1953, the President shall be authorized to order into the active military or naval service of the United States, with or without their consent, any or all members and units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces. The period of time for which any person who has served on active duty in any of the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of 6 months or more prior to June 25, 1948, may be ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 18 consecutive months and the period of time for which any other person may be ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 26 consecutive months."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make a very brief statement in support of my amendment. I believe it is a fair amendment, if the desire is to be just to veterans who have already served a period of time which would at least be equal to the period of basic training. They have had their basic training. We have just agreed to a term of service of 24 months for the new inductee. He will not have had any basic training, and I believe that if we call veterans back into the service as reservists we at least ought to give them credit for their basic training. I think it is only fair to limit their term of service to 18 months in comparison with the 24 months for the draftees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this amendment would limit the active service of any reservist, who has had more than 6 months of active service prior to the date fixed in the amendment, to 18 months.

But this amendment affects all members of the Reserve who have had as much as 6 months of prior active service. It affects the members of the Organized Reserve who were on a pay and retirement status the same as it affects those in the Inactive Reserve who were receiving no pay, no instruction, no retirement benefits. It gives the same benefits to those who have had no combat and who have been in the Reserve only since World War II, as it gives to those who suffered great hardship while fighting in the last war. This amendment is loosely drawn and creates as many new inequities as it seeks to correct.

Much ill will and dissatisfaction will be caused if it is adopted. It cannot begin to operate effectively for many months. By that time the present inequities created by our helter-skelter recall program the past few months will have largely disappeared. That is, they will have disappeared if this bill is not disfigured beyond recognition by hastily thought out amendments which will put a hopeless drain on our manpower and prevent the planned rotation of the reservists which the committee seeks to accomplish.

The committee considered all of these problems at great length. Much care and study went into the final draft which is before us. If we here embark upon a course of rewriting legislation on the floor of the Senate—a course of legislation by whim, by impulse, by instinct—then we might as well throw the committee system out of the window.

Under the bill as written, it may well be that a reasonable and equitable plan for rotating reservists with long periods of prior service may be effected. That is one of our specific targets. We are as alert to this problem as the Senator from Oregon. But the problem cannot be solved by wishful thinking.

Another basic objection to the amendment is that it imposes an arbitrary time which precludes any orderly plan for rotating thousands of reservists according to the merits of each particular case. It would mean that nearly 400,000 indivaduals, all in one bundle, might be discharged from the service some time this year nearly 8 months before the expiration of their period of service. It allows no flexibility. It makes it impossible to select the more worthy cases first. It is a strait-jacket upon the imagination of those who would work out the details of the more equitable committee plan.

It would mean that many reservists with little prior service would be discharged before trained replacements became available. It would therefore step up our rate of turn-over to a point which is beyond the capacity of our available manpower pool to supply—unless we reinforce that pool by taking a large number of 18-year-olds who would not normally be inducted until the age of 19.

The amendment is a pleasing subterfuge, a gaudy trinket on a bargain counter, pleasing to the eye but of little worth.

The objectives are worthy ones, but the overriding fact remains that we are limited by the lack of available manpower. There is no lack of desire on our part to minimize the sacrifices required of the reservists.

We have repeatedly stressed that the only sources for additional men are the veterans of the last war, or tearing apart the organized units of the reserve components, or taking more young men from the pool of 18-year-olds.

We cannot provide additional deferments, shorten the period of service, arbitrarily send large numbers of men home, cut the enlistment period in half, take a slash here, take a slice there, and pull manpower out of the air.

This amendment carries with it an additional manpower requirement of proportions. It does nothing to provide additional men.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have one change made in the amendment, in view of the fact that we have just adopted a 24-month-service-period provision. In line 6, page 2, the figure should be changed from "26" to "24."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator modifies his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now wish to call up my amendment identified as amendment E. I ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 83, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "seventy-five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundred and fifty thousand."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I know there is a great deal of interest in this amendment on the part of certain Senators who are not now present. I believe the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] contemplated proposing some modification of the amendment; but I am not quite certain about that. I believe he is being notified that the amendment has been called. I shall give my explanation of the amendment, because I hope we can get to a vote on it before the day closes.

Mr. President, as I stated the other day, I believe our greatest hope of retaining our superiority over Russia is in the field of science and technology, and we should not run any danger whatsoever of sacrificing that superiority.

As I listened to the witnesses who testified in regard to the 75,000 students the authorities intend to set aside for the next 3-year period for training I felt that that was not a sufficiently large number. In checking up with educational leaders in the country, and a good many teachers, I am satisfied it is not sufficiently large, although I am very frank to say to the Senate that I believe there are many difficulties inherent in this entire program.

I believe that as the problem is covered in the bill, the provision is very cumbersome complicated and fuzzy. We hear talk about requiring the boys to get their basic training. I wonder where they are to get it, and how that matter is to be handled. Are they to be put in some special training corps? That is not clear to me, and never became clear to me during the hearings.

I then wonder, if we are selecting some student because he has shown special aptitude as a biochemist, for example, or special aptitude as a potential nuclear physicist or special aptitude as a research man in some phase of medicine, whether we are not wasting our time in giving that particular individual so-called basic training. Are we going to assign him, as any other draftee, to the basic training through which other draftees will go?

Then I am disturbed about putting the label "deferment" on him even after we get through giving him the basic training which I understand is contemplated. It is provided that he shall perform military service after he has had this training, and I think he should perform such military service. In fact, I think we should work out a program under which the boys, if they are selected for this training, will perform a longer period of service for the military than other boys.

There are so many ramifications to this problem which have not been worked out in the bill, and there are so many problems which I think would be created by it even though a civilian commission is created to handle the matter, that I do not believe anyone can read the bill, with this particular section in view, and have clearly in mind exactly what is going to happen.

First, if we are to do the job this year, we have not provided for a sufficient number of men to take the special training. Second, I cannot see the desirability of requiring so-called basic military training for these special students before we put them in the laboratory for study. Third, I do not like the idea of deferment for them. All through the hearings I have said we ought to work out a joint military-educational program for the so-called special students, which would require an additional term of military service after they had completed their educational training. I say that because in this program it is possible for the civilian commissioners who are going to administer the program to take an exceptionally able boy and have the expenses of this training paid by the Government. That was not originally suggested by the military, Mr. President. It came out of discussion in committee. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in his fair way, argued along with me that we had to have the program worked out in economic fairness to everyone concerned. We should not pick out only certain boys whose parents are able to pay for their college training, and say to them, "We will give you special treatment under the selective-service law." We must always keep before us the duty of seeing to it that the law is working democratically and uniformly on our population, taking into account the individual differences that flow from differences in aptitudes and skills. We can only justify this program if it can be justified at all on the ground that our defense needs, our military needs call for training a group of superior students along the lines of this section of the bill. I think we have in the RECORD a clear agreement that the civilian commission would be able to take a poor boy, for example, who shows exceptional ability in one of the sciences, and train him at Government expense. However, I feel that the blueprint should have been made clearer than it has been in the bill in regard to the class of students to which I have referred, which would bring about—and I know many people do not like my referring to it in this way—a marriage between our military training program and our colleges in respect to the training to be given to special students. I am still hopeful it can be done. I think it should be done. I certainly think that the limit should be a selection of students which would give us a pool of exceptionally able students to be trained in the sciences. Then we would be free at a subsequent date to deal further with the problem. It can be said by anyone, and I think quite truly, that my amendment does not go far enough. I do not have any blueprint as to exactly how such boys are to be handled and trained. I think the civilian commission program should be frequently reviewed by Congress in order to make certain that it is following principles which we can approve. At least we should provide a pool of 150,000. The commission, under my amendment, would not be required to take 150,000. They are not required under the present bill to take 75,000. Under my amendment they could go as high as 150,000 if they find a need for going that high in getting qualified students to perform that kind of special military service for their Government.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. For the purpose of the legislative record, in connection with future reference, I want the RECORD to show that I think it is very important that the commission to be created under the bill should work out a program which would require the students, once they are trained as doctors, biochemists, or nuclear physicists, to perform service for the military beyond the time of service required of other inductees. That may require subsequent congressional action, and I am willing to let that await future action. At least I think we ought to require a pool of 150,000 of these special students if we are to have any at all. It may be that we should not have any at all in view of the vagueness of the present wording of the section.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator understand that under section C of the bill at the "termination of such period of suspension" the person shall serve a period equivalent to the amount of time suspended?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore he would not get credit, in the cast of a 24-month period of service, for the amount of time he spent in college?

Mr. MORSE. No; he would get credit only for his basic training.

Mr. KILGORE. Only for his basic-training period?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from New York that when the pending amendment was called up I said I understood there were other Senators who were interested in it, and that they would perhaps have some amendments to propose. I said that I thought the Senator from New York was one of the Senators. I went ahead with the explanation of my amendment, knowing that notice would be given to the Senator from New York that the amendment was being considered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment at this point, if I may. I am really disturbed by the comparatively unimportant position to which the term "humanities," as it appears on line 11, at page 83, has been relegated. I doubt that it would be possible properly to amend the bill in a way which would convey the meaning I have in mind with reference to the emphasis which I believe should be placed on the humanities. In all that the distinguished Senator from Oregon has said, he has mentioned only the scientific aspect. He has not mentioned the humanities at all. He has not mentioned the liberal arts. Mr. President, if we are going to set up a system of this kind, which might finally be permanent, it

seems to me that we would be making a very grave mistake if we were to place the humanities, the liberal arts, at the tail end of the educational parade. All of us time and again have heard comment by many people, and not only by educators, over the way in which in Nazi Germany, and prior to the time of nazism, the liberal arts were relegated to a secondary position and finally removed entirely from the educational picture in Germany. All the emphasis was placed on science.

Mr. President, please do not misunderstand me. I give to science all the credit to which science can possibly lay claim. It is vitally important. However, I feel very strongly about this question, and I should like to inquire of someone representing the committee—and I assume the Senator from Oregon does that himself—as to whether it was the intention of the committee to treat the liberal arts as of secondary importance.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make two points in reply to the Senator from New York. Speaking only for myself and not for the committee, I completely agree with the Senator from New York that there is a need for working out a much better coordinated program between the colleges of America and the Military Establishment. I do not know how anyone could stress it more than I have in public hearings and in executive sessions of the committee. I think it is a great mistake to relegate the humanities in the way they have been relegated in this bill.

The second thing which I wish to say to the Senator from New York is that I think we are very fortunate even to have the word "humanities" in the bill, because at one time in our executive sessions an attempt was made within the committee to eliminate all reference to the humanities entirely. The record will show that.

Being confronted with that situation in committee, I think the Senator from New York can understand a little better why the junior Senator from Oregon has at least been stressing the development of the sciences and the technologies. But if we had, as I think we should have, a better coordinated program for the years immediately ahead, as between our miiltary defense training program and our educational defense training program, we would have much greater emphasis on the humanities.

Mr. IVES. I should like to inquire, for example, why three specific, broad fields—and probably the most important ones, but only three in the whole area of the healing art—were specifically mentioned in the bill—namely, medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. I grant that they are important. However, there are other phases in the area of the healing art which are also important.

In this connection it occurs to me that all the emphasis in the entire expression in this particular subsection is being placed on science. It is being directed at medicine in one form or another. Again, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not in any sense wish to convey the idea that these things should not be emphasized, but they should not be emphasized to the exclusion, or almost the exclusion, of the other matters which I have tried to point out this afternoon.

I am wondering if that verbiage could not possibly be changed in such a way that the bill, which may be an act for considerable time, could not be regarded as a directive by the Government to concentrate on science, but rather as applicable equally to all education, including science and the liberal arts, or the humanities, as expressed in the bill. I think that is the way the approach should be made, so that when the board is established, if it is to be established, its members will not feel impelled, perhaps, to direct their chief attention to the field of science.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. I should like to say to my good friend from New York that I think we are faced with a practical situation. Within the committee the preponderant point of view was that as of now, the special training for the short period of time covered in the bill should go into the fields of the sciences and the technologies. In fairness to the committee—although I wish members of the committee to speak for themselves—it was pointed out in our discussions that it will be only a relatively short time before a large number of students will be coming back to the colleges to study in the humanities, as the inductees take the benefit of what I think we all know will undoubtedly be an extension of the GI bill of rights for educational training, at least in some form. So in committee it was pointed out over and over again that this provision under discussion was going to be only for a short period of time, and that although there might be some dropping off in enrollment in the humanities, we cannot afford a great dropoff in the registration of our superior students in the field of sciences and technologies even for a short period of time.

Mr. IVES. This provision applies, does it not, only for a short period of time?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes. The 75,000 limitation extends to June 30, 1954.

Mr. IVES. That is what the language of the bill provides.

Mr. MORSE. Only for a 3-year period.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Even though the provision be applied for only a 3-year period, does not the Senator feel that having the language in the bill, expressed as it is, would thus set a precedent as to later determination in this matter?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts in a moment, but I should like to say in reply to the Senator from New York that I think the committee would tell him that under the language of the bill the commission would have the authority to select superior students in the humanities. It is not estopped from doing so. However, I believe that the Senator is correct, in that the emphasis of the committee and of the language of the bill shows that it is on the sciences. I would that the program were more broad, but it just does not happen to be. I would join with the Senator from New York in any attempt to broaden it, but I will tell him in advance that he and I will find ourselves in the minority on any vote on the question of broadening the provision. Nevertheless, I am perfectly willing to join in an attempt to broaden the language.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York is not contemplating any amendment. I doubt that an amendment would help the situation without causing new complications. I am trying to find out what the intent behind it is. After all, the word "humanities" does occur in the verbiage of this particular subsection. The Senator from New York would like to have cleared up the question as to whether the humanities, as that term is used in the bill, are supposed to be secondary to the other things which are included.

Mr. MORSE. All I can say, speaking for myself, is that the intent is to give the civilian commission the authority to select, within their discretion, certain superior students in the humanities and have the deferment procedures of the bill applied to those students. I believe that if I were on the commission, however, and read the committee hearings—as they will—as well as the report, and the bill itself, I would be pretty sure that what was intended was that science and technology were to be emphasized over and above the humanities. I think that is pretty much the meaning of the language.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, having very rapidly gone through the report of the committee, it occurs to me that that is the essence of the report itself.

Mr. MORSE. I think so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from New York to paragraph (g) on page 88. As the Senator from Oregon has so well pointed out, until June 1, 1954, the President could defer the 75,000 men approved by a civilian commission after competitive examination. In connection with that situation, we discussed the humanities and the liberal arts, as the Senator from Oregon has said. However, these 75,000 men are essential for scientific and engineering purposes.

Furthermore, there will be going to the colleges a minimum of 50,000 a year in connection with ROTC. In addition, there will be the IV–F's and certain other students who will not be within the age limit. Then, provided we do not become involved in an all-out war, and provided there are a sufficient number of men, there will be additional deferments, under the authority of the President, under subsection (g) (1) on page 83.

I am merely expressing my own opinion when I say that sufficient provision is made for the humanities and the liberal arts. The Senator from New York ought to bear in mind the additional exceptions.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that the Senator from

New York may ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts that during the 3-year interval the humanities are to be placed in a secondary position?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not so understand. I understand that the 75,000 men can be deferred as a result of competitive examination by a civilian group, for the various studies set forth on page 83. There is no separation of any certain number of men into the sciences or the humanities, or osteopathy, dentistry, medicine, or anything else. That is entirely up to the five-man civilian commission.

Mr. IVES. Then is it the Senator's understanding, and is it his interpretation of the legislative intent, that the humanities rank equally with all the other categories which are listed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. The Senator from New York must not forget that this exception applies only for 3 years.

Mr. IVES. I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that time the five-man board, which the committee hopes will be an able board of educators and others who understand the problem, would select able students to the number of 75,000, who would be prospectively good in their various fields.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to make an inquiry of the able Senator from Massachusetts as to what yardstick the commission is going to use.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The yardstick of ability.

Mr. CAPEHART. On what basis? Will it be on the basis of an examination or what?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On fair competitive examination open to men from all sections of the country, and with no restrictions because of financial ability to pay.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who is going to write the examination? What are the candidates going to do, answer 100 questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is left, as I understand, to the five-man board.

Mr. CAPEHART. The five-man board is going to write the rules and regulations?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will they possibly write 100 questions to be asked, 200 questions, or 300 questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would assume that they would arrive at a conclusion as to the means which would give them the best opportunity to determine the best scholars with the best prospective capacity to become leaders in their respective fields of science, and so forth.

Mr. CAPEHART. Without having experience with the boys, or without knowing anything about them at all, the board would simply throw down before them 100 or 200 questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The board would have the academic records of the boys. These boys are going to have 4 months' basic training.

Mr. CAPEHART. The board would have only their high-school record.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would have their academic record, and the result of a fair competitive examination. I suppose the examination will be somewhat along the line of the collegiate methods of examination.

Mr. CAPEHART. But the Congress is leaving it entirely in the discretion of the board.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, in my opinion.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have an amendment which I shall offer later which provides a standard, which would be fixed by the Congress of the United States, without leaving it to the board.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be through in a moment. Because I think it is important for the future work of the Commission that we make a clear record today as to the meaning of this provision in the bill, I want to say, speaking only as one member of the committee, that it was my feeling that the attitude of the committee was that the greater emphasis should be placed on training in the sciences and the technologies. We had some discussion of the need for some linguistic training, within the field of the humanities, quite a bit of discussion about the importance of having some people trained in foreign languages to be available to us in our military intelligence work; people trained in Russian and Chinese, and all the other languages with which the military intelligence has to deal. There was some discussion that it was important, of course, to continue some of these superior students in the humanities. But I think I would be guilty of misleading that civilian commission if I at least, as a member of the committee, did not make clear that it was my understanding that the real purpose of this exception was to retain these students in the field of science and technology and medical training. I do not know what other interpretation one could possibly make when it really was seriously discussed for a time in one of our executive sessions that the word "humanities" ought to be stricken entirely, because it was thought it would open too broad a training for these students and might sacrifice selecting the number of students that otherwise would be selected within the 75,000 for scientific training. That was the impression that was left with me.

So I say that if I were a member of the commission, Mr. President I would be rather inclined to think that the objective was to limit even the training within the humanities to the linguistic training and those special fields within the humanities that would be of particular benefit to the military an dto military intelligence, particularly in case of an all-out war. It seemed to be the opinion of the majority of the committee that the broader base of training in the humanities would have to wait, as far as these students who are being inducted are concerned, until they get back out of military service.

It was at that point in our committee hearings, I think that the RECORD will also show, that after quite a bit of argument was presented, the conclusion was reached that after all there would still be a large number of students left in college until 1954 . There will be many women, there will be many IV–F's; there will be a considerable number of persons who would be deferred for other reasons. Thus it was argued in committee that the humanities would not suffer as much as we might at first think they would. So the real danger—and I am giving the Senate my interpretation of the attitude of the committee in executive session—is that we will suffer immediately from a break in the training of men in those special skills so essential for maintaining military superiority over Russia.

I think I have been fair in my statement. I will leave it to the chairman of the committee. If I have not been, I want him to correct me, because I think that what is being said these few minutes on the floor of the Senate right now, along with the transcribed records of our committee hearings and along with the committee report—are going to be pretty much the bible that will be followed by the civilian commission, at least in getting itself organized and outlining for itself the scope of its work. I wish the chairman of the committee would correct me if he thinks I have given to the slightest degree a wrong impression of committee intent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I might say that my general impression of the intent of the committee, from all the discussion at the time this section of the bill was adopted, is in general accord with what has been stated by the Senator from Oregon. It was primarily intended as a means of avoiding a hiatus in the graduation of doctors and dentists and special scientists in the various engineering fields.

I was one of those who raised some question about the meaning of the word "humanities." I was not too familiar with the pedagogic definition of the term. I thought the term was a little too nebulous to be placed in the bill. But, of course, it was said that before a doctor could be fully educated, he had to be given a preliminary course in the humanities. That is necessary before he can get through the medical college. The same is true with respect to the training of those who are to be skilled in Russian, Chinese, and other languages.

The Senator from Oregon has well stated my understanding of the intention of the committee in having the 3-year period during which 75,000 men are deferred from their service after they have had their preliminary training. It was to avoid any interruption in service, to the people of the Nation and to the armed services, of doctors, dentists, and men who are highly skilled in various technical services, such as chemical en-

gineering and other fields of engineering. That was my understanding.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The question I would raise with the Senator from Oregon also applies to the Senator from Georgia. Is it the understanding of either Senator that the emphasis here is by action of the committee placed on the scientists on the fields of the healing art, and on matters of that particular kind, which are scientific, and that the humanities or the liberal arts are in a secondary position?

Mr. MORSE. That was my impression. We included the humanities for those special subjects which would be of help to the military.

Mr. IVES. I understand that those in the medical profession always have to take a certain amount of the humanities in order to qualify to enter the profession. The point I am trying to find out is what the intent was. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that all these categories rank equally.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expressed the situation, as did the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], very clearly. The first emphasis before the committee by the witnesses was on science and engineering. Then either in a letter sent to the committee or through a witness we had testimony as to the importance of the liberal arts and the humanities. The humanities were included as a broad general term on the theory that we needed individuals who would understand different languages, and be able to teach, as we needed them, persons in the engineering and the medical sciences. So when the provision dealing with the humanities was placed in the bill, it is my understanding that all essential fields of study are included, and that the board of five should pick out the best students who would be prospective leaders in any of these fields. The main emphasis by such men as Vannevar Bush is on science and engineering, but the humanities were included.

Under the terms of the bill, the five members of the commission can decide to take some leaders in the humanities, as well as in other fields.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Was any question raised in regard to the matter of establishing this as a precedent in connection with a future bill for permanent action of this type?

Mr. MORSE. There was a great deal of discussion in regard to what might have to be done in the future in regard to bringing about a closer relationship between an educational program and a military program, depending upon what conditions will be a few years hence. However, I have to say to the Senator from New York that I do not think we can find in the RECORD any great amount of discussion which could be looked upon as a commitment that any of us intends to have the authorities go ahead with a more permanent program. It is to be a very temporary matter.

There was a great deal of discussion to the effect that if we can get over the period of the next 3 or 4 years we shall not have to worry about having all the students we need in these specialities, because the boys then will be coming back from military service, and they can take the special training under a bill of GI educational rights.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon another question, if he will yield further.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator from Oregon or does any other member of the committee who happens to be in the Chamber at this time feel that this amendment would establish a precedent which, in any permanent set-up that might ultimately be established, would result in having the humanities relegated to a secondary spot?

Mr. MORSE. No; I wish to say that my impression is completely the opposite, namely, that this amendment has no permanent value, but is just for the purpose of covering the hiatus which will exist for the next 3 or 4 years, and is not to be looked upon as a precedent. In fact, it was pointed out in the hearings that we hoped the commission, through its work, will be able in the years immediately ahead to prepare for us a report which will be of use to us when we come to consider some years hence, the entire question of a bill of educational rights.

However, let it be said with emphasis, Mr. President, that this amendment is not offered as one to establish a precedent for any long-time, permanent program in this field of education.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to yield the floor, or I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question.

Mr. CASE. Is there some reason for the difference in treatment proposed to be accorded to those who would be suspended from service for training in the humanities or in scientific work, as compared with the treatment of those for whom service is deferred by reason of their being in the ROTC? The distinction to which I call attention arises from the fact that apparently those who are deferred because they are in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps will have to agree, in writing, to accept a commission, if one is tendered to them; but I do not find provision for a similar requirement of service for those who would be deferred for educational reasons.

The Senator from Oregon will recall that during World War II, considerable complaint was made to Congress because those who received free medical training had no requirement of intern service or service after the war was over.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from South Dakota has placed his finger upon what I think is one of the administrative weaknesses of this section of the bill. I think we should have had submitted to us a blueprint program as to what the obligations of these students would be after they have completed their service; but we note that the bill does not specifically say what kind of service that shall be. I think such persons should be placed on a basis at least comparable to that of those in the ROTC program. It should be understood that as they take this training and receive all the benefits from it, they will be committed to special assignment after they have completed the training—assignments for the benefit of the Military Establishment.

Again I am simply recalling, as best I can, some of the discussion which occurred in the committee. Let me mention this: We discussed there, one day, the suggestion of some that such students could be assigned to private industry for a period of time, following their training, to work out the length of service they would owe to the Government after that, assuming that the particular private industry, for example, was working on a research project which was of concern to the Navy or the Air Force or the Army.

I had some puzzlement about that and some grave doubts about it. I doubt the wisdom of such assignments to private industry unless some carefully worked out safeguards are provided.

However, this can be said, let me say to the Senator from South Dakota: This matter is so indefinite at the present time that about all we are doing is committing ourselves to the principle of setting aside 75,000 students, to be handled in such a way as the civilian commission which is provided for in the bill develops. We shall have time in the future, of course, if we as a Congress do not like the way the commission operates, to put some checks on it.

That is not the way I like to have this matter worked out; but, in all fairness, I say that even though the blueprint is not provided, there will be adquate time, before this matter is worked out, for us as a Congress to put some checks upon any plan developed.

Mr. CASE. Then, am I correct in understanding that as to those who are in the ROTC, the committee amendment proposes that although they will not have their training paid for, other than by such allowances as are available to the ROTC, they must agree, in writing, to serve for 2 years of active duty after the receipt of commissions; whereas with respect to the 75,000 persons referred as being given scientific training, the President will be authorized to provide for the payment of such costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any persons who are selected, but in return for that there is no requirement for intern service or any other service, which would be agreed to in writing, by the person involved?

Mr. MORSE. No; in return for that, the law would provide that after they received the training, they would have

to complete the part of their military training which they did not complete before they went into the special training; and the law would require that they must take the 4 months of basic training before they start their special educational training.

So under the amendment, as proposed to be adopted by us, after those students finished the special training, they still would owe the Government 20 months of military service. The nature of that service is not stated in the bill. However, their liability for the service is clear; they still would owe 20 months of so-called military service to their Government, after they completed their education.

Mr. CASE. Within the discretion of the President?

Mr. MORSE. No; they will owe that much. The bill provides that within the discretion of the President, or of the civilian commission acting in his behalf, some boys who cannot pay for their own education may be selected. Again, I think the understanding is that most of the boys to be deferred under this part of the program will pay for their own education. However, we do not want the commission to be in a position where it will have to turn down a boy who, on the competitive examinations, ranks very, very high as a possible nuclear physicist, for example, simply because he comes from a very poor family and cannot pay his college expense. We believe that in such a case that boy, at the discretion of the President, can have his expenses paid.

I am very much puzzled about that, too, let me say, because this question of what is a democratic principle in connection with such matters works both ways. Surely it is democratic to take the poor boy and say the Government is going to pay his expenses, but there is a tendency, I think, for people to assume that there is no principle of democracy violated if we say, "But it is all right for the boy who can pay his expenses to be required to pay them."

I do not believe that. If we are going to follow the principle of the Government's paying the expenses, I believe we have no right to discriminate against the boy who comes from a well-to-do family and to say to him, "Your family must pay your expenses," while, to the boy coming from a poor family, it is said, "The Government will pay your expenses." I always have difficulty in reconciling such a distinction.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has just suggested to me, in whispered conversation, that what I am really saying is that this character of training should be provided on the basis of scholarships and fellowships. I think that is right and that is the way these special students should be handled. If a boy gets a scholarship or a fellowship on the basis of his ability, not on the basis of the ability of his father to pay for his education, we are then carrying out a policy of nondiscrimination in selecting these boys.

What we are trying to do in our fellowship and scholarship program through the great foundations, is to recognize ability, not economic status. But the Senator from South Dakota did not raise that question, though it is impliedly involved in the question he asked. But my categorical answer to his question, "Does this draw a distinction between the ROTC boy and these special students?" is "Yes." Again I raise the question as to whether that is as fair as it ought to be.

Mr. CASE. But in either case the Government may require service, more or less, in return for the free training given.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but I do not know what kind. We know the kind of service it will require from the ROTC boy. He must take a Reserve commission and serve in the ranks for at least a period of 2 years. But we do not know yet what the nature of this service of the special student is.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MORSE. I am going to yield the floor in a moment. The Senator from Indiana may then offer his amendment. I merely want to say in conclusion that there was another feature of this whole problem which disturbed me a little bit. It is the matter of geographic distribution of students. Of course, the danger of that argument is that one may be charged in making it, with trying to provide students for various State institutions in various parts of the country; and that may be involved somewhat.

But I think it only fair, as we adopt such a principle as is involved in this section of the bill, that we include certain safeguards which will prevent the concentration of these students in certain institutions. If we have 150,000 of them, it is a little easier to work out a fair geographic distribution of them than if we have a smaller number. I merely mention that in passing. I think we need to keep reinforced our scientific departments and our humanitarian departments in some of our institutions, which are doing a splendid job in other parts of the country, besides the East. I had hoped we could work out a little clearer blueprint on that. But I was not very successful on it, and I merely report my failure to the Senate, so that at least, somewhere in the RECORD, someone will have said that he thought the principle of geographic distribution ought to have been written into the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CORDON. I desire to propound an inquiry with reference to the application of the pending measure to the act which was approved May 10, 1950, which is the National Science Foundation Act. Under the terms of that act, the Foundation exists chiefly for the purpose of determining the identity of students who should have scholarships or graduate fellowships in the sciences. The Senator will remember that under section 10 of that act, among other things, there is provision for the widest possible geographical distribution of the scholarships or fellowships, and that the decision is to be made by the Foundation.

The question in my mind at the moment is this: If we either adopt the Senator's amendment, to raise the number of possible exemptions to 150,000, or leave it at 75,000, what is going to happen with respect to the impact of the exemption, or suspension of the period of service, of those persons with scholarships or fellowships, which may have been granted to others in the field of science by the Science Foundation? Where the two happen to coincide, of course, there is no problem. But where the Science Foundation has selected certain ones to be the beneficiaries of scholarships or fellowships, and the board created by this bill selects others, does it mean, then, that our work in connection with the National Science Foundation Act goes for naught, and that the particular beneficiaries of that act may become cannon fodder, while the persons selected under this bill, alone, will get the opportunity for further study?

Mr. MORSE. I can only give the Senator my impression. I know of no discussion in the record which bears upon the point raised by the senior Senator from Oregon. But it would be my interpretation that this law would apply in respect to any of the students concerned, and that the National Science Foundation would not be in a position of exempting students who otherwise would be drafted under this law.

Furthermore, I think that the National Science Foundation program will be dealing for the most part, particularly if this law is passed, with students beyond the age limit of these particular students, and will probably be dealing pretty much, I should think, with the Ph. D. candidates and advanced students who have already had their so-called basic scientific educational training.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Will not this bill as finally passed, since it is an amendment to the Selective Service Act, apply to all persons up to the age of 26?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I think it will.

Mr. CORDON. In that event, would it not, almost of necessity, include the scholarships referred to?

Mr. MORSE. I think as to those students in the age category, it would supersede the other act.

Mr. CORDON. If it were intended to be limited, as the language indicates, to the 18-year-olds only, or to those who come in at the end of basic training, it might not affect the older men; but if it does affect them, then there would be two boards set up to do the same thing, one prevailing over the other. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. MORSE. One is on a broader basis than the other. I think this bill is on a broader base than the National Science Foundation group. I think it would handle more students.

Mr. CORDON. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Science Four-

dation Act received no consideration by the committee, at all?

Mr. MORSE. There was some passing reference to it, but I never heard any detailed discussion of the relationship of this to the National Science Foundation Act. I think something was said one day, and the question was raised as to whether the Chairman of the National Science Foundation had been selected yet. I do not know what the facts are, I may say to my colleague, but my understanding is that the National Science Foundation program has not moved ahead very rapidly.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I might as well get a few other observations into the RECORD. I should like to say, in the first place, that if we are going to attempt to set up two classes of citizenship, a first class and a second class, I think my colleague's figure of 150,000 is not too great. So far as I am concerned, I oppose either 150,000 or 75,000. I oppose any exemption whatever based upon the philosophy that there shall be a discrimination in the degree of sacrifice which American youth may be called upon to make. Certainly in this case, as I view it, there is discrimination.

Truly, Mr. President, attempt has been made to lessen the discrimination among the elect.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. In a moment. The poor boy who can pass the examination has the same chance as has the rich. The Government will see the poor boy through if he shows worthiness, and ability in his work. But the discrimination is that in the philosophy there is one group of American citizens who can be exempt from a sacrifice which others must make.

According to the reading in the bill, I understand that one can say that is not true because those who are selected simply have their period of training suspended, and may be called upon later to have the training. But that is a difference in words and not in fact, as I shall disclose in a moment.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was interested in what the Senator from Oregon said about not being in favor of any exemption at all; and I agree with him. Does not the Senator feel that this exemption, whether it applies to 75,000 or 150,000, will favor boys whose parents are sufficiently well to do to send them to private schools, where they may receive the individual attention which will enable them to demonstrate technical ability perhaps out of proportion to their actual capacity? We know that there are private schools which train boys to pass the entrance examinations for Annapolis and West Point, for instance, and they do their work well, so far as the number of graduates passing with high marks is concerned. Could they not be trained in the same way to pass the examinations which would demonstrate their technical ability, and perhaps give them an advantage over a boy who goes into the public school and is simply run through the mill before he goes into the service?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Vermont has put his finger upon another possible basis for discrimination, in that there may arise cramming schools. Many parents, because they feel that their children are far above the average, will seek to have their offspring put into the select-exempt class, and will, of course, do everything in their power to have their youngsters trained to pass the examinations just as soon as they possibly can, in order that the young men may be equipped with that specialized training which will permit of the passing of the examinations.

There will, of course, I suppose, be the type of examination worked out that is now used in the Military and Naval Academies, examinations in which aptitude and various other things are considered, other than knowledge in the field of mathematics, and the like, incident to the regular courses which young men take in school.

However, there is a greater danger. Inasmuch as the particular provision, I am discussing will run for 4 years for those who will be exempted or for whom there will be, first, a suspension of the obligation of training, and, of course, later complete excuse from it, there is a greater danger that we will find substantially all those in the groups composed of individuals of the highest ages, 26, 25, 24, or 23, those who have had an opportunity for study beyond high school. So that within the group which may be called for service under the bill, if it be amended as it is proposed to be amended, there is a very grave danger that the group which will be discriminated against will be the 18-year-olds, that it will be the youngsters just out of high school, the ones who have had no opportunity for training and schooling in the institutions of higher learning. They will be the ones who will be discriminated against under any type of required examination which possibly could be provided.

Everybody knows that the boys in high school are not themselves so mentally equipped that anyone, I do not care how wise he may be or how much he knows of psychology, psychiatry, or what have you, can go among them and, out of a million, pick 75,000 and be even 75 percent correct, or 50 percent correct. I doubt if he can be 25-percent correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would not the Senator believe that a better plan might be to take a percentage out of those in the freshman or sophomore or junior classes in high school, and avoid the difficulty the Senator has described?

Mr. CORDON. The senior Senator from Oregon believes there should be no exemption. If I could have my way about it, if we are to have a call for service in the Armed Forces, I would have no exemption of anybody within the class limits, except those who were physically incapable of performing service. That is the fair, nondiscriminatory, and, in my opinion, democratic way of proceeding.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. In a moment. There must be some exemption on the family basis, and that sort of thing, but that is because there are duties which one must perform possibly just as high as the duty of serving his country, namely, for instance, the duty of serving his family. But when it come to the type of exemption proposed, I cannot find it in me to support it at the figure 150,000, 75,000, or 1.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. There are points the Senator raises which I think might be answered, at least so far as the administration is concerned. It is true that an elder man would stand a better chance of making a high grade on an examination; I am sure the Senator is correct about that. But it was my experience in the service that many of the examinations were based on an adjustment of values, so that an elder man had to make a substantially higher grade in order to rate higher than a younger man. I believe all the authorities comply with that procedure, I wondered if the Senator had given though to that.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, I recognize that a board worthy of the name will do its best to equalize the advantages and the disadvantages, but in the end, in my humble opinion, they cannot be equalized. If the bill is enacted as proposed, we would still have the basic vice that one class would be set up and relieved of obligations which we place on the shoulders of those less fortunate. That is the thing which is abhorrent to me in this sort of exemption, and the reason why at the appropriate time I shall move to strike the whole provision from the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Would my colleague feel the same way about special training if there had been worked out a program which put the boys into the Army at the time of induction, took them through their course of training, and then required that they give to the Military Establishment a certain period of service, in consideration of the fact that they had been given such special training?

Mr. CORDON. Unquestionably so. I want to see that the primary obligation of a citizen to bare his breast to death, if necessary, is equally borne.

Mr. MORSE. If he were given training which placed such obligation upon him, but if the military said that instead of working in a mechanical shop in some airport, many miles away from any combat, they will put him in an atomic-bomb laboratory, in order to bring to bear his special knowledge of physics, and wanted him to understand that he was in uniform and subject to military discipline, would the Senator object?

Mr. CORDON. To the extent that I recognize the necessity of that sort of thing, there cannot be logical objection. At least let us observe the basic equities of calling all within the age ranges into

service, putting them into uniform, and subjecting them to the same disciplines and the same controls.

Mr. MORSE. Without deferment.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. So far as that principle is concerned, may I say to my colleague that I argued for such a principle at length. That is what I meant when I said that to the extent we must have a special educational program we should have a so-called marriage of our colleges and the Military Establishment. The boys in service, while they were getting their training, would be subject to military discipline, plus the future obligation to serve further.

Mr. CORDON. My colleague presented the same views to me before the debate commenced.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If I understood the senior Senator from Oregon, he said he believed there should be no exemptions whatsoever from military service. Where are we to get the men for our colleges? Where are we going to get the students for our colleges? How are we to maintain student attendance?

Mr. CORDON. The question is not where we are going to get them. The question is, Which is more important—equity and equality in sacrifice, or special consideration in order to have students in college?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what he suposes would happen to our country if we robbed our colleges of students during the time they ordinarily get their students. What would be the condition of our country under such circumstances in 5 or 10 years?

Mr. CORDON. There would not be any robbery of the colleges. I can hope that all who are inducted into service would not occupy graves all around the earth, but would return. My colleague has succeeded in reducing the term of service by 2 months. I congratulate him. There will be hiatus. We shall have to completely reorganize our educational system if the philosophy of the bill is maintained. I do not mean the exemption provision, but the philosophy of universal-military service. We shall have to reorganize our educational system and much of our economic system if we are to protect ourselves in this way from the dangers we all understand, admit, and concede confronts us today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the difference between deferring the 2-year service of the 75,000 students for 4 years, or whatever time it may be, so that they may acquire certain desired knowledge, and, on the other hand, sending a number of boys to West Point and deferring their services for 4 years while they are educated to become officers in the Army. What is the difference?

Mr. CORDON. The difference lies chiefly in the fact that those who are sent to military schools are sent there for the purpose of later on having a more important part in the military service on the battlefield. Those for whom suspension of training is provided in the bill may never wear a uniform.

Mr. TAFT. Why not? They would be required to give 2 years of service later on.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has not fully understood the bill.

Mr. TAFT. They could then be deferred, or the training postponed, as would be the case of any man in the Army who might be sent to a physics laboratory to perform certain specialized work. However, they are liable to that service; are they not?

Mr. CORDON. Under the terms of the bill, the President may by regulation leave them for the rest of their lives in some special service.

Mr. TAFT. But he may take one and a half million of the 3,500,000 men and order them to serve where they may never see combat service. May I also ask the Senator, inasmuch as he wants to retain the right of equality of sacrifice, what he thinks of paragraph 2? Under paragraph 2 any man could go to a college, get into ROTC in his freshman year, and then stay in college and in ROTC. He could thus gradually become an officer, just as he could at West Point. I am not certain of the total number of men which is contemplated under the bill. However, under paragraph 2 the service of such a man is deferred indefinitely while they learn to become officers. After that, they may never serve in the Armed Forces at the front.

Mr. CORDON. I read from page 85:

(B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission;

Mr. TAFT. That seems to be exactly the same obligation assumed by the 75,000 boys who are sent to college. I do not see any difference.

Mr. CORDON. It is completely different.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Under the ROTC provision every 17-year-old boy can go to college, and, if he is smart enough, get into ROTC, and then have the right to be deferred for a period, as I see it, equal to the other periods. I am merely suggesting that the Senator cannot, under this kind of bill, hope to obtain the ideal perfection with respect to equality of service of which he speaks.

Mr. CORDON. I do not know whether the Senator was on the floor when I said I wanted no deferment. I also recognize the fact that we must have an increase in our Armed Forces at the present time. I have gone over the bill. There are a number of things about it which I do not like. I want to vote for the bill. I shall vote for it whether the motion which I shall make later prevails or does not prevail. However, I do not like the philosophy of the particular type of exemption which is made by the bill. For that reason I shall attempt to take it out of the bill. I want the RECORD to show my position.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from Ohio. I think he said that 75,000 men would still be in military service. If he will read the bill carefully at page 83, in lines 12 and 13, he will see that it says:

While so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in the military service (active or inactive) for any purpose.

Mr. TAFT. That is only during the period of their service. They must still serve 2 years in the Army.

Mr. GREEN. But the Senator said while they were pursuing their studies they were still in the military service.

Mr. TAFT. I made a mistake if I said that. I did not intend to say it. ROTC might be said to be military service, although I think that is open to question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Let us not forget that a time limit is placed upon the operation of this particular provision. The purpose, as indicated by that time limit, is to take this group out from any possibility of active service in the period immediately ahead, in this period of emergency when we must build up our Armed Forces. That is the purpose of it. They are just as far removed from any obligation to go into service and take their share of the high obligation of service under the terms of this bill as they would be were they entirely exempt.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator two questions in connection with the discussion which has been had with respect to the ROTC. The first question is: Is it not true that a young man who is in the ROTC today must obligate himself to serve two full years in the Army after he receives his commission, and that he is indefinitely subject to call in case of war?

Mr. CORDON. I did not understand the last part of the Senator's question.

Mr. LODGE. As a Reserve officer he is subject to call for an indefinite period in case of war, in addition to the 2 years he has agreed to serve.

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding, although I am not an expert in the military field, as is the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I believe that is true.

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true also that the statistics indicate that among second lieutenants in the combat branches of the Army the casualties are higher than in any other group in the armed services?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is better informed on that subject than I am. Upon his statement that it is true, the Senator from Oregon will accept it and accord it absolute verity.

Mr. LODGE. I believe that is true. I believe further that during World War II—and I think I am quoting him correctly—General Marshall said, "The greatest asset we had was the ROTC." So it seems to me that the ROTC can very definitely be counted as a fighting, integral part of our Military Establishment.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator 100 percent. What I object to is this particular provision, which exempts up to 75,000 men from any possibility of service in the present emergency, which we can certainly hope will not extend beyond 4 years. The philosophy of the bill is that it will not.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I wish the floor in my own right when the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I yield the floor?

Mr. MORSE. May I finish this comment?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there is any question about the fact that over the years the ROTC has produced some of the most able officers in our entire Military Establishment. I do not know where the so-called Regulars would have been if it had not been for the officers trained in the ROTC.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement to the Senate. It will require only 2 or 3 minutes to do so.

This particular part of the bill was given exactly the same detailed, meticulous, close attention as were all other phases of the bill. It was given just as close attention as the 18-year-old provision, the length-of-service provision, or any other portion of the bill.

On this particular issue we heard 49 competent witnesses. Of those 49, 36 favored excusing these men while they were students. That is not deferment. That is the wrong term. They are never deferred. They are merely excused while they are students; 36 favored the bill as written; 13 requested that there be a larger number.

I believe that one thing about which Senators are not completely informed is that in the last session of the Eighty-first Congress we passed a physicians' and dentists' draft bill, which allowed premedical, predental, preveterinary, or preosteopathic students, as well as optometry students, to be excused from service while they were pursuing their particular studies. That provision is written directly into the law. The President is given authority to excuse them. So, in addition to the 75,000, we have those 5 categories which are exempt from present service, regardless of the bill we are considering today. That is the law as it now stands.

Adding these together, we have 90,000—not 50,000—ROTC, together with approximately 26,000 IV–F's, and 25,000 veterans of World War II who will still be in school. We find that the over-all total male enrollment for 4 years would be approximately 845,000 students.

It is estimated that at no time during the period of the operation of this program, between now and 1954, would the enrollment of male freshmen, not including those under 18 years of age, fall below the mark of 191,000; and the total male enrollment in college would not decline below 719,000. That is a minimum which is very close to the 1939 prewar total enrollment of male students.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I shall be through in a moment os so, if I may complete my statement.

Mr. President, this is not written into the bill, but I understand that it is contemplated that we shall not disturb the two upper classes in college at the present time. The statement was made that four of five would not be touched. I think we all understand how imperative it is that students who have only 2 years to go to finish their college courses should not be disturbed. It is contemplated that that shall not be done.

Today the American Council on Education issued a press release which has just come to my attention. I wish to read two short paragraphs from it. The first paragraph reads as follows:

> If the bill is passed with the amendments voted by the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Senate, prohibiting induction of 18-year-olds until the 19–26 age groups have been inducted, there should be no appreciable effect on male enrollment in the fall of 1951.

The other paragraph reads as follows:

> If the bill is passed with the amendments voted by the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Senate, prohibiting the induction of 18-year olds until the 19–26 age groups have been inducted, the Department of Defense plan calls for the induction of 200,000 college students in the summer of 1951. This number will presumably include those from the deferred and postponed groups who have enlisted or may enlist before July 1.

Here is the principal point of this paragraph:

> If all are taken, there will be a decrease in male, nonveteran enrollment of approximately 20 percent in September. (As indicated above, practically no freshman would be subject to call.)

I should like to say again to the Senate that just as much time and study were devoted to, and just as much interest was taken in, this particular part of the bill, as was the case with any other portion of the bill. Twelve of the 13 members of the Armed Services Committee believe that 75,000, as provided by in the bill, is the proper figure.

Let me say a word about administration. A 5-man board is to be appointed to select the 75,000 students. I do not believe that we could possibly write into the bill the details of administration of those selections. It cannot be done. I assure Senators that selections will be made by the most modern methods of aptitude tests we now have. That provision of the bill will be administered very fairly.

Mr. President, I believe that the pending amendment should be defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the Senator can state for the RECORD what was the purpose or objective of the committee in bringing out this particular provision? Was it to keep up to a certain level of attendance at the colleges and institutions of higher learning the students who were engaged in the various classes of training mentioned in the bill, or was it simply to keep certain kinds of training going in such a degree as to have enough students to supply the essential needs of the Nation in those particular classifications?

Mr. HUNT. The latter part of the Senator's question was primarily the reason why the committee wrote this provision into the bill. It is understood, as has been said on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, that in the third world war, if there should be one, we can not depend alone on the members of our Military Establshiment. We must depend, other than on manpower, on our technical know-how to get production of things which will win the war. The second part of the Senator's question was the reason why we wrote in the provision for 75,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. There was no intention of keeping the attendance at the colleges or universities up to the peacetime average of attendance?

Mr. HUNT. No, it was not for that purpose. However, let me say I do not think we can proceed any longer on the theory of business as usual. There may be some small minor colleges which may be hurt somewhat. Let me say that I believe some of the educators who testified against the bill had in mind more than anything else the loss of future enrollment in their colleges which they would suffer. The provision was not made with the purpose of keeping colleges alive. It was to protect the present know-how that we must have.

Mr. HOLLAND. By what standard will the President or his advisers provide for the 75,000 that will be required out of the inductees or enlistees, or, if a smaller number, what number shall be required?

Mr. HUNT. The 75,000 figure was arrived at, I will say to the Senator from Florida, after testimony of those persons we thought best qualified to give us testimony regarding the proper number to select. They thought 75,000 was the correct number.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call to the attention of the Senator the fact that the bill does not prescribe 75,000 persons, but says, "not to exceed 75,000," leaving to the discretion of the President or his advisers the determination of the precise number to be called in each year. By what standard and with what objectives in view is that specific number, 75,000 or less, to be determined?

Mr. HUNT. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that the members of the Armed Services Committee have great confidence and faith in the ability of those who now are at the head of our Military Establishment,

and we believe that their studies and their judgment was the best indication we could secure with reference to the proper number.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next question, if I may ask it, would be: Does this apply alike to inductees and enlistees and reservists called up, or only to inductees and enlistees, or only to inductees? In other words, does it cover one class, two classes, or all three classes?

Mr. HUNT. I know it refers only to persons of college age inducted.

Mr. HOLLAND. It does not apply then to volunteer enlistees or reservists?

Mr. HUNT. I am advised by the expert who sits beside me that it does not.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call the Senator's attention, if I may, to the fact that, as stated by the wording which applies, the bill uses these words——

Mr. HUNT. I ask the Senator from what page he is reading.

Mr. HOLLAND. Beginning with line 3 on page 83.

Mr. HUNT. Let me say to the Senator from Florida, I think I am wrong. I think any person who has just completed his basic training may be selected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then it does apply to inductees and enlistees?

Mr. HUNT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Equally?

Mr. HUNT. Equally.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very well. The next question I should like to ask is this: During the early part of the operation of this bill, if I understand the report of the committee correctly, the inductees will be almost entirely persons of the older age classification, 19 to 25, that is, persons who are to be called before the calling of the group that falls between 18 and 19 years. Do I understand that up to 75,000 of those persons, many of whom will not be called away from college work, will not even plan for college work, will be chosen in order to obtain this group of men?

Mr. HUNT. Not only is he in the service; he would not be given the privilege of taking the various tests to provide him with future designation as one of those excused for training.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe the Senator got the meaning of my last question.

Mr. HUNT. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not reading from the text. I am stating the question from what I understand of the report of the committee and the meaning of the bill, which will require that in the first year and perhaps the first 2 years of experience under this bill a large number of the inductees will be out of the older groups. Is that correct?

Mr. HUNT. Above 19.

Mr. HOLLAND. At the time that the inductees are of that age group, what will be the necessity for picking out freshmen to enter college and universities from that older group, when the young group, which customarily furnishes the freshmen entering colleges and universities, will not be seriously affected by the bill during the first year or two?

Mr. HUNT. There would be some question in my mind whether there would be a sufficient number out of the service going to school below the age of 19 to meet the requirements of the Nation to maintain our economy and at the same time supply the Armed Forces with technical knowledge.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next question is this, if the Senator will yield further: Is this appointment of these up to 75,000 persons a year limited to those who will be applicants from among the inductees and enlistees, or does it require a combing of all the inductees and enlistees to decide who are the best qualified?

Mr. HUNT. Every inductee is given the opportunity, but there will be no way to say to a boy "You must apply." Does that explain the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish the Senator would repeat his statement.

Mr. HUNT. I say every inductee will be given the opportunity, but there is no way designated whereby the armed services can say to a boy, "You must apply." If he is not interested and does not care he will not be selected. But every boy will have the opportunity to make application.

Mr. HOLLAND. One more question. The Senator has been very gracious. How was this 75,000 fixed? Was it fixed with the view to allowing a full quota of the age groups that were involved to take the particular classes of training that were intended to be allowed under this program—the full peacetime quota as if no war existed?

Mr. HUNT. No; it was based under the anticipated requirements to maintain our civilian economy and also to supply the Military Establishment with the technological know-how they must have. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I wish to ask another question, if I may. If the Senator understands, as I believe he stated, that juniors and seniors now in college are not to be affected by the bill which is being debated, what portion of the bill does he find to justify that understanding?

Mr. HUNT. That was dealt with only in committee discussions.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator means that the bill itself makes no provision which allows young men who want to remain in college and who are in their third or fourth years to remain there, but that it is understood, off the record, that they shall have that privilege?

Mr. HUNT. The Senator is quite right because we discussed time and time again what poor judgment we would show if we took into the armed services a boy who was about to graduate and whose technical knowledge we wanted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think it is wise to leave the bill without any statement of principle or any standard at all in this matter for the guidance of those who shall handle the induction of men into the service?

Mr. HUNT. I believe so, because I have great faith in those who are at the head of our Military Establishment. I believe they are doing the things which are best both for the Military Establishment and for our civilian economy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then there is no thought in the bill to preclude by regulations and administration the Selective Service from the deferring of boys who are students or who are in premedical or predental or other training, or actually taking professional work or work in the humanities?

Mr. HUNT. Of course, under the existing law no boy who is taking medicine, dentistry, veterinary surgery, optometry, or osteopathy can be drafted. Those five professions now cannot be touched. As the Senator knows, since the Korean incident we have drafted very, very few boys out of college.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment, for one of the things the Senator from Wyoming has said disturbs me very much. I did not know of any existing understanding that such person who now are attending college will be allowed to complete college. I think it would be most unfair to give them such an exemption.

It is one thing to say, "Here is a group of students who have such skills that they should be permitted to complete their training in those skills, because that training will be of great service to the Military Establishment in connection with the defense program." On the other hand, I certainly think it would be most unfortunate for us to have any program on the part of the military, by which the military would say, "We are going to permit college students, as college students, to complete their college training." In my judgment, that clearly would be undemocratic.

I know of no reason why a college student who does not have a special skill or who is not training for the development of some special skill in such special fields as languages, physics, engineering, chemistry, medicine, or any of the other fields especially important to the military and our defense efforts should be allowed to complete his college training during the next 2 or 3 years, simply because he happens to be in college now. I do not think we can draw any such distinction among our young people insofar as their obligations to serve right now in the military is concerned.

I will go along with a program which seeks to set aside certain students who are to receive training which will be of help to us in meeting our military needs. But I wish to say that students as a class should take their sacrifices, along with all others in this country. I do not wish anything I have said this afternoon to be interpreted by anyone as being a statement by one who is interested in saving for the colleges of the United States a single enrollee. I am not interested in protecting college enrollments. I am interested in what colleges can do to develop special skills which may be of service to the security of our country in the next few years.

I simply wish to insert that note of protest here, because if the military have any such program as suggested by the Senator from Wyoming in respect

to letting students now in college finish their college courses irrespective of their special skills, I am opposed to it. There is no room in our defense program for coddling college students. Any blanket exemption of them until they finish college would be most unfair and undemocratic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Benton | Ives | Morse |

NAYS—67

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Millikin |
| Bennett | Hoey | Monroney |
| Bricker | Holland | Mundt |
| Butler, Md. | Humphrey | O'Conor |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hunt | O'Mahoney |
| Capehart | Jenner | Pastore |
| Carlson | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Case | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Chapman | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Connally | Kem | Schoeppel |
| Cordon | Kerr | Smathers |
| Dirksen | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Duff | Langer | Sparkman |
| Dworshak | Lodge | Stennis |
| Ecton | Long | Taft |
| Ellender | McCarran | Thye |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Welker |
| Frear | McFarland | Wherry |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Williams |
| Green | McMahon | Young |
| Hendrickson | Magnuson | |
| Hennings | Martin | |

NOT VOTING—26

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | George | Murray |
| Brewster | Gillette | Neely |
| Bridges | Hayden | Nixon |
| Byrd | Hill | Smith, Maine |
| Cain | Kefauver | Tobey |
| Chavez | Lehman | Vandenberg |
| Clements | McCarthy | Watkins |
| Eastland | Malone | Wiley |
| Flanders | Maybank | |

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to offer a modification of my amendment lettered "A." In line 3, I should like to strike out the word "thirty" and insert "thirty-six"; and, in line 6, to strike out the word "thirty" in the two places where it occurs, and insert in both places the words "thirty-six."

I wish to say, in explanation of this perfecting amendment, I think that in view of the changes which were made this afternoon in the length of service, and in view of certain discussions which I have had with colleagues in the Senate, the amendment should be changed from 30 months to 36 months. I should like to offer the amendment now, so that it may be the pending question tomorrow. In doing that, however, I wish to serve notice that, in view of the discussion this afternoon regarding the 75,000 special students I may tonight join with certain of my colleagues in an amendment, to be offered tomorrow, proposing to strike out the entire subsection (d) on page 83 from the bill. I think the discussion of this section this afternoon shows it would be such a confused section that it would probably be better not to have it in at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I could not hear all the Senator said, but as I understood, he is proposing to modify his amendment lettered "A." which he expects to call up tomorrow. It is an amendment which reads:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter no person shall be enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for an enlistment period in excess of 30 months. The period of enlistment of any person who, on or after June 27, 1950, has enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for a period in excess of 30 months is hereby reduced to 30 months.

The modified amendment of the Senator from Oregon proposes, as I understand, to reduce the period of enlistment to 3 years instead of 30 months; am I correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. It is for an enlistment period of 3 years instead of 30 months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment as amended was read, as follows:

On page 91, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter no person shall be enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for an enlistment period in excess of 36 months. The period of enlistment of any person who, on or after June 27, 1950, has enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for a period in excess of 36 months is hereby reduced to 36 months."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment lettered "A" of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as modified.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to express to Senators my appreciation of their willingness to remain here, to work and to accomplish as much as we have accomplished today. I should like to state, however, that it is our intention to finish with this bill Wednesday evening. That may mean a late session tomorrow evening, and a night session Wednesday. It is very important to conclude action on the bill. I give notice now that we will have to work a little harder, if we hope to take an Easter recess, because legislation of this kind is on the must list.

## PRICE STABILIZATION—LIMITATION OF MARGINS OF PROFIT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table. I should like to serve notice now that I shall call up the resolution immediately after the pending measure is disposed of. I submit the resolution for myself and on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I ask that the resolution be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. JENNER) was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Whereas section 11 of the General Ceiling Price Regulation issued January 26, 1951, purports to establish ceiling prices for processors, manufacturers, and distributors of certain listed agricultural commodities and their products; and

Whereas such section permits such ceilings to be increased upon the basis of the in-

creased cost of isolated purchases of such commodities or products, but does not require such ceilings to be decreased as costs decrease; and

Whereas sellers are therefore free in many cases to increase their prices and derive excessive, inequitable, and inflationary profit margins without commensurate increases in their average costs, and without benefit to the producer of the listed agricultural commodity; and

Whereas section 11 insofar as it now so purports to impose ceiling prices, but leaves sellers free to raise prices at will, is false and deceptive and encourages abnormal, excessive, and inflationary profit margins: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Director of Price Stabilization is requested to amend section 11 of the General Ceiling Price Regulation so that its provisions will not under any circumstances accord sellers greater than their normal margins of profit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should hope that the Senator would ask that the resolution go to committee. It is far reaching. It is a resolution which should have the study of a committee. I believe the Senator would make a great deal more progress if he would ask that his resolution be referred to a committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I discussed this resolution with the chairman of the committee, and there is no misunderstanding on behalf of anyone with whom I discussed it, or any Member of the Senate. The bill which was passed and became the Defense Production Act had two purposes; first, to hold down the cost to the consumer, and, second, to provide adequate safeguards for the farmer. As it is now being interpreted, the act is nothing more than a licensing vehicle for a group of wartime profiteers who are using it for their advantage.

I intend to discuss the question on the floor of the Senate. In my opinion the resolution is not one which should go to a committe, but I think it is something on which each Member of the Senate should act individually in order that all may go on record.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Members of the Senate would go on record on it individually when it was reported to the Senate, but the Senate would not want to take action on the resolution without its reference to a committee and the recommendation of a committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I have said, I shall later on discuss the resolution and the subject it involves.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

George G. Jeck, of Atlantic, Iowa, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Iowa.

By Mr. McCARRAN, for the Committee on the Judiciary:

Daniel Holcombe Thomas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Alabama, vice John McDuffie, deceased;

Paul D. Shriver, of Colorado, to be United States judge for the district court of Guam;

Charles J. McNamee, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Robert N. Wilkin, retired;

John P. Cowart, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia;

J. Ellis Mundy, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia;

J. Saxton Daniel, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia;

James G. Mackey, of New York, to be United States attorney for Guam;

Edward B. Doyle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia;

James R. Wright, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas; and

Joseph Henry Young, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph E. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified at once.

## RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislature session I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

*To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance*

Emil E. Palmquist

*To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance*

Manly B. Root

*To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

James W. Phipps
Leo R. Melcher
Robert J. Sillery

*To be assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

Harold M. Silver

*To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Irvin F. Buck

*To be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance*

Arthur W. Dodds

*To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance*

Frederick F. Aldridge

*To be junior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

Morton I. Goldman

*To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Harry Rubin

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Mar. 7, 1951
For actions of Mar. 6, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 40

CONTENTS

Banking and currency.....15
Budgeting.....22
Contracts.....7
Cotton.....8,11,20
Electrification.....24
Expenditures.....4,22,23
Farm production.....18,19
Foreign affairs.....9
aid.....21,27
Grain.....21
Health.....14
Housing.....10
Information.....2,26
Labor.....25
farm.....18,19
Lands.....5
Military training.....1
Nomination.....3
Organization, legislative.....6
Personnel.....3,4,12,23
Postal rates.....17
Prices, control....8,11,20
farm.....8,11
Purchasing.....7
Resettlement administration.....2
Roads.....16
Small business.....25
Taxation.....16
Transportation.....13

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated military-training bill. Sen. Hickenlooper claimed "faked pictures" by Resettlement Administration. Senate committee reported Ramspeck nomination. Rep. Rankin introduced and discussed bill to prohibit price ceilings on cotton. Rep. Gathings claimed "ceilings on raw cotton are unworkable." Rep. Smith (Miss.) and Sen. Kefauver introduced bills to permit cotton ceilings only on cotton textiles. Rep. Gathings inserted Under Secretary's testimony on rural manpower.

## SENATE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military-training selective-service bill (pp. 2059-67, 2070, 2075-90, 2099-103). Rejected a Morse amendment to limit enlistments to 3 years. Sen. Saltonstall inserted a description of work done by conscientious objectors during World War II, including projects on forestry and soil-conservation camps, farm labor, dairy testing, experiment stations, etc. (pp. 2080-1).

2. RESETTLEMENT; INFORMATION. Sen. Hickenlooper charged that the Resettlement Administration used "faked pictures" to influence Congress to grant appropriations for that agency's work (pp. 2090-7).

3. NOMINATION. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported favorably the nomination of Robert Ramspeck to be a Civil Service Commissioner (p. 2059).

4. PERSONNEL; EXPENDITURES. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted a report on Government employment for January 1951 (pp. 2053-6).

5. PUBLIC LANDS. Received a S. Dak. Legislature resolution requesting payments to States and subdivisions in lieu of taxes on Federal lands (pp. 2052-3).

6. LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION. A summary of all amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was ordered printed as S. Doc. 11 (p. 2058).

7. CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees on H. R. 1724, to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, agreed to file a report (p. D159).

HOUSE

8. COTTON PRICES. Rep. Gathings, Ark., claimed that "ceilings on raw cotton are unworkable," discussed efforts which have been made to change the price order, and said that controls "should be applied on the finished product in order to hold down the price of cotton goods to the consuming public" (pp. 2023-4).

9. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Subcommittee on Federal Relations with International Organizations of the Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee submitted its first intermediate report (H. Rept. 210) (p. 2049).

10. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2988, to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense (H. Rept. 211) (p. 2049).

BILLS INTRODUCED

11. COTTON PRICES. H. R. 3076, by Rep. Rankin, Miss., to amend section 404 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, so as to exempt cotton from price control; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 2050). Rep. Rankin discussed the purpose of his bill and inserted the text (p. 2024).

H. R. 3077, by Rep. Smith, Miss., and S. 1065, by Sen. Kefauver, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, so as to require that price control in the case of cotton be established only through ceilings on cotton textiles and other cotton end products; to Banking and Currency Committees (pp. 2050, 2057). Sen. Kefauver inserted his statement explaining the purpose of the bills and criticizing the present price order on cotton (pp. 2057-8).

12. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3082, by Rep. Karsten, Mo., to deny benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act to persons convicted of felonies involving improper use of their authority, power, influence, or privileges as Government officers or employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 2050).

13. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 3078, by Rep. Smith, Miss., to amend the act entitled, "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act"; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 2050).

14. HEALTH. H. R. 3079, by Rep. Burnside, W. Va., to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of children of school age through the development of children's health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 2050).

15. BANKING AND CURRENCY. S. J. Res. 45, by Sen. Douglas (for himself and Sens. Fulbright, Flanders, Gillette, Tobey, and Thye), to vest in the duly constituted authorities of the Federal Reserve System the primary power and responsibility for regulating the supply, availability, and cost of credit in general; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 2057). Discussion by Sen. Douglas of the purposes of the measure, including an article by Gardiner C. Means, "The Inflation Crisis" (pp. 2070-4).

16. ROADS; TAXATION. S. 1063, by Sen. Butler, Nebr., to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers in building roads; to Finance Committee (p. 2057).

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 6 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BRICKER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 87, line 19, change the period to a comma and add the following: "and any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, and having entered such institution prior to the eighteenth anniversary of his birth, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the second academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier."

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BRICKER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 6 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 6 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BRICKER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 83, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 19 on page 84.

On page 84, line 20, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d) (1)".

On page 86, line 10, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 86, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".

One page 86, line 18, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

3-6-51——B

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BRICKER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 6 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 6 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: On page 91, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new subsection:

(aa) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fifth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such

reviews, the committees shall report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable."

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 6 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

statement entitled "Northwest Power Situation," delivered by Rudy Block over Station KOMO, Seattle, on Monday, February 19, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ED ALLEN'S FIRESIDE THOUGHTS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article under the caption "Ed Allen's fireside thoughts," which appears in the Appendix.]

INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARMY-NAVY-AIR FORCE JOURNAL

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding a bill providing for special income tax exemptions for all members of the Armed Forces, published in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal on February 24, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reorganization—Or Burial?" published in today's New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER—STATEMENT BY S. ABBOT SMITH BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relating to manpower made by S. Abbot Smith before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, on March 6, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE FRANK D. SCOTT—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Michigan State House of Representatives memorializing the death of Hon. Frank D. Scott, formerly a Representative in Congress from the Eleventh District of Michigan.

Mr. Scott's service in Congress preceded my own by a number of years, but I was privileged to know him and to know of his record of distinguished service. I join the Michigan House in expressing sincere regrets at his passing February 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 14

A resolution expressing the regret of the legislature on the death of Hon. Frank D. Scott, formerly a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Eleventh District of Michigan

Whereas Hon. Frank D. Scott, long a resident of Alpena, Mich., and for 12 years a Representative from Michigan in the Congress of the United States died on February 12, 1951; and

Whereas Hon. Frank D. Scott served his home city, county, and State in public life through many years as prosecuting attorney of Alpena County and as a member of the State senate for two terms, as well as his subsequent service in the Congress, and in that latter service received the honor of being elected as chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in which capacity many of the vital problems of Michigan relative to its maritime and fishing interests came to his attention, and the interests of his native State therein were well protected and served; and

Whereas his many friends and former colleagues in the legislature and the Congress deeply regret the passing of a great and significant figure in public life, as well as the loss of a good friend and public servant: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives*, That the regret of the legislature at the loss of Hon. Frank D. Scott to the State and the Nation is hereby profoundly expressed, and the deep sympathy of the legislature is extended to his widow and his family; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a suitable copy of this resolution be sent to Mrs. Scott and to each Member of the Michigan delegation in the Congress.

Unanimously adopted by the House February 14, 1951.

NORMAN E. PHILLES,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

POSTMASTERS—EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably the nominations of 33 postmasters. They were unanimously ordered reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT RAMSPECK TO BE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably the nomination of former Representative Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously agreed to this appointment this morning. Many members of the committee paid high tribute to Mr. Ramspeck's nomination, and I want to say at this time that I think the Government and the general public have gained immeasurably from this appointment.

I have known Bob Ramspeck for a good many years, and I know of no man who has keener knowledge or more sympathy for the civil-service merit system.

We in the Senate should be highly pleased that Bob Ramspeck has agreed to accept this nomination, and we wish him well in his new duties.

I cannot let this moment pass without paying tribute to the man whom Robert Ramspeck succeeds.

Harry Mitchell, the retiring Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has served long and faithfully the civil servants and the general public of his country.

Harry Mitchell is loved and respected by all who know him, and no man is held in higher esteem by the people who work with him.

Chairman Mitchell's name has been written deep and firm in the annals of Government administration and he will be remembered for years to come for his great service to the American public.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION OF F. JOSEPH DONOHUE TO BE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONER—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report favorably the nomination of F. Joseph Donohue, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years. It is a unanimous report of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

FAVORS GRANTED TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for half a minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. I notice in this morning's Washington Post that a hotel man in Miami, Fla., by the name of Sax made certain statements with respect to favors granted to Members of Congress. I read from the article:

Asked if he had ever offered free rooms to Members of Congress, Sax said:

"I wouldn't go around inviting anybody. But if they come here—we have had Senators from both sides of the fence there."

Then he enlarged:

"We don't have to go out and tell everybody. We'd have 48 Senators down there maybe. I don't know. Or. 96."

The membership of the Senate totals 96.

I wish the RECORD to show that at no time was the senior Senator from North Dakota ever a guest of Mr. Sax, or of any of the three hotels mentioned.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], lettered "A" as modified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 91, between lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter no person shall be enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for an enlistment period in excess of 36 months. The period of enlistment of any person who, on or after June 27, 1950, has enlisted in any of the Armed Forces for a period in excess of 36 months is hereby reduced to 36 months.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in support of this amendment. I wish to say at the outset that the purpose of the amendment is to help correct what I think has been a very bad practice on the part of the military, particularly the Air Force and the Navy, because since the outbreak of the Korean War the Air Force and the Navy have

been enlisting more men than they can properly absorb.

As the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, so well stated in what I think is one of the most important reports which has been issued to date by that subcommittee, the Air Force has been guilty of stockpiling men. The Senator from Texas made that statement when speaking in regard to the scandalous conditions which characterized the Air Force operation of its manpower policies in respect to Lackland Field, Tex.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am satisfied that the Air Force and the Navy have taken advantage of the attitude of thousands of American boys since the outbreak of the Korean War. The boys have rushed to enlist in the Air Force and in the Navy in order to avoid the possibility of being drafted into the infantry.

Mr. President, I wish I were free on the floor of the Senate to give the source of certain statements which I am now about to repeat; but I am not free to do so, because it would prove embarrassing to certain high officials in the Military Establishment. However, I believe that my colleagues in the Senate know me well enough to be assured that not only will I respect the confidence, but that I will report accurately confidential information without disclosing the name of the person who gave it to me.

Mr. President, since I started the fight for the shortening of the enlistment period, a total of four men high in the Military Establishment have told me that I am absolutely right in the position I am taking with regard to reducing the period of enlistments. They said I was wrong in my 30-month proposal in my original amendment, but that they thought 36 months would be proper. I have modified my amendment to comply with their advice, to 36 months.

Those men have told me that I am also right in stating that the stockpiling practice which has been going on under the 4-year enlistment program is not only working a great hardship upon the boys, but is working an injustice to the military program itself. They have been taking the men so fast that they cannot begin to absorb them. It is having a detrimental effect upon morale within the Armed Forces, and they have had to adjust their procedures to such an extent, as was pointed out by the Armed Services Subcommittee report on the Lackland scandal, that they have reduced their indoctrination course in the Air Force from 14 weeks to 14 days.

Mr. President, what does that mean? The assumption would be easy to make—but the facts would not support it—that when the boys are sent from the overstocked bases, so far as manpower is concerned, they are going to get their indoctrination training in the camps or military stations to which they are sent. But again I am advised by reliable friends in the Military Establishment that that is not the way it works. The result is that those boys do not complete their indoctrination course. They ought to have it if they are going to be properly trained for service in the Military Establishment.

Next, I wish to emphasize again a point which I made time and time again in the committee's discussions, that there is something about the ethics of the practice which the military has been following in regard to enlistments that I do not like. It does not set well with me, Mr. President, because I do not like to see my Government taking advantage of 18- and 19-year-old boys and their fears by putting the kind of pressure on them which has been put on them in the recruiting offices by the recruiting officers themselves by statements to the effect that if they will only enlist in the Air Force or in the Navy they will avoid any danger of being sent into the infantry.

I have had a considerable amount of correspondence on this subject, as well as advice from friends in the Military Establishment. I have had considerable correspondence not only with parents, but in some instances with the boys themselves, and with friends of boys who have enlisted. I am satisfied, Mr. President that it is accurate to say that the Air Force and the Navy have been following what amount in fact and effect to pressure devices, to psychological pressure on these boys to get them to enlist for 4-year terms.

It probably will be said—at least it has been in the argument thus far on this point—that my amendment, of course, will in effect make some reduction in the manpower pool. But there is nothing that stops these boys from reenlisting at the end of 3 years if either the Navy or the Air Force can sell them their program. Reenlistment is open to them. But let me forewarn the Senate today that if—and again I underline the word "if" in this hypothesis—that if world tensions lessen in the next couple of years, as we all hope they will, we are going to hear plenty about these boys who, in many cases, were, in effect, pressured psychologically into a 4-year enlistment.

I think we need to keep in mind the fact that a 3-year enlistment program will give these boys the training they need and a reasonable time to put their training into practice in the various assignments to which they go. Three years, Mr. President, is a long time for an enlistment, and if I am correctly informed from the statistics which have been presented to me as to the period of enlistments in the case of our allies in the North Atlantic Pact, it is above the average of a majority of them. I am not proposing an enlistment period which could possibly be interpreted abroad as any weakening whatsoever on the part of the United States in the international defense program under the North Atlantic Pact, but, to the contrary, it leaves us on a par with the best and superior to most so far as the enlistment period is concerned.

Mr. President, I would it were possible that the step I now have in mind could be taken at this time, but it is not, and I am therefore not going to offer it, because I know pretty well the sentiment of the Senate in regard to it; but I think that sooner or later we must come to a further modification of our enlistment program in order to make our selective service law function more democratically than it does at the present time, by so modifying it as to require that a certain percentage of draftees be assigned to the Air Force and to the Navy. I think it is wrong to permit the Navy and the Air Force to fill up their complete roll by enlistees, because it seems to me that following that practice is impliedly a reflection upon draftees. The public policy theory of the selective service law is that it is part of the civic duty and patriotic obligation of men of military age to do their stint in uniform in defense of their country if their country needs them. But, Mr. President, the selective service law should not be administered by the Government to any degree whatsoever in a spirit of having the inductees considered to be second-class military men.

Mr. President, any boy in this country who wishes to have the Selective Service law operate upon him, has the right to know that waiting for the operation of the law does not shut the door to his pro rata chance of being drafted into the Air Force or into the Navy. But we have got to face the fact that as the selective service law is operating at the present time a draftee has practically no chance of being drafted into the Air Force or into the Navy. I know the argument on the other side, and I am frank to say that I recognize some reasonableness and some merit to it, but I am inclined to the view that the selective service law, if it is going to apply the principle of uniformity of obligation, should provide for at least some positions in the Navy and in the Air Force for inductees.

My amendment does not cover this problem, but I raise the point because I believe it has an indirect relationship to what, in my opinion, should be done. In due course of time we will have to do something about the present policy which in effect denies to the inductee an opportunity to serve in the Air Force or in the Navy. Whether we want to admit it or not, I think there is involved a psychological implication at least that the draftee is a second-class serviceman. I do not like that, Mr. President. In our democracy the Selective Service Act should be considered one of the great democratic pillars, one of the great bulwarks of our democratic way of life. We should not tolerate a policy which reflects upon it or in any way clothes it with any negative implication, as will be the case until we make very clear that at least a pro rata or a certain percentage of inductees must be taken into the Air Force or into the Navy. We do not have to do that by law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. My question deals with the point the Senator has just been discussing. Recently a directive was issued which permits a student enrolled in a college to be deferred until, I think, 30 or 60 days before the semester ends, with the understanding that the stu-

dent properly enrolled would have the opportunity of enlisting at that date and in the meantime remain in college.

The Senator from Oregon is touching upon a subject which I think is very vital to the colleges. Does the Senator know whether the enlistments are running so high in the Air Corps and in the Navy, or in any other branch which might offer such an opportunity, so that the young man in college today will be foreclosed from taking advantage of the service he chooses in the event he would like to enlist, if he waits until the induction date materializes? Does the Senator know anything about how that is working out?

Mr. MORSE. My answer is that I do not know the facts in detail. I have been advised, and I believe absolutely accurately, that the Air Force and the Navy presently are able to fill by way of enlistments all the positions they have available from month to month. I assume that when this group of college students are ready for enlistment in accordance with the Department of Defense administrative order which has been issued to the various recruiting officers, they will be allowed to enlist. The military will have to keep faith with the boys. But as a result I think something will happen. I think that what the military will have will be an addition to the surplus of manpower they already have, which they are not absorbing very well.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, give any good reason why there should not be one recruiting office for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, instead of having three different offices in some places?

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, there is no good reason for justifying the waste of manpower in the recruiting system of the Military Establishment. I thought we had passed a unification measure some time ago.

Mr. LANGER. So did the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. I thought one of the purposes of the Unification Act was to unify. I thought one of its purposes was to eliminate some of the unconscionable waste which characterizes the Military Establishment of the United States. The Senator from North Dakota has put his finger on another waste of the taxpayers' money, another example of the inefficiency of the Military Establishment, another example of how those in the Pentagon are building themselves up as a class which must be watched by the Congress at all times.

Mr. President, in this period of emergency we have to be on guard against the military class as represented by those in the Pentagon Building who are taking unto themselves more and more discretionary power; and unfortunately the Congress is voting it to them. That is why now, next year, and in the years to come, so long as these abuses exist in the Military Establishment, I am going to be heard to say on the floor of the Senate, "Let the American people beware of the power the military will take unto themselves if we do not check them by means of the kind of legislation we have before the Senate today." That must be done if we wish to protect the interests of the American people against a wasteful Military Establishment which takes advantage of every emergency to deepen its vested interests.

Anyone who will talk to some of the military officials out of chambers, outside of committee hearings, and get them to tell privately what some of their fears are, will find from their conversations ample support of what I am forewarning in this debate about the importance of our being on guard against giving the military any broad, blanket powers, without adequate checks within a bill which will provide means by which we can review them periodically.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very curious to know what was contained in the Unification Act which was passed. I certainly believed it provided for one unified service for all the branches of the Armed Forces.

Mr. MORSE. I think a great deal was accomplished by the Unification Act, but not enough. So far as it went, I think it was fine; but there are many other reforms which should be brought about in the Military Establishment in order to put into effect a true unification program.

For example, if we really want to save great sums of money, as the Hoover Commission has so well pointed out, we should say something about the procurement system of the Military Establishment, in order to bring about greater centralization and unification of procurement practices—to put into effect, for example, a one-catalog inventory system within the Military Establishment. In these times, we must be watchdogs 24 hours of the day and night on the powers and the administration of the powers we give to the Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I was saying—and I wish to complete my comments on this point, and then I shall conclude my remarks on my amendment—that in order to require that at least a certain percentage of inductees must be taken into the Air Force and into the Navy, and thereby have their total enlistments limited accordingly, we do not have to proceed by means of legislation. The power now exists in the military to do it, if they wish to, by administrative order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The VICE PRESIDENT. For some time the Chair has been trying to maintain order in the Senate. Senators who are compelled to converse will please leave the Chamber.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; as soon as I finish this sentence.

Mr. President, let me say goodnaturedly that it is quite unimportant to me whether my colleagues listen to my argument, because, again, I am making a record for the people of the country, and in due course of time I am going to take a good many of these issues to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Regardless of the Senator's indifference regarding the preservation of order, the Chair feels that it is the business of the Senate to preserve order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to thank the Chair for his endeavor to get order, so far as the Senate is concerned; but I did not want anyone in the Chamber to think that I was at all disturbed because conversations were going on.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; in a minute.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the failure of the military under the unification system to make the Selective Service System work more democratically than it is presently working, by requiring that the Navy and the Air Force take a certain fair share of inductees, is a good example of why the Congress should place a legislative check upon the military if they do not proceed to carry out the spirit and intent of the Unification Act.

Now I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, my question is this: The Senator from Oregon has been talking about enlistments in the Air Corps and in the Navy. When, as has been indicated, the Air Corps accepts, by way of enlistment, more men than it is able to train, is it possible that under the Unification Act or under some other present law some of those enlistees could immediately be transferred to the Army?

Mr. MORSE. I seriously question that. After the Government enters into what amounts, in effect, to an enlistment contract with a boy, I think we must keep the contract.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Unification Act consolidated the services in respect to enlistments; or are the services now so separated that an enlistment in one service is an enlistment in only that service?

Mr. MORSE. The latter is my opinion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator have information as to whether the President by Executive Order could wipe out the excess recruiting stations? For example, when there are three recruiting stations in a small town—one recruiting station for each of the three services—could the President by Executive Order provide that there would be only one recruiting station in that town?

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion that could be done by administrative order, within the Military Establishment.

Mr. LANGER. It would be up to the President to do it, would it?

Mr. MORSE. I should think that the President, as Commander in Chief, could make very clear to his subordinate offi-

cers what they must do in regard to unifying the recruiting service.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. The other day when this matter was previously before the Senate, the Senator from Minnesota, inserted in the RECORD some statistics, which he obtained from the Pentagon, regarding the manpower operation of the recruiting service. Although standing alone it does not seem to involve a large number of men, yet it does involve several thousand men; and when we begin to talk about saving manpower, every man we save helps in reaching the total number we wish to have in order to get more able-bodied men into the field for military service, and in order to place in administrative positions men who cannot perform combat service.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How would the Senator from Oregon accomplish what he has in mind regarding the Air Corps and the Navy, so far as recruits are concerned, if, under the law, voluntary enlistments are permitted and if there is no method of transferring men from one service to another?

Mr. MORSE. As I said earlier in my remarks, my amendment will not cover this problem. I am raising the point because it seems to me that somewhere in the record of this debate, there ought to be a discussion of this problem, in the hope that on the basis of such discussion alone the military will clean its own house in regard to this problem. I have said, if that does not happen, then I believe we are going to be confronted with this problem in the future by way of legislative action. But I should like to give the military due notice and an opportunity to adopt administrative regulations which will make the selective service system operate more democratically than I think the present enlistment program permits it to work.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator any doubt that the present plan of allowing enlistments in what at least the men who are going into the service feel are enlistments in a preferred service, brings about the hoarding of manpower?

Mr. MORSE. The proof is quite unanswerable in support of the point made by the Senator from Michigan. There can be no doubt of the fact that there has been a hoarding of manpower. We found that to be true without any question in the Lackland investigation, and it is so stated in the report of the Johnson subcommittee, known as the Subcommittee on Preparedness, issued some weeks ago. I may say—and I mention this as not idle flattery at all, because I do not think it can be mentioned too frequently—that the work done by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] as chairman of that subcommittee has been of tremendous value to the American people, not only in checking the abuses which we have already discovered, but, I am satisfied, in checking many abuses which we have not discovered, as to them, the military, taking note of what we have already discovered, have become busy and cleaned their house in some respects in regard to certain bad practices which they were fearful might come to the light of day sometime, if they did not make the corrections before the Johnson subcommittee got on the job in regard to those particular abuses.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. I should like to say that, the hewing to the line, the absolute courage and fearlessness of the chairman of the subcommittee on preparedness in meeting problems arising throughout the country, whether in Texas, in connection with the Lackland Air Base, or in any other section, has been one of the great inspirations of the junior Senator from Oregon, as a member of the subcommittee. That is the way I like to see the people's business transacted in the Congress of the United States. The Senator from Texas is doing a magnificent job.

For example, the tin report which was published in recent hours by that subcommittee will save the American taxpayers several billion dollars, because, already, in the few hours since the report has been released, we have been advised that the price of tin has dropped several cents a pound. That saving, alone, will run into several billion dollars in the months ahead, even if the price goes no lower; and I think the chances are pretty good that the price will go lower. Moreover, the speculation racket, which has characterized the whole matter of production and sale of tin is, I think, going to be checked as a result of the investigation conducted by the subcommittee. In my book, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas simply cannot receive praise too high for the work he is doing as chairman of the subcommittee. I admire his work so much that, as I have told him privately, and now say publicly, I am sorry that he and I have a few differences on this bill. They have been merely professional differences, and the Senator knows that when the final vote is taken on the bill, after I have had the fair hearing which I am receiving in the Senate on my amendments and which I received in committee, I am going to vote for the final bill, because I believe it necessary that the Senate should pass the best manpower bill we can get, rather than to have no bill at all.

Returning now to my amendment, as I say, I feel that the advice I have received from my friends in the military, to which I have already referred in my speech, is sound; that 3 years is a proper limitation and will place some effective checks upon the Navy and the Air Force. It will at least demonstrate to them the attitude of the Senate. It will give them the manpower they need. It will give them the opportunity to sell their program to enlistees, so that men may reenlist at the end of the 3-year period if they think it a good program. It will also give some protection to American boys, many of them somewhat immature, who were talked into a 4-year enlistment program upon the representation by the military itself that by so doing they would be able to avoid being drafted into the infantry.

Oh, I know, Mr. President, it can be said that we should not be wasting sympathy upon boys who were so easily persuaded, and I know that in some of our discussions it has been said—and I do not share this point of view, I may say, before I state it—that some of the boys who have enlisted in effect have been using enlistment as a way of dodging the infantry. I do not think that is at all a fair evaluation of what these boys have done. I think they have been very human in what they have done. It is an understandable human reaction to accept the persuasion of the Military Establishment for enlistment, thinking only of the present emergency and not foreseeing in the future to the extent that I think they are going to come to see, the fact that, after all, the Government struck a pretty hard bargain with them when it tied them into a 4-year-enlistment program.

Then, too, we need to remember that it was not so long ago that enlistments for a lesser period were accepted. When we keep in mind the fact that we are trying to train the largest pool of manpower in the shortest possible period of time, I believe there is some merit in my 3-year-enlistment program as a substitute for the 4-year program.

For these reasons, I submit my amendment, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to modify the present enlistment program by placing a top ceiling, for the time being, of 3 years instead of the present 4-year enlistment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment, which would destroy the finest voluntary-enlistment program the world has ever known. The proposals of the amendment are almost completely at variance with the testimony heard by the committee from each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, regarding their needs for a voluntary-enlistment program. In the many weeks of hearings conducted by the committee, we heard no evidence whatsoever to support the idea that an enlistment period of 36 months, or any period of months less than 4 years, would be adequate to meet the needs of all the Armed Forces. The traditional policy of the Nation has always been to secure the maximum number of military personnel on a voluntary-career basis. This is imperative to the efficiency of our Armed Forces.

What is the actual situation? At the present time the normal Army enlistment is for a minimum period of 3 years. The Army also has longer enlistments for 4 years, for 6 years, and indefinite career enlistments in excess of 6 years. I would point out that the best estimate the committee could get was that under this bill, with an armed force of 3,500,000, only 500,000 to 600,000 men will

immediately be drafted, under the language and terms of the pending bill. Where do the other 3,000,000 come from? They come from the Reserve and from voluntary enlistments.

A few highly specialized civilians, whose civilian occupations are identical with the work they will do in the service, are sometimes accepted for shorter periods, when it is in the interest of the service. The Navy and the Air Force have proved through years of experience that a 3-year enlistment period is too short to provide the advanced specialist training required for both services. In those services the normal enlistment period is 4 years, with longer enlistments of 6 years. The career enlistment is for a period in excess of 6 years.

We should not forget the important fact that the Navy and the Air Force are now meeting their manpower requirements from voluntary enlistments on those terms. They have had to cut off voluntary enlistments temporarily because they do not have the facilities to take care of the number of men who are volunteering. Every time a man volunteers to enlist 4 years, it means that it is unnecessary to draft a man to take his place. One volunteer for 6 years means more than two drafted men for 24 months.

During the 7-month period from July 1950 to January 1951, 570,000 men enlisted in the armed services for periods in excess of 3 years; 195,000 of those men enlisted for 3 years—the present minimum period, which the junior Senator from Oregon would make the maximum period; 300,000 men enlisted for 4 years; 75,000 men enlisted for 6 years. Therefore, a total of 375,000 men enlisted for periods of service which this amendment would outlaw.

We now have the amazingly successful average of 81,400 enlistments each month. Those 81,400 enlistments would be cut down from 48 months to 36 months, notwithstanding an individual's desire to volunteer for 4 years. Let us consider the Air Force. It takes 29 months to train a radar repairman for a B–36. The man who presents himself for enlistment has an ambition to make a career of the service, or to be promoted and attain a higher rating. He receives 29 months training in order to be a radar repairman. It takes 28 months to train a radio repairman. It takes a great number of months to train all the other specialists used in the Air Force and the Navy.

If the pending amendment should be agreed to, we would say to a man who wanted to enlist for 4 years, "We don't want you." At the same time we would be saying, "We are going to pass a draft act which, by this amendment, will require the drafting of an additional 210,000 18-year-olds."

Mr. President, that simply does not make sense. In one moment we say to a man who desires to volunteer, "We will not take you for 4 years." Then as a result of the amendment it is required that we draft two men to take the place of the one we turned down.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected overwhelmingly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of rebuttal I merely wish to say, in a few sentences, that the questions raised by the Senator from Texas can be completely answered by merely pointing out that my amendment would not prohibit reenlistment, and all the men about whom he has been speaking would be perfectly free to reenlist if the program about which he has been talking has been proved to them, during their 3-year enlistment, to be so desirable for their future.

We ought to protect these boys, many of whom, in my judgment, in the present crisis have been psychologically pressured into a 4-year enlistment by the representation that that would be a way to avoid getting into the infantry. No matter what one may think about boys yielding to that sort of pressure, I do not believe we ought to hold that kind of a representation out to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The United States has provided a liberal and generous retirement program for enlisted men, has it not?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is very generous. That would be one of the inducements for reenlisting, I should think.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is one of the inducements for reenlisting, but what I am worried about is whether or not a man who has decided to make the Army his career might come to the time to reenlist and might be turned down by the Army. The Army is not compelled to let a man remain in the Army.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think that presents much of a problem in considering the difference between 3 and 4 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Probably it is not much of a problem, but I am thinking of the principle involved, and I am wondering whether the Army could say to a man who desires to reenlist, "No, we don't want you any longer," and he might be cut off from the retirement privileges.

Mr. MORSE. He has accumulated some retirement rights during his service, and the fact that he would get out of the Army would not affect his right to some financial protection. I do not believe the Senator has a very serious problem in that respect at all.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Bridges | Carlson |
| Anderson | Butler, Md. | Case |
| Bennett | Butler, Nebr. | Chapman |
| Benton | Byrd | Chavez |
| Brewster | Cain | Connally |
| Bricker | Capehart | Cordon |
| Dirksen | Johnson, Tex. | Neely |
| Douglas | Johnston, S. C. | Nixon |
| Duff | Kefauver | O'Conor |
| Dworshak | Kem | O'Mahoney |
| Ecton | Kerr | Pastore |
| Ellender | Kilgore | Robertson |
| Ferguson | Knowland | Russell |
| Flanders | Langer | Saltonstall |
| Frear | Lehman | Schoeppel |
| Fulbright | Lodge | Smathers |
| George | Long | Smith, Maine |
| Gillette | McCarran | Smith, N. J. |
| Green | McClellan | Smith, N. C. |
| Hayden | McFarland | Sparkman |
| Hendrickson | McKellar | Stennis |
| Hennings | McMahon | Taft |
| Hickenlooper | Magnuson | Thye |
| Hill | Malone | Tobey |
| Hoey | Martin | Watkins |
| Holland | Maybank | Welker |
| Humphrey | Millikin | Wherry |
| Hunt | Monroney | Williams |
| Ives | Morse | Young |
| Jenner | Mundt | |
| Johnson, Colo. | Murray | |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment, but first I wish to read a letter written by a man in the Navy, who is now stationed in the Philippine Islands. The letter is dated February 18th, and reads:

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, *February 18, 1951.*

Senator LANGER,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am a naval reservist called back to duty from North Dakota. I am also a taxpayer and I can't say that I appreciate the way my tax money is being spent.

To begin with I reported to Bismarck for a physical. They felt of me and saw that I was warm and sent me on to Seattle. Played pinochle and did nothing there for 2 weeks while being processed. Then on to Treasure Island for another 2 weeks. They rechecked what they did in Seattle. Oh yes, I got to mow the admiral's lawn while there. Two weeks at sea and then Guam. Guam was 2 weeks of cutting grass with a machette. Finally got orders and transportation to the Philippines. They let us lay around here for 4 or 5 days to get used to the place before assigning us to duty. It was just a little better than 2 months from the day I was recalled until I got assigned to duty.

This station has a normal complement of men of about 300 men. They had 13 airplanes to take care of before. Now they have close to 600 men here and still only 13 airplanes to take care of. Now I ask you—does that make sense to you? The men the Navy called back were supposedly men with critical rates, men that were needed. I understand that they have a similar condition on Guam too.

I understand also that men are bleeding and dying up north in Korea. Haven't seen anyone do anything about that around here.

All we do is lay around and make picture frames, bracelets, and watch bands. Maybe we should appreciate the vacation. About all we are doing is wasting our own time and a lot of the taxpayers' money. What's going on? Is the Navy trying to spend a lot of money now to get a bigger appropriation next year Seems like a very silly operation to me.

Mr. President, I have the man's name. His brother, in Fargo, N. Dak., also writes, saying that he received the letter I have read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that the letter which the Senator from North Dakota has read is not remotely involved in the pending amendment. Perhaps it is remotely involved, in that if we cut the term of voluntary enlistment it would mean that reservists who are so unhappy as the one who wrote to the Senator from North Dakota would have to stay on duty for a longer period of time.

Frankly, up to this time, I have been able to understand the reasoning behind all amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon. This amendment I am unable to digest. He says that because of the fact that so many men desire to enlist for 4 years in the Air Force and in the Navy he finds it necessary to endeavor to cut the period to 3 years.

He talks about psychological pressures put on men to compel them to enlist for 4 years in the Navy. I respectfully submit that any man who yields to psychological pressure to enlist for 4 years would yield much more readily and much more quickly if he could enlist for 3 years, as proposed by the amendment. The hoarding of manpower of which he complains would be greatly aggravated. This amendment relates only to a voluntary contract between the citizen and his Government, whereby he enlists for a period longer than 36 months.

As the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] said in his very able statement, there are all kinds of periods of enlistment in the Army and Navy, including an indefinite enlistment. Today there are thousands of men in the Army and Navy, and particularly in the Marine Corps, who are making a career of service. They enlist for an indefinite period because they want to serve 20 years and have retirement privileges.

The Senator from Oregon says, "Oh, no; it is all wrong if a man wishes to do that. He cannot do it. We are going to limit him to an enlistment of 36 months." So if we adopt this amendment, all we are doing is adding to the pressure on the Air Force and the Navy to waste manpower.

This amendment has no place in a selective-service bill, which takes men by compulsion. It ought to stand on its own merits as a separate proposition, and not be brought here to be confused with the issue of the reservists and the inductees. Because of the action taken by the Senate yesterday, their period of service is limited to 24 months.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did I correctly understand the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee to say that persons could enlist for an indefinite period?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Not for any definite term?

Mr. RUSSELL. There are conditions as to the length of service; but there is such a thing as an indefinite enlistment in at least one of the branches of the service. I am quite sure of that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. How does a man get out of the service? When he gets up near the guns can he decide to resign at that point? How does he get out?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with all the conditions, but there is an indefinite period of enlistment which is authorized in all the services, for the noncommissioned officers. I am not familiar with all the details. Of course, there is a period of release.

A certain number of men make a career of the service. That includes radar operators, B–36 pilots, men who handle generators and other delicate machinery in the Navy, and many other classes of men. They get the benefit of their reenlistment pay all in a lump. It is a rather attractive proposition to a man who wishes to serve 20 years and retire. Of course, a man may be court martialed and discharged from the Navy. However, there is an indefinite period of enlistment in all the armed services at the present time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean that a man may enlist for 20 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. His period of enlistment is subject to the retirement law. He can be retired after 20 years' service. I am not familiar with all the details, but I know that there is such a thing as indefinite enlistment, and that thousands of American citizens have availed themselves of it in the armed services.

Mr. President, this amendment is utterly inconsistent with the amendment which was offered yesterday to increase the age at which youths may be drafted. If we adopt this amendment, which cuts back the voluntary contract of enlistment to 36 months, whereas it is now 48, and the men do not reenlist, we shall have to dip 200,000 men deeper into the 18-year-old group to make up for the men who will be lost by reducing the period of enlistment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that in the pool there are approximately 545,000 men who are I–A, who are fitted for service, and that if this amendment should be adopted it would make it even more difficult than it is now to fill up the 901,000 vacancies which occur in the armed services every year?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only effect this amendment can possibly have will be to increase the length of service of the reservists and to increase the number of 18-year-olds who will have to be drafted, because the men will have to come from somewhere to fill up the ranks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It will mean going deeper into the group of men who have positions in the community, men who are fathers of families, and those who hold responsible positions in industry, and who are trying to get ahead and lead their own lives.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is utterly incompatible with the entire philosophy of the bill, which is worked out on a basis of something like equal sharing. The amendment not only undertakes to interfere with a voluntary act of the citizen in the future, but it reaches back into the past. It cuts the period of the contract between the citizen and his government for service in the Armed Forces. It would increase the length of service of the reservists and increase the number of 18-year-olds who would have to be drafted.

The amendment deals with a voluntary proposition. Any citizen who wishes to reduce his term of service to 24 months—not 36—can present himself for induction to his induction board. Then his period of service is limited to 24 months, whereas this amendment would limit to 3 years a voluntary agreement on the part of the citizen to serve for a longer period than 3 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that the evidence before us—not in the selective service hearings but in other hearings—is to the effect that many of the men in the submarine service and many men in the Air Force enlist for upward of 4 or 5 years, and then reenlist because they are proud of their duty in the service? They are proud of their skills. It is that pride in skill and the morale of the men in the submarine service and Air Force which make those forces superior forces today.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Massachusetts is exactly correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the opinion of the very able Senator from Georgia as to whether or not we would get more enlistments on a 4-year basis than on a 3-year basis? Is not that the question we are trying to decide? Would we get more on a volunteer basis if the enlistments were for 3 years rather than for 4 years? Has the Senator any facts on that subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; we have no facts on the subject. There is a 3-year enlistment in the Army today; yet the Army, with the shortest period of enlistment, is obliged to draft men. The Army is the only service which is compelled to take men through selective service.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not as yet made up my mind what to do with respect to this amendment. I believe that what the committee is seeking to do, and what everyone wants to do, is to get as many enlistments as possible in the Army. Of course, most of the enlistments have been going to the Air Force and the Navy. At least, that is the information which I receive through my mail. Young men write to me and say, "I would like to enlist in the Navy," or "I would like to get into the Air Force." Even though

the enlistments in the Army might be for 2 or 3 or 4 years, it seems to me that the preference is for the other two branches of the service. I should like to obtain the judgment of my distinguished friend as to whether or not a 4-year period of enlistment would produce more volunteers and get more personnel into the military than would a 3-year period of enlistment. It seems to me that that is the important point.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will not work out that way in operation, because the Army has a 3-year enlistment period today.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Nebraska heard the Senator from Oregon——

Mr. WHERRY. I heard him.

Mr. RUSSELL. He argued this question from the standpoint that there were too many enlistments in the Air Force for 4 years, and too many enlistments in the Navy for 4 years. Therefore, he proposes to cut the Navy and the Air Force down to where the Army is. It could have no other result than greatly to increase the rush to the Air Force and the Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. I heard that argument, and I appreciate the argument and the answer which was made to it. But to me that does not answer the question. I am not saying that the Senator did not mean to answer it. It seems to me offhand, as a layman, that we might get more enlistments if the enlistments were for a 3-year period, rather than for 4 or 5 years, or some longer term. I say that even though I agree with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that it takes a certain length of time to train a mechanic, and so forth.

Mr. RUSSELL. The trouble is that today we are getting too many enlistments for a 4-year period in the Air Force and in the Navy. We are not getting a sufficient number of enlistments in the Army for 36 months. If the Senator were to offer to reduce the enlistment period in the Army to 24 months, I could understand it; but I cannot understand how he is going to help the Army by making the Air Force and the Navy even more attractive than they are today.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator that I do not see how a change in the formula will help out the Army or not help out the Army, because many men do not want to enlist in the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know that I can answer it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If more men are enlisting in the Air Force and in the Navy for 4-year periods than either branch of the service can use—and there have been periods when both services have had to cut off enlistments—and not a sufficient number are enlisting in the Army for 36-month periods of enlistment, will not the disproportion be increased by changing the formula?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether it will or not. My opinion is that many men who want to get into the armed services want to get into the Air Force and into the Navy. I think we are at the point where we have to do away possibly with all enlistments, and take the men in as inductees, and assign them to the various services. I cannot say whether a 3-year or a 4-year enlistment period would accomplish the purpose the Senator from Georgia has in view. That is what worries me.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry, but I cannot explain it if the Senator cannot see it, that to reduce the enlistment period in the Air Force and in the Navy will continue to make service in those two branches even more popular, and will militate even more against enlistment in the Army, for the Infantry. If the Senator cannot see that, there is no way I can possibly explain it to him.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with the Senator from Wyoming that career soldiers, the career personnel in any of the three components of the armed services, are the most valuable men in the service?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a matter of common knowledge. Everyone knows that to be so. A person does not have to be a Senator to know that.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator further agree with me that after a man has served for 4 or 5 years in one enlistment, has separated himself from his civilian contacts for that long a period, has become very well acquainted with and interested in and likes his position in any of the three components, there is a great deal more likelihood of getting him to reenlist than if he had originally enlisted for a shorter period?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct.

Mr. HUNT. The third observation I should like to make is that without a question of doubt the longer the period of enlistment the greater will be the soldier's efficiency to the service. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. President, the amendment has no place on this bill. It deals with the provision for voluntary enlistments and not with inductions. I feel that adoption of the amendment will only increase the disproportion between the services. Under the amendment all that any man who now wishes to avoid the 4-year enlistment in the Air Force or in the Navy, or the 3-year enlistment in the Army, has to do is to present himself for induction and his services are limited to 24 months. The amendment has not been carefully thought through. It would add to the difficulty of shortening the period of service of reservists who are called to active duty, and would increase the number of 18-year-olds it would be necessary to draft into the service.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the amendment affect enlistments in the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it would. It provides that the services cannot accept men for enlistment for periods longer than 3 years in the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would that not be a distinct disadvantage to the Army? Is it not true that a great many at least of their most valuable men, old enlisted sergeants and others, would be affected by the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would affect any one man going into the service. I do not understand that it would affect reenlistments today; but it would affect enlistments in the first instance. If a man wanted to enlist for 5 years in order to train himself to become expert in repairing aircraft, or to be a skilled mechanic, he could not do so. He would be limited to 3 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does it not take considerable time to train for such technical work, and do we not need men with such ability in the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. They are the backbone of the Army. We should not do anything in this haphazard fashion that would prevent any man who desires to do so from making a career of the armed service, especially at a time when we are casting about for ways and means to increase the national defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I want to thank the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] for the letter he read into the RECORD. Examples of the wasteful practice, as set forth in the letter, in the use of the military manpower can be multiplied many times, I am sure, in the Senator's own files, and it can be multiplied many times in my files. It was a very good letter bearing out what some of us had been trying to point out on the floor of the Senate for some days past, that this period of time which the military tells us is required to get servicemen back and forth to their posts is a very wasteful period so far as military practice is concerned. Although it has little to do with the amendment pending, I want to nail it once more so there will be no doubt as the military reads this RECORD—and, Mr. President, they are reading what is being said on the floor—that they at least will be conscious of the fact that some of us are wise to their wasteful practices in handling manpower and using time and money.

Just a word of reply to the Senator from Georgia. I pointed out in my main remarks earlier today that what we need to adopt in the future, if the military does not keep faith with the spirit and intent of the induction law, is additional legislation which will require each branch of the service to take a certain percentage of inductees. I think that is the only way in the long run to solve that particular problem unless they do it by their own regulation and orders, which they have power to do under the law. I said that at the beginning of my statement, Mr. President. So the purpose of my amendment was not to cover that particular point. I did not design it to cover that particular point. But I did design it to accomplish two things, namely, to carry out what, in my opinion, it is our duty to do, namely, to impose some constitutional checks on the military by deciding, here in Congress, what the ceiling on enlistments shall be,

because under the discretion we have given them in past legislation—and it is too wide a discretion—they can at the present time make the term of enlistment 3 years or 4 years or 5 years or 6 years.

In my opinion they have taken advantage of a state of mind held by thousands of our young men in order to bring about their enlistment for a period of 4 years. I think time will prove that that was an unfair advantage they took of the boys. If the tensions should become worse and we should face an all-out war situation, then all of us know that all ceilings would be removed anyway, and that Congress would meet very quickly to pass whatever additional legislation might be necessary to meet the emergency. But my belief is that here and now is the place to pass that legislation. I do not like the idea of making agencies of the administrative branch of the Government quasi-legislative bodies by giving them so much discretion in respect to so many things for which we do not write the blueprint here. So I want to write the blueprint of the 36-month enlistment period.

The last thing I want to say to my good friend the Senator from Georgia is that he, as did the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], answered by saying, "The services can sell their programs. The boys can reenlist." There is nothing in my amendment which would prevent reenlistment. But my amendment authorizes the kind of check which we ought to provide as clear notice to the Military Establishment that we are going to limit their broad discretion.

## PROPOSED ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION INSTALLATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, a site was chosen in South Carolina for a new atomic energy installation in November of last year. Some rumors reached me, about the middle of January, that there might have been quite a bit of speculation going on in land near this tract. I thereupon dispatched investigators—I believe they got there January 25—and they have been busy conducting an investigation. Of course, operations since the acquisition, or rather since the announcement date, fall into quite a different category than operations which may have been predicated upon so-called inside information.

I noticed on the news ticker today that the Governor of South Carolina has suggested that an investigation is in order. I wish to advise the Senate that both the Commission and the Joint Committee have been making such an investigation.

I also noted that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] suggested that he was going to ask the FBI to make an investigation, too. I think that is all very well; but I simply wish to inform the Senate that, so far as we can prevent it, no profits will be made upon the acquisition of land, either there or contiguous to any other atomic energy installation, where the purchase of land is based upon so-called inside information.

As I see it now, on preliminary reports, the dealings in land have occurred since the site announcement was made. However, we are still checking every transaction within the area where speculation may have taken place.

I should like to say further, in closing, that there is no doubt in my mind that, under the law, of course the Government can take any of this land which has been traded in, and can pay a fair price for it, even though the Government soon thereafter may resell the land to private parties, for the private development of private housing.

I simply wish the Senate to know that the matter is not being brushed aside or disregarded, but that we have it well in hand. If anyone thinks he is going to make any unholy profits or any illegal profits in the area referred to and get away with it, I simply wish to state that this will not occur.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, "3–5–D," proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness. If present, they would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business; and if present, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 77, as follows:

YEAS—14

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ecton | Schoeppel |
| Butler, Md. | Hendrickson | Smith, Maine |
| Capehart | Langer | Taft |
| Case | McCarran | Wherry |
| Dirksen | Morse | |

NAYS—77

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | George | Lodge |
| Bennett | Gillette | Long |
| Benton | Green | McClellan |
| Brewster | Hayden | McFarland |
| Bricker | Hennings | McKellar |
| Bridges | Hickenlooper | McMahon |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hill | Magnuson |
| Byrd | Hoey | Malone |
| Cain | Holland | Martin |
| Carlson | Humphrey | Maybank |
| Chapman | Hunt | Millikin |
| Chavez | Ives | Monroney |
| Connally | Jenner | Mundt |
| Cordon | Johnson, Colo. | Murray |
| Douglas | Johnson, Tex. | Neely |
| Duff | Johnston, S. C. | Nixon |
| Dworshak | Kefauver | O'Conor |
| Ellender | Kem | O'Mahoney |
| Ferguson | Kerr | Pastore |
| Flanders | Kilgore | Robertson |
| Frear | Knowland | Russell |
| Fulbright | Lehman | Saltonstall |
| Smathers | Stennis | Welker |
| Smith, N. J. | Thye | Williams |
| Smith, N. C. | Tobey | Young |
| Sparkman | Watkins | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clements | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Eastland | Vandenberg | |

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

## THE PRESIDENT'S PLEA FOR PEACE THROUGH DISARMAMENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on February 26, 9 Members of the House and 14 Senators sent a letter to the President of the United States, which, at this point, I desire to read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 26, 1951.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned, urge that your plea for peace through disarmament, made before the United Nations Assembly on October 14 last, be now followed up by definite proposals to be made by our representative on the United Nations Council.

In your address you set forth principles which we abbreviate as follows:

"First, the plan must include all kinds of weapons. Outlawing any particular kind of weapon is not enough. * * *

"Second, the plan must be based on unanimous agreement. * * *

"Third, the plan must be foolproof. Paper promises are not enough. Disarmament must be based on safeguards which will insure the compliance of all nations. * * *"

Supporting these principles, as we do, we suggest—

That the first step proposed by the lifting of the iron curtain and the resumption of at least that degree of freedom of communication between all the peoples of the earth which existed between the nations of Western Europe and the American continents prior to the Second World War;

The the proposal be for complete disarmament of all nations under the direction and surveillance of the United Nations;

That a United Nations Commission be set up to effect disarmament in an orderly, complete, and rapid way:

That a United Nations police force be established in accordance with the original intention of the Charter which shall be superior in size and armament to any forces available to the member nations for the maintenance of civil order;

And, finally, that the proposal be permanently in effect and repeatedly offered until it is accepted.

If the other nations refuse our proposal, we lose nothing; but if they accept, the whole world wins.

There are many indications that action of this sort would find an immediately favorable response from the American people. We ourselves ask that we may have an early opportunity to discuss this question with you in detail. We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours.

I shall not read the signatures to the letter, but I ask permission to have them incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the signatures to the letter addressed to the President, dated February 26, 1951, were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, LAURIE BATTLE, FRANCES P. BOLTON, A. S. J. CARNAHAN, ROBERT HALE, BROOKS HAYS, CHRISTIAN HERTER, JOHN W. HESELTON, WALTER H. JUDD, RALPH E. FLANDERS, LESTER C. HUNT, WALTER F. GEORGE, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, LISTER HILL, ESTES KEFAUVER, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, JOHN C. STENNIS, EDWARD J. THYE, CHARLES W. TOBEY, HOMER FERGUSON.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say with regard to the letter that, since the time was short, and the President was about to depart for his Florida vacation, no endeavor was made in either the House or Senate to obtain the largest possible number of subscribers to the letter; but we know there are a good many more Senators and Representatives who are in sympathy with the letter than those whose signatures I had the opportunity of securing.

Pertinence is given to this letter by news reported in the morning press. I have before me a clipping from the Washington Post under the headlines, "Russia asks arms slash on agenda of Big Four; Gromyko proposals go beyond German question, give hope of Paris agreement." It seems perfectly clear that the opening is now made for us to proceed with the 100-percent disarmament proposal, of which the first step will be the raising of the iron curtain because without that there is no possible assurance of any sort that any disarmament agreement will be honored or carried through. It is my hope, and the hope of others who have signed this letter, that Senators who are sympathetic to this undertaking will, perhaps daily, and until some notice is taken of this matter by the President or by the State Department, press for entering through the door which Russia has so providentially opened to us.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont what reply, if any, he received?

Mr. FLANDERS. We have received no reply. The President is on vacation. We tried to get the letter to the President in time. We were simply assured by the President's Secretary that the letter would have his attention—presumably during the period of his vacation.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I further wish to put into the RECORD a message which I received from General Marshall. I was greatly concerned with the proposed 27 months of service, from the standpoint of the boy who was leaving preparatory school to attend college, because service of that length would take the entire time from his graduation from high school to his matriculation in college, with no time for brushing up on his entrance requirements at the end of his service. I was referred to Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who assured me that administrative action could be taken on the 26 months' provision, which was originally incorporated in the bill, to give assurance that no boy would have to lose an extra 6 months—or an extra year, more likely. I asked, however, for that confirmation directly from General Marshall himself. He dictated for me the following message:

DEAR SENATOR: I just called up to confirm what Mrs. Rosenberg communicated to you regarding the administrative action that would make it possible not to deprive a boy of more than 2 years of schooling.

This message of mine is to confirm what Mrs. Rosenberg told you as being correct.

Gen. GEORGE MARSHALL.

It is quite evident that if administrative action could be taken to this effect, on a 26 months' military training and service program, it will be that much easier to do it on a 24 months' training and service program.

I want to have this statement entered in the RECORD so that it will be perfectly clear that it is the intention of the Department of Defense so to administer the bill which we are now considering that no boy will be required to waste an extra year between preparatory school and college.

## SHIPMENT OF WAR MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate two articles. One bears a Washington date line, and reads:

The Government tonight banned or limited the use of natural rubber in more than 40,000 civilian products, effective March 1. No natural rubber will be allowed in passenger-car and light-truck tires or tubes.

The order covers nearly every civilian rubber item from industrial belts—

And so forth. On February 28 there appeared in the Hong Kong Standard the following article:

RUBBER CARGO FOR CHINA LOADED HERE

Bales of rubber sheets and steel building materials have been loaded on two ships bound for Red China.

Some 2,000 tons of rubber are being loaded on the Chinese Communist freighter *Ming Shan* destined to sail for Canton tomorrow, from where, it was learned, they will be railed up to North China.

That was February 28; it was not last December or even last January. The article continues:

Meanwhile, shortly after her arrival here the British steamer *Taksang* (of Jardine, Matheson) discharged several tons of rubber sheets. She arrived here from Calcutta via the Straits.

At the same time, junks berthed alongside the wharf were loading rubber bales.

The "Five Star-" flagged freighter *Ming Shan*, according to an officer, is loading rubber bales in the colony for the second time. She took 1,000 tons of rubber on her last trip here. She is now taking on 1,900 tons, he added.

Operated by the Far East Shipping Co. of Kwangtung Province, the *Ming Shan* plies on the Hong Kong-Canton cargo run together with another ship, the *Hsin Men*, also owned by the same company. The Communist-flagged freighter *Hsin Men* cleared port early at dawn today for Canton with 500 tons of general cargo.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, we are engaged in a United Nations action in Korea. Up until today, 8 months after the outbreak of the Korean fighting, the United States has been supplying 90 percent of the troops furnished by the United Nations members, and is suffering more than 90 percent of the casualties. If our allies in this endeavor and our fellow members of the United Nations are not willing to carry their full share of the load of supplying troops, the least they should do is not to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I submit, Mr. President, that if a citizen of the United States had conducted such trade during World War I or World War II it would have been a violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act. Great Britain is a member of the United Nations. She has troops in Korea, although as yet a very small fraction of the troops there. If this trade is allowed to continue, the material sent will be used to build the Chinese Communist war machine for the purpose of destroying the United Nations forces in Korea and driving us into the sea if possible.

I believe the American Government has dilly-dallied too long in making strong representations to the Government of Great Britain that we cannot and will not tolerate this type of trading with the enemy, and if the British of their own volition are not willing to stop this trade, I fully agree with the statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] yesterday, that the Government of the United States should forthwith take steps to impose a blockade, if necessary, to stop this type of illicit trade with people who are shooting American troops and United Nations troops each day.

Mr. President, I believe this is something which is beyond justification. I believe the British Government should recognize that it is morally wrong and indefensible, and if His Majesty's Governme does not recognize that it is morally wrong and indefensible, in my opinion the United States Seventh Fleet should be instructed to stop such dealing with the enemy.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Can the Senator inform us who actually made the shipments, whether it was the British Government, or some of the nationals of the British Government?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am merely quoting from the Hong Kong Standard, a responsible newspaper, published under date of February 28, just a few days ago, in the British crown colony of Hong Kong. The article was sent to me by a responsible American citizen who knew of the interest some of us have had in this subject over a period of time. I had been under the impression that, because of representations made in

December and January, this type of trade had stopped.

I wish to say further to the Senator from Utah that we are now about to be called upon to pass another arms implementation bill for the purpose of furnishing military trucks and guns which have to move on rubber tires, and other types of equipment, to help to defend Europe against communism. In order to supply that material, we have, as I have heretofore pointed out, of necessity cut down civilian production in this country, closed down American plants, thrown American citizens out of work. We were trying to conserve the natural rubber in order to meet the wartime needs of our own and our allies, and yet we find that as of the 28th day of February the British were permitting to be sent out of Hong Kong a thousand tons of natural rubber in one instance, and a considerable quantity in another.

Mr. President, I do not think that is justifiable. It is morally wrong, and I do not believe it can be defended, either on the floor of the Senate, or by His Majesty's Government in discussions with the State Department.

I will add that I believe the reason why this has happened is that our Government has assumed a dilly-dally attitude, and has not made strong representations. If the representations the Government makes are not sufficient, I believe we are in duty bound to the men we are asking to risk their lives in Korea to say that we will take whatever steps are necessary to see that such war materials do not get into Communist China.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. That probably is one way to bring to a stop these shipments of potential war materials to our enemies. Let me say to the Senator that we have other means of approaching the problem. We are now engaged in a program whereby we are helping Great Britain with economic assistance, and we are now preparing to help her with armaments. It seems to me we should go beyond a mere blockade and say, "You cannot ship anything of that kind from now on." Let us say to Great Britain, "From now on, unless you cease this practice, no help of any kind will be given."

I think the matter has gone so far that we should deliver an ultimatum to Great Britain—and, if necessary, to any other of our allies—that from this time on they should live up to the Atlantic Pact if they expect us to do so, and that they should also keep their agreement under the ECA program, under which we have been helping them for so many years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator that I was absolutely shocked by this information which was called to my attention, and which I am now calling to the attention of the Senate. There are perhaps several ways in which this practice can be stopped, but I believe steps should be taken forthwith to stop it. I do not believe that we should tolerate any longer such type of trading with the enemy.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon, who rose a moment ago.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that it always disturbs me very much when the Senator from California and I are not in agreement on an issue on the floor of the Senate, as we have not been on the manpower bill. I am very happy to find ourselves together on this issue. I think the Senator from California is absolutely right. What he says bears out what I have been trying to point out in connection with the manpower bill, namely, that we have in Asia a very confused policy, to say the least, if we have any policy at all. I certainly think we must take necessary steps to call a halt to the sacrifice of American boys in Korea by taking a line we can defend without such losses until we find out, as I said before on the floor of the Senate, whether, in Asia, Great Britain is on our side or on the side of Red China.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is time for them to stand up and be counted.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from California.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from California is performing a real service in bringing this shocking information to the attention of the Senate. Certainly it is shocking to me, as it is to him, and as I know it should be to every American. Aside from calling the information to the attention of the Senate, as the distinguished Senator has done, I think some further action should be taken.

Of course, the President of the United States is vacationing in Key West, and the Secretary of State is vacationing in Bermuda. They are our two key policy officials. So perhaps they will not be on hand to do it. However, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is here. I think it is his duty, as chairman of the committee, to call the committee into session, and to bring before it the policy-making officials who are left in Washington, aside from the President and the Secretary of State, particularly the officials of the State Department, so that we can put it up to them straight from the shoulder.

I agree with the Senator from California and the Senator from Utah that we have ways of acting. We have been dilly-dallying long enough. It is a crime against our boys. It is certainly turning a moral back to the United Nations. It is certainly criminal to the American boys who are suffering and dying in Korea to have things like this happening.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, to the Senator from Oregon, and other Senators who are members of either the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations that I intend to ask the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] this afternoon temporarily to suspend, if necessary, hearings now being held in connection with the troops-to-Europe resolution, and to bring before the committee the responsible officials of the State Department of the United States to see what steps, if any, have been taken to stop this type of illicit traffic with the enemy, who are shooting American and United Nations men in Korea. Would the Senator agree with me that such a step would bring the question to a head?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. May I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that this is not anything new so far as Great Britain is concerned. That is why I proposed such a drastic form of shutting off of help to Great Britain, until the British conform to what ought to be an ordinary and reasonable state of affairs between allies.

In 1948 and 1949, and even in 1947, we found that Great Britain had, with Russia, Poland, and other nations behind the iron curtain, trade agreements which procided for the shipping of rails, locomotives, motors, copper, tin, rubber, and other commodities which could be used as potential war materials by such nations. It was called to the attention of Congress at the time the ECA Act was passed. It has been repeatedly called to the attention of Congress, and has been repeatedly called to the attention of the country. But these things go on day after day.

As I say, if this were only an isolated instance, probably we could forget it. However, it represents one in a series of events. It involves not only Great Britain, for France, Italy, Belgium, and other members of the Atlantic Pact have seemed to be under the impression that they can go ahead and do as they please, and that no matter what they do they cannot offend Uncle Sam. They do not seem to worry about anything like that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the specific question of the Senator from Utah, I do not think it is necessary for Congress to twiddle its thumbs for a long period of time. I believe that under the Constitution of the United States there is sufficient power in Congress with its control over appropriations, a constitutional power which even the President of the United States does not challenge, so that after we have given reasonable time for such things to be straightened out, the Congress itself can start taking some action on its own. I believe that all troops who are fighting in Korea deserve at least that much support from Congress, from the people of the country, and from countries who are supposed to be allied with us in this joint endeavor.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from California is to be complimented for the efforts he has been making in connection with this subject.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I think the distinguished Senator from California was not on the floor last week when I brought out information to the effect that 27,000 tons of steel had been shipped to Communist China in exactly the same way as the rubber which the Senator has mentioned this afternoon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate very much the point which the Senator from California is making. I should like to add one comment. In shipping such great quantities of natural rubber to Red China, the British are, in a sense, endangering American boys who are fighting in Korea, but, what is even more incomprehensible, is their attitude toward their own troops. We know that British boys are fighting in Korea, alongside of our boys. We know that Australian and New Zealanders are fighting over there. We know that only a few days ago a battalion of Princess Pats from Canada entered active fighting in Korea, and others are on the way. Therefore, in effect, the mercenary attitude of Great Britain is a direct threat to our own men and to the men of the independent nations which form a part of the forces in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to compliment the Senator from California on the information he has brought before the Senate. While joining him in condemning Great Britain, I think it is only fair to suggest that when the officials of our own Government are called to appear before the committee, as the Senator suggests, we ask them why they have permitted American ships and American companies to continue trade with Red China. We have had testimony before the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], which revealed that not only American shippers but but even an agency of the United States Government negotiated with and actually made five shipments of raw cotton to Red China since the outbreak of war in Korea last June. The excuse offered was that our country had not recognized a state of war to exist between our country and Red China, but considered it only a police action. Furthermore, evidence presented before the O'Conor committee showed shipments of cotton cloth from Japan to Red China have been several times greater since last June than they were in the months before the Korean War started. These shipments from Japan are under control of the military. I think we should also check into actions of our own Government agencies and determine what our far-eastern policy is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that he is absolutely right. I would not condone such shipments from the United States at a time that I was condemning shipments from Great Britain. I am fully aware of the very fine work which is being done by the subcommittee to which the Senator has referred, and which is very ably headed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. I condemn just as strongly any shipments made from this country to Communist China as I condemn such action by the British. However, I had assumed from the dispatches which I have received recently, and from what I had learned of the activities of the committee, that finally, after a great lapse of time—and I believe too great a lapse of time—such shipments had stopped.

The matter to which I have referred was current as of the 28th day of February. I certainly hope that the trade to which the Senator has referred is not presently going on, even though we know it went on up until a very short time ago, because it has the same implication which attached to shipments of scrap iron and oil from the United States to the Japanese war lords during 1939, 1940, and 1941.

At that time, as the Senator from Delaware will remember, not only did we permit the shipment of scrap iron and oil, which we knew were being used against our historic friends and allies, the Republic of China, but some of that same scrap iron and oil came back at us on the morning of December 7 at Pearl Harbor.

I venture to predict that strategic materials of this kind, which are going into Red China, will be used for the purpose of the destruction of the American, British, and United Nations forces in Korea. To my way of thinking, it is dealing in blood money; and neither the United States nor His Majesty's Government should put profits above the lives of their men.

It is high time that this thing was stopped. If it cannot be stopped by diplomacy it should be stopped by the use of the United States Seventh Fleet. So far as I am concerned, I believe that we should establish a blockade against the coast of China that will be so tight that it will not permit a ship under any flag, British or any other, to move in or out of Red China so long as there are Red Chinese troops as aggressors in Korea.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say that the committee has been promised that the shipments will be stopped; and, so far as I know, they have been stopped as of today, although they were very late in stopping shipments from this country. The excuse we received from the businessmen who were called before the committee was, "What do you expect us to do when the Government of the United States itself is still shipping cotton to China, 3 or 4 months after the beginning of the war." I think it is one of the situations which cannot be explained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say in response to the Senator from Delaware that it is only within the past few days that a report appeared in the local press to the effect that steel plants in Italy which have been rehabilitated with Marshall plan money are now fabricating steel for shipment to Russia.

We have discussed this subject for a long, long time. In the Eighty-first Congress I observed that an amendment was tacked on to the Marshall plan proposal. We considered it when I was at the other end of the Capitol, as early as 3 years ago.

But in the face of all the mendacious treatment we have received from our so-called allies, this thing continues, and nothing has been done about it except to talk. I think the time has come to adopt an amendment in this or the other body, for concurrence by each of the bodies of Congress, so that we can serve notice on our allies that largess from the American Treasury is going to stop unless they act like allies in truth and in fact. We ought to know whether they are going to stand up and be counted in our corner or not. If they are not, let us forget about them and not worry about their destiny any longer, because this thing is just too expensive in terms of American lives.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from California have any compilation of totals of materials up to date, in the past few months, which have been shipped to Red China through Hong Kong?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no compilation, but I will say to the Senator that during the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee I read into the RECORD previous information which I had obtained, to the effect that during the month of January—I am not exact in these figures, but they are approximately correct—there had been shipped out over the Hong Kong-Kowloon railroad into Red China 27,000 tons of material, much of it strategic, compared with 25,000 tons a year ago, showing that in the year since the Chinese Communists have become the aggressors in Korea not only have such shipments not been curtailed, but actually there has been an increase in them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What I had in mind was this: I saw in the press a few days ago a news story to the effect that 47,000 tons of rubber had been shipped through Hong Kong into Red China. I cannot recall at the moment—and I do not have the clipping before me—over what period of time such shipments were made, but it runs in my mind that it was over a period of only 2 or 3 months since the first of the year. Has the Senator seen such an item in the press?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I saw an item with respect to a considerable shipment of rubber, but I am not familiar with the period of time it covered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I commend the Senator from California for his un-

swerving attention to this particular subject, among many other subjects to which he gives his attention. I think it is one of the most astoundingly dastardly things that our Government is permitting to go on in the world today.

I recall that in World War I the nationals on one side owned a part of the stock in the munitions factories in Czechoslovakia, and the nationals on the other side of the conflict also owned a part of the stock. They declared dividends to both sides all during the war, and they sold munitions from behind the German lines to the Allies in World War I, and everyone on both sides made a profit. Munitions were furnished so that they could continue shooting.

The shipment of strategic materials to Japan before Pearl Harbor has been referred to. This traffic has been going on, as the Senator from California has pointed out, for a long period of time. The Senator has raised this question. He has brought facts to the attention of the Senate. The O'Conor committee has raised some startling figures, which indicate what amounts to trading with the enemy.

The Senator has suggested today that we summon officials in the State Department, or someone else, and see if something cannot be done about it. These matters have been repeatedly brought to the attention of the State Department. The Senator from California has brought them to the attention of the State Department. Other matters involving American citizens have been brought to the attention of the State Department. The atrocious situation in Morocco has been passed upon by the Congress on two or three different occasions, and the State Department finds ways and means to avoid the very direction of the Congress, formally adopted and put into law for the protection of American citizens and their rights—not unfairly as against other nationals, but only on a fair basis with other nationals.

I will say to the Senator that I have had some little experience along this line during the past few years, and that I have very little faith that under the present circumstances the State Department will become any more zealous in the future than it has been in the past in protecting the sound, practical, realistic rights of the American people.

Let me say to the Senator, as collateral to the idea of administrative agencies, that in my judgment the only agency that can be relied upon to protect the rights of the American people under the present circumstances is the Congress of the United States, because the administration has neglected and failed over a period of years realistically to perform that duty.

We are approaching a point today where one of the most momentous decisions this country has ever made is about to be made, on the question of whether or not the President of the United States, whimsically or otherwise, can send large bodies of American troops to Europe and place them under the command of a foreign authority. I am not saying that General Eisenhower is a foreigner, but he represents a foreign authority—a combination of foreign countries. The Congress of the United States and the American people had better consider pretty carefully where the basic constitutional rights of this country and its policies rest. I believe that in the last analysis the Congress must save the fundamental rights of the American people, because the administration, through indifference, neglect, or failure, has utterly failed to meet that responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, since we are discussing the situation in Korea, I will say that the facts of the matter are that now, 8 months after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, the United Nations members other than the United States—all 60 of them—have suffered approximately half the number of casualties we have suffered.

As of this day they have supplied fewer troops than the Republic of China, through President Chiang Kai-shek, offered to send to Korea in support of the United Nations 5 days after the outbreak of hostilities. He offered to send 33,000 of his best troops to be there within a period of 5 days. Nationalist China was among the first nations outside the United States to respond to the call of the United Nations. We did not accept his offer at that time because it was said that if Chinese Nationalist troops went into Korea it might tend to inflame the Chinese Communists to enter the contest. Nevertheless, in October they entered the contest despite the fact that we had not accepted the offer of the Nationalist Government of China, and up until this hour, 8 months after the outbreak of hostilities, that offer of the Republic of China still stands good. They are still willing to take their part as a permanent member of the United Nations and supply 30,000 troops, which is more than all the rest of the United Nations put together have supplied. The United Nations and the United States still refuse to accept those troops, and at the same time we find one of our principal allies trading with the enemy by sending strategic materials from Hong Kong.

I yield the floor.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. WATKINS addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon. He had the floor and yielded to permit the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to speak. Therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Oregon should be recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment lettered "C"—3-1-51, with one modification on page 2, line 6. I wish to add, after the word "million" the words "five hundred thousand," so the total number would read "three million five hundred thousand." I suggest that the amendment be read by the clerk, with that modification, and when the amendment has been made the pending question before the Senate, I shall be very happy to yield the floor to any of my colleagues who wish to make comment on it or on some other matter, before I make my speech in explanation of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 91, beginning with line 25, it is proposed to strike out all through line 4 on page 92 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. The act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2 of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the Reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of 3,500,000 persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this act."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor, if the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Utah wish to speak.

## THE FEDERAL RESERVE-TREASURY CONFLICT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a joint resolution for appropriate reference, sponsored by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator's resolution will be received and read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to vest in the duly constituted authorities of the Federal Reserve System the primary power and responsibility for regulating the supply, availability, and cost of credit in general, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. THYE), was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Whereas the primary power and responsibility for regulating the supply, availability, and cost of credit in general is, and should remain, vested in the duly constituted authorities of the Federal Reserve System; and

Whereas policies with respect to financing the Federal debt, as established by the Secretary of the Treasury, have a direct influence on the supply, availability, and cost of credit; Now, therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That (1) notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any provision of law granting emergency powers

figures as to the strength of Italy's naval personnel in 1942, but it no doubt exceeded the 1938 strength of 55,836.

The Italy which had a standing army of almost 3,000,000 in 1942 is now limited by the treaty of 1947 to an army of 185,000.

In September 1943 Italy surrendered to the Allies. On October 13, 1943, she declared war on Germany and became a cobelligerent of the Allies against the remaining Axis Powers. In July 1945, several months before Russia declared war on Japan, Italy declared war on Japan.

The Italian fleet engaged in military action and escort duty in aid of the Allied cause. It suffered notable losses.

Italian soldiers in France, Croatia, Montenegro, and Greece aided the anti-Nazi partisans in their resistance activities against the Germans. Italian troops in the islands of Sardinia and Corsica turned on the Germans and drove them from those islands. A motorized force of some 21,000 Italians joined the United States Army.

The Allied forces welcomed numerous Italian soldiers into their ranks and employed them in noncombat service behind the lines and in coastal and anti-aircraft defense. More than 1,000,000 Italian soldiers and prisoners were employed by the Allies as laborers. Many more than this number requested permission to enlist in the Allied forces.

I have cited these figures of Italy's World War II strength in order that the Senate may get an idea as to the number of troops Italy may be able to call up for her own defense and for the defense of Western Europe in case of need—that is, provided the limitations of this peace treaty are removed. Italy has made progress, industrially and economically, since the war ended. I understand that today she has at least as many men able to bear arms as she had when the World War started in 1939.

The United States is now advocating so-called limited rearmament of Germany and Japan. We are doing this because we are convinced that the continued condition of German and Japanese military helplessness is an open invitation to Communist subversion and aggression. Thus Germany and Japan have been asked to join with the Western Powers in the defense against communism.

Why should not Italy also be allowed to more adequately arm herself and more effectively contribute to the defense against Communist aggression?

With the situation as it now is in the world, with the burden we have now in the Far East, in a war which is now raging and which may expand at any moment to much larger proportions, it is only an act of prudence which ought to be taken by this country and by all the nations of the west, to relieve Italy of the liabilities and restrictions imposed upon her by the treaty of 1947.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46), introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there are some very important facts which we do not dare pass over in the consideration of Senate bill 1. If we overemphasize military training at the expense of education, we will be weaker instead of stronger after a long period of mobilization. The threat of Russian aggression should not lead us to impose any unnecessary restrictions on individual liberty. The pending military manpower bill, S. 1, contains two major threats to our survival as a free people. First, it fails to recognize the importance of education in a long-range preparedness program. Secondly, the bill provides a large measure of compulsion which is not required either for the present emergency or for the foreseeable future. The amendments to S. 1 which I shall support are those which would minimize these two dangers.

Any draft law weakens the higher-education system to some extent. The necessity of protecting our educational system would not be so pressing if total war were imminent. From a short-range point of view, we can become stronger militarily if we shut off temporarily our educational pipeline. Our problem today, however, is to be stronger at the end of 5, 10, or 20 years than we are 2 or 3 years from now. If we sacrifice the benefits to be derived from higher education to achieve a quick build-up in military strength, the Nation will be immeasurably weaker over the long run.

The demands of the Army for young men cannot be completely satisfied without wrecking our system of higher education. We cannot have education as usual without dangerously impairing the Nation's military strength. The Armed Services Committee has recognized this dilemma. The committee proposes to reconcile this conflict by authorizing 75,000 men annually to be relieved of military service in order to engage in the study of subjects essential to the national security and welfare. The committee's purpose is commendable, but in my opinion the proposed solution is completely unworkable.

Until June 30, 1954, S. 1 would permit 75,000 men to be removed each year from active service and training to engage in studies described as follows: "Medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him—the President— to be in the national interest."

The 75,000 students sent to college under this provision of the bill do not come close to meeting the Nation's needs for trained men. This figure barely satisfies the number needed for medicine and engineering alone. It seems perfectly obvious that the men who are selected could not be given the right to choose the subjects they wish to study. To meet a critical shortage of engineers, for example, a certain number would have to be selected for engineering. They would be forced to pursue that course of learning. To provide an equitable distribution of 75,000 students among our colleges, students could not be given the right to attend the school of their choice. To be even partially effective, the 75,000-student program requires compulsion. This could be a dangerous entering wedge for Federal control of both schools and students.

S. 1 also provides that the 75,000 men shall be selected by a civilian commission "upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission." It is impossible to devise any completely objective test of merit which is fair. No single test can measure aptitude for subjects so diverse as medicine, engineering, education, and the humanities. Moreover, if a general intelligence test is given, the most serious shortages might not be alleviated. Students cannot be selected on the basis of aptitude for particular specialties because many of them do not decide on their career until after they have completed 1 or 2 years of college. In addition, some method of equalizing the opportunities for 18-year-olds in competition with more mature college men would have to be devised. The selection of students for particular studies by an agency of the Federal Government promises to be an administrative nightmare.

Selection of students on a competitive basis necessarily involves some degree of discretion. It is impossible to be completely impersonal. Selection of students by a Federal agency involves the risk of selection on the basis of political influence and favoritism.

We might, and possibly could, be educating a Fuchs, a Gold, a Hiss, or a Remington, and destroying perhaps forever the possibilities of education of many fine teachers and leaders in social service, the preachers and lawyers of the future. So we must look at this as an all-around program, and not from a purely militaristic point of view.

The program for 75,000 educational deferments permits payment of a Federal subsidy to needy students. After years of experience with social-security legislation, virtually everyone is opposed to means-test assistance. It is simply impossible for any agency of the Federal Government to determine which families can afford to send their boys to school and which families cannot. The possibilities of improper influence and favoritism are inherent in this form of Federal subsidy. Unquestionably, the military training authorized by S. 1 will interfere with the educational plans of many young men. We had the same problem in World War II. The only equitable solution is to offer all draftees an incentive to return to school by providing GI educational benefits.

Another defect in the proposed educational deferment program is the requirement for 4 months' basic training. This involves a waste of millions of dollars and is detrimental both to the Army and the trainee. Some of the 75,000 stu-

dents, for example, will have completed 1 year of college. Their studies would be interrupted for a short training period of no benefit either to them or to the Army. While a man may be physically hardened in 4 months, the benefits of such training do not last through four or more years of college.

We must keep our educational pipelines reasonably full. There is a simple way to do this without creating a new Federal agency and without creating new opportunities for waste and political favoritism, which is too prevalent in Washington now.

Dr. Ralph W. McDonald testified for the National Education Association and its affiliated associations representing more than 900,000 teachers, professors, deans, presidents, and other professional educators. He testified in opposition to the induction of 18-year-olds. Dr. McDonald spoke for more than 80 percent of the college and university faculties in urging that the 19-year-age limit be retained. The view of the National Education Association was that the induction of 18-year-olds would have a disastrous effect on American education. The committee recognized the value of high-school education by providing for the deferment of students until they graduate from high school or until they attain the age of 19, whichever date is the earlier. I intend to offer an amendment to S. 1 which will accord comparable recognition to the value of higher education.

More than three-fourths of the young men who go to college enter before they reach the age of 18. S. 1 would continue the present policy of deferring college students until the end of the academic year. There are approximately 300,000 18-year-olds now in college. The great majority of them are freshmen who entered college at the age of 17. S. 1 would make almost all freshmen, other than IV–F's and those in the ROTC program, eligible for induction upon the completion of the first school year. My amendment would postpone the induction of most of these freshmen until completion of the second academic year. Testifying for the National Education Association, Dr. McDonald explained the importance of allowing a majority of students to complete at least 2 years of college work. The NEA found that only a small percentage of those who were called into the Army during World War II after 1 year of college returned, even though GI benefits were provided. A much higher percentage of those who were called after 2 years of college returned to complete their studies. If we are serious in our desire to give the Nation an adequate number of college-trained men, we will allow as many as possible to complete their second school year.

The amendment which I have suggested is infinitely superior to the committee's proposal for 75,000 students to be selected by a new Federal agency. The risk of political influence and favoritism is eliminated. The danger that the students selected will not be allowed to go to the school of their choice or to pursue the studies of their choice need not be incurred. We can keep the educational pipeline full without bringing boys into a useless, time-consuming, and expensive 4-month period of basic training. When those who enter college next fall complete 2 years of work they will have formed an intelligent conclusion about the careers they wish to pursue. The President can continue to defer those classes of students whose skills are urgently needed. My amendment would prevent the President or any Federal agency from exercising any direct control over the education of American boys. No one could permit Smith to go to school while denying the privilege to Jones. No intelligence tests would decide whether Brown goes to school or Green stays in the Army. No Federal agency would tell any young man where to go to college and what courses to take. No Federal agency would decide that A should pay his own way but that B should be subsidized.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the amendment which I have proposed will embarrass the military. While there would not be quite so many men available in the immediate future, there is a large reservoir of manpower which the military can tap at will. The ridiculously high rejection rate for physical reasons is an indication that the Army is still insisting that most of its inductees be fit for combat duty. The great majority of service categories do not require physical perfection. The military should abandon its practice of taking only the cream of the crop.

At the hearings on S. 1 Mrs. Rosenberg pointed with pride to the fact that mental standards had been lowered to the level of World War II. A recent study reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association for February 17, 1951, indicates that almost 80 percent of the men rejected during World War II for mental and educational deficiencies might have served satisfactorily. This unnecessarily high rejection rate may have deprived the Army of the services of as many as 1,500,000 men during World War II. The study of neuropsychiatric rejectees was made by Dr. John R. Egan, Dr. Lionel Jackson, and Col. Richard H. Eanes, Medical Corps, United States Army. These doctors made a case study of 2,054 men who (1) were rejected for mental and educational deficiencies on at least one occasion; (2) were subsequently inducted into the Army; and (3) served as enlisted men. They discovered that only 20 percent of these men were discharged for neuropsychiatric reasons. For the Army as a whole the discharge rate was 6 percent. The Army must stop its criminal waste of manpower by accepting men who have been able to make their living as civilians and who have made a satisfactory adjustment with civilian life.

Another serious defect of S. 1 is the absence of any termination date. There is no justification for extending the present law indefinitely. Of necessity we are forced to employ broad language and to grant flexible powers to meet the changing conditions of an emergency period. The strongest safeguard against unnecessary compulsion is surveillance by the Congress. Accordingly, I intend to support any amendment providing for a termination date. In my opinion, Congress should be able to review the vast powers conferred by the pending bill without being hamstrung by a Presidential veto.

The universal military training proposal is a perfect example of the blank check authority which is scattered throughout the pending bill. S. 1 does not spell out the details of a universal military training program. It provides, in effect, that at some future time the President is empowered to set up a universal military training program which is unknown and unknowable. The universal military training authorization has so little connection with the present emergency that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I have introduced an amendment which would postpone consideration of a universal military training program. However, there are other broad powers conferred by S. 1 which, while they might be useful in the present national emergency, should be reviewed by future Congresses, in the same way that a future Congress, after thorough consideration of the subject, in the light of conditions that exist 1, 2, or 3 years from now, ought to pass upon the desirability of universal military training.

I have heard it asked time and again on the floor of the Senate, "Do we not trust our military leaders?" I do trust them within their capacity, their jobs, their responsibilities, and in what they have to do. Yet they should not be determining public policy, and should not be substituted for the Congress of the United States. I likewise trust the present Congress, as I shall trust future Congresses, to meet our needs, in war or in peace. I for one do not intend to vote to bind future Congresses to any universal military training program on the basis of facts that exist today.

S. 1 would require all persons inducted into the Armed Forces to serve in the Reserve for approximately 6 years after completing their tour of active duty. However, S. 1 does not shed any light on the operation of the Reserve program. As indicated in the committee's report, our Reserve program of the past 5 years has not been adequate or realistic. Before placing a 6-year mortgage on those who have completed active-duty service, Congress should retain control over the operation of the Reserve program. We may hope that the Defense Department will adopt a Reserve program which is fair and adequate, but we should not commit millions of young men to an unknown program without retaining full power to modify the program eventually adopted.

A settlement of the conflict in Korea would probably make some changes in the pending bill desirable. "Operation Killer" cannot be continued year after year. I may say that one of the most distressing experiences I have had was when I read the report from Korea referring to "Operation Killer." It stated that the Army was engaged in only one objective, and that was the killing of Communists. Without regard to whether our troops were waiting on United Nations authority, or waiting for com-

mand from home or from the President, there was only one objective, and that was the killing of Communists. We must either withdraw from Korea, expand the area of military action to China itself, or reach some honorable settlement. S. 1 is necessarily based on the fact that war in Korea does exist and that there should be some rotation policy for the men engaged in combat. Our military manpower policy should be reappraised after the cessation of hostilities in Korea, or in the more unlikely event that the current four-power peace negotiations are successful. The Korean War and the cold war with Russia make it unwise to try to adopt at this time a permanent military manpower policy.

Congress has generally recognized that legislation adopted in response to some emergency should have an expiration date. The Defense Production Act of 1950 provides for total economic and industrial mobilization. Because of the danger of undue regimentation, Congress provided for the termination of various titles at the end of 1 or 2 years or upon the passage of a concurrent resolution. I do not believe, Mr. President, that the Eighty-second Congress will be less concerned with protecting the youth of America against unnecessary compulsion than the Eighty-first Congress was in safeguarding industry and labor.

Mr. President, I submit the two amendments, which I shall call up at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish now to make my explanation and argument in support of my amendment C, which seeks to place a 3,500,000 manpower ceiling on the Military Establishment as of now. The amendment has already been read by the clerk, and is the pending question before the Senate.

The first argument I wish to make in support of this amendment is that it is of the utmost importance that the Congress of the United States, in the passage of the military manpower bill, make clear to the military authorities that they do not have discretion to increase the number of men in the Military Establishment beyond a ceiling fixed by the Congress. It is very important that we exercise our constitutional check upon the military. In my opinion, the recent pronouncement of the Secretary of Defense is adequate argument in support of my amendment, when he testified before the House committee in what seemed to me to be such a vague manner as to what his intent may be as to the total number in the Military Establishment; and when he said in effect that some of the amendments proposed to the military manpower bill would make it difficult for the Military Establishment to proceed to raise an army of more than 4,000,000 men in case of an emergency, determined by the Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we should ignore the importance of the Congress giving the orders to the Military Establishment as to what its manpower ceiling shall be. In this modified amendment I have selected the President's own figure of three and a half million men, which was contained in the President's message to Congress and which was cited to the Armed Services Committee in the course of the hearings as the President's ceiling intentions as of now, on which the manpower bill was based.

I point out again that when the military sent this bill to the committee for consideration and hearing it first talked in terms of 3,200,000 men. Some days later it raised its estimate to 3,500,000. I think it is very important that we make clear to the military through this bill that we are not giving them blanket authority to increase the size of the Military Establishment in accordance with their discretion, to whatever extent they can increase it under the operation of the manpower bill. If we do not watch the military and check them by way of placing a ceiling in this bill there is a very great danger that the military will so apply the selective service law as to increase the military forces far beyond the 3,500,000 figure they used as the basis for asking for this bill. Incidentally the Defense Establishment I am informed is asking the appropriation committees to recommend to the Senate and to the House a military budget based upon a 3,500,000 military force. They can get more later if they can prove their case but we should require the proof and impose now the legislative check upon the military provided for in my amendment.

There is not a Member of this body who knows for a certainty how many men beyond the military's own estimates of 3,500,000, can be raised by this manpower bill, if they proceed to operate the bill in full. I say that it is wrong, as a matter of public policy, to give carte blanche authority to the military to go beyond auy ceiling fixed by the Congress. If we start doing that, what will be our check on the military?

The check for which some members of the committee argue is the check on appropriations. Some members of the commitee say, "We have a check in the power of Congress to make the appropriations." I wish to say that after the military makes its manpower commitments, after it brings into the Armed Forces thousands of men above 3,500,000, we shall not get very far in the Appropriations Committee—and every member of the Appropriations Committee knows it—by saying to the military, "We are going to cut down your appropriations, or not give you the money you need to finance the men you have already taken into an overstaffed establishment." The time to place a check on the military officials is before the fact, not after the fact. That is why I believe we should have in the bill before we pass it the ceiling called for by my amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator agree with me that if it were possible for the Appropriations Committee to determine the ceiling through appropriations, still it would be bad policy to require the Appropriations Committee—which, after all, has the job of determining how much money is necessary to do a given thing, and not whether the given thing should be done—to turn aside from its orderly efforts in order to set a policy and establish a ceiling, which the Congress itself should establish? The Congress should establish the ceiling and say to the Appropriations Committee, "You determine how much money is necessary to do the thing which we have determined ought to be done."

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with my senior colleague. I do not believe that we should turn the Appropriations Committee into a legislative policy committee in respect to the military. The Armed Services Committee, in the first instance, should consider policy matters in respect to the military, and not pass the buck to the Appropriations Committee by saying, "We have an ultimate check in the Appropriations Committee, in the matter of carrying out any policy as to the number of men who are to comprise our military force." I believe that now is the time to determine the manpower ceiling while this bill is before the Senate.

Mr. President, there is another argument with which I have been bombarded in committee. I have been hit around the ears with it on the floor of the Senate in these days of debate on the bill. I am perfectly aware of the fact that, figuratively speaking, my head is a little bloody. However, I am undaunted in fighting for what I am satisfied is the public interest in regard to this military manpower bill. I am perfectly willing to let time and the American people pass judgment on the principles of the amendments for which I have been fighting, although on most of them I have been defeated.

The argument to which I refer is an emotional argument. We are asked, "Do you not have confidence in General Marshall, General Bradley, Admiral Sherman, General Vandenberg, and General Eisenhower? Are you not willing to give them broad powers and let them determine what the ceiling should be in accordance with the military exigencies as they meet them?"

My answer is pretty much the answer given by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] a few minutes ago. I have confidence in them as military men, to execute legislative policies determined by the Congress. But in order that there may be no room for doubt about it in this RECORD, Mr. President, let me say that I do not have sufficient confidence in their judgment on legislative questions to make them an extension of the Congress of the United States and delegate to them legislative power. The Members of the Congress were elected by the people to perform the legislative functions of our Government. The people have never authorized the military to legislate. I intend to reserve all the legislative power in the Congress, and say to the men in high military posi-

tions, "The only authority we are going to give you is to execute a public policy on military affairs, a policy determined in legislative form by the Congress."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have not followed the matter too closely, and I am a little puzzled over the distinction made by the Senator from Oregon as to what is military and what is political or public policy; as to the distinction he draws between the views he advocates here regarding the constitution of the Army, and the views I understood him to advocate regarding the sending of soldiers to an international army in Europe.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon has long since learned to treat one issue at a time. When, at a later date, we come to the legislation to which the Senator from Maine is referring, the Senator from Oregon will then take his position, after he has heard full debate on the subject, as to what his vote will be on that issue. But as to this particular issue, I hardly think the Senator from Maine can disagree with me that it is a question of public policy as to what the ceiling for the Military Establishment in terms of manpower shall be. To me, it is perfectly clear that that is a legislative matter to be determined by the Congress, and never by my vote will I delegate that authority to any galaxy of generals, I care not how able they may be in military strategy. Under my oath to uphold the Constitution it is my duty in this body to determine such questions of public policy.

In closing this argument, Mr. President, let me say that I am exceedingly fearful of giving to the military any such unrestricted manpower discretion as will be given to them if we do not place in the bill the ceiling which I propose. We ought to take the President of the United States at his word on this matter. He used the figure of 3,500,000 in his message to Congress and in his public pronouncements on this problem. We ought to take the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, at her word, after she changed her mind as to what the figure should be, from 3,200,000 to 3,462,000. She presented much of her later testimony on the basis of charts which used as their statistical base the figure of 3,500,000 as recommended by the President.

We ought to take the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, at his word, at least prior to his very vague and confused testimony on the House side, when he testified along with General Bradley, Admiral Sherman, General Vandenberg, and the others for 3,500,000, in round numbers. Then we ought to say to them, "If conditions change so that you need more, and you can show that you need more, we will be at the old legislative business stand as usual. We will be there transacting the people's business in accordance with our constitutional obligations of determining policy in Congress, and not delegating policy and legislative questions to the Pentagon for determination."

Let me say that I do not think I can discuss a more fundamental question, so far as our constitutional system of checks and balance is concerned, than the question inherent in my amendment. I leave it with the Senate of the United States to determine whether it wants to carry out its constitutional duty of determining the public policy question as to the size of the Military Establishment or whether it wants to delegate that legislative function by way of arbitrary discretion to the Pentagon.

Mr. President, in my opinion, there can be only one answer to the question as to what we should do, and that is to determine here on the floor of the Senate what that ceiling should be, and I suggest we take the President's own figure. On the basis of the public statements made by the officers in the Pentagon as to limiting the number of men they are going to send to Europe for the time being, at least, to 100,000 more, and particularly in view of the colloquy I had a few minutes ago with my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as to the very confused program we are carrying on in Korea, I think we certainly ought to check what has already been demonstrated to be a very arbitrary power on the part of the military at the Pentagon, by fixing the ceiling at 3,500,000 for the time being. The ceiling of 3,500,000 should be fixed with the understanding that whenever General Marshall can come before us and show a need for a higher ceiling, he will get a full and fair hearing and action on the basis of the facts he presents. But, I for one, am not going to give to General Marshall or any other Secretary of Defense the kind of discretionary power being proposed in this bill in respect to determining the number of men who are to be in the military forces of our country.

I take the Senate back for a moment to some of the fears which were expressed on the floor of the Senate at the time the unification bill was pending. Fears were then expressed about the danger of the unification law developing so that more and more discretionary power would be given to the Secretary of Defense. But assurances were given then—if Senators will check the record of that debate they will find them—that the Senate sits here as a check on the Secretary of Defense and could be counted upon to check the Secretary of Defense from obtaining arbitrary power. I challenge the Senate today to exercise a check on the Secretary of Defense by putting the ceiling I propose into the manpower bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very happy the Senator has said what he has said in the way he has said it. Historically the Congress has determined the size of the Military Establishment. That is nothing new. It would now be an abandonment of our historical practice not to establish a ceiling. I am as glad as I can be that the Senator is making the talk he is making, and that he has offered the amendment he has offered.

Debate took place in the Senate yesterday in regard to a priority system for 18-year-olds. I should like to ask the Senator what sense there would be in setting up a priority system with reference to 18-year-olds if the whole thing is to be left open at the top?

Mr. MORSE. It is my opinion that if we do not impose a three and one-half million ceiling the so-called priority system for 18-year-olds becomes an empty gesture and farce. Whenever we go to four million or above we can be sure that most 18-year-olds will be taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know what the Secretary of Defense meant when he testified on the House side that some of these restrictions would prevent the military from raising an Army of four million or more if at the present time in the back of his head he does not contemplate exercising that kind of discretion without first coming to the Congress and asking for permission to go beyond the three and one-half million which in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee he said he wanted. Senators can give the brass this discretionary power if they want to, but I am not going to vote for it, and, believe me, as the military take on more and more power—and we can see them doing it—I am, to the extent of my ability, going to take the issue to the people of the country. I think they will support the exercise of the constitutional check for which I am fighting.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The present Secretary of National Defense, when he was Chief of Staff of the Army, operated under a ceiling limit, and never had any difficulty with it whatsoever.

Mr. MORSE. He never had any trouble getting from Congress the number of men he needed on the basis of the facts he presented at any time. He can do it now, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He always obtained the full number he asked for, and, so far as I know, neither the present Secretary of Defense nor anyone else has ever complained about that. They took it for granted that Congress in its duty to the people would exercise its power in that respect.

Mr. MORSE. They are not recommending a ceiling by legislation now, are they?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; they are not recommending it now.

Mr. MORSE. I am suspicious of why they are not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask permission to raise some questions with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] about the amendments to subsection (j), section 6, as covered on page 88

of S. 1, in section 1 (t) of the bill. It will be found on page 83 of the report of the committee.

This is the section dealing with so-called conscientious objectors. Am I correct in my understanding that religious conscientious objectors under this section, if they are found to be genuine in their convictions, shall not be deferred, but shall in lieu of induction for military service be given alternative service either in the form of noncombatant military service within the armed services, or in work of national importance under civilian direction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I note Mr. President, that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is in the Chamber. He is the chairman of the subcommittee. With his permission, I shall be glad to answer the questions of the Senator from Illinois in regard to conscientious objectors.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say to my colleague, the Senator from Illinois, that it is my understanding that this bill restores the provisions of the 1940 act and repeals those of the 1948 act regarding conscientious objectors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is to say, this bill provides that conscientious objectors can no longer be deferred, but that instead of induction, they must give alternative service of equal duration; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. I think the best answer I can give is to be found on page 2 of the report of the Committee on Armed Services on Senate bill 2496 in the Eighty-first Congress, second session, Calendar No. 1561, a bill to authorize contributions to the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc. That bill was passed by the Senate, but was held up in the House of Representatives. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and myself.

The purpose of the bill was to make it possible for the net receipts of $1,389,000, in round numbers, to be contributed by the Secretary of State, in his discretion, to CARE, for use in providing technical, scientific, and professional publications and scientific equipment for libraries and institutions of learning abroad.

I read from page 2 of the report on that bill, as follows:

The National Service Board for religious objectors—

Which is a board set up to consult with the Selective Service System—

states that religious organizations contributed over $7,000,000 in operating and maintaining camps and supplying the every day essentials of the conscientious objectors.

The report further says:

Maj. Gen. L. B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, in testifying on this bill stated that the Federal Government expended approximately $4,731,000 during World War II to administer the program for conscientious objectors.

This amount includes all direct expenditures, including the employment of supervisory personnel, transportation of personnel and equipment, purchase of tools, equipment, clothing, and food. Conscientious objectors contributed over 6,000,000 man-days of productive labor in work of national importance without remuneration. Various Federal agencies received 3,000,000 man-days at no expense. Conscientious objectors served as guinea pigs on medical projects 180,000 man-days, and in veterans' hospitals as attendants 120,000 man-days. Various State institutions were subsidized to the extent of 1,500,000 man-days. In addition, approximately 1,000,000 man-days were sold to private employers, which for the most part consisted of working on dairy farms or harvesting seasonal crops. The employers paid the Federal agency concerned for this labor at the going wage.

Mr. President, I have read only a portion of the report on the bill; but the portion I have read states in substance how approximately 12,000 of the conscientious objectors were employed during World War II.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand, then, that it is the intention of the Senate Armed Services Committee that after these men have been found to be religious conscientious objectors, they are to be assigned, during a period equivalent to the period of military service required under this bill, namely, 24 months, to work which is judged to be of national importance, and that the work will be under the immediate direction of civilians?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My answer to that question is, Yes; they will will be for a period of 24 months, which is the length of inducted service which was decided upon by the Senate yesterday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And they may be assigned or furloughed to approved private agencies or employers, as was done to a limited extent during the last war; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. I think the Federal Government would expect to have a first lien on their services, so to speak, for work of national importance; but that if the Federal Government did not exercise that lien, and if they could be farmed out, so to speak, to private agencies or employers, that would be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it further understood that although the work which they would do would not necessarily make them national heroes, yet neither should the work be of a type which would subject them to humiliation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. Even though they conscientiously object to serving in the Armed Forces, they should be given 24 months of work for their country, and it should be work which would not be humiliating.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would include assignment to hospitals for work in research and for work on other projects of a public nature, would it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. During World War II the American Legion and some other organizations objected in some cases to having conscientious objectors work in hospitals; but in other cases conscientious objectors did work in hospitals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, it would not be obligatory for them to work in hospitals; but where local public opinion approved, they could be so assigned. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They could be used to work upon a wide variety of projects, either manual or skilled or professional in character, could they not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It would depend upon the capacity of the conscientious objectors and where they might be available.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The assignments of the individual conscientious objectors would, depending upon the type of projects of national importance available, be made in every possible case to positions which make the maximum use of their capacities. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is as I understand the matter. The board which handles this matter under the selective service system is, as I understand, composed of men belonging to the churches to which the conscientious objectors belong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the committee does not intend these men to be given easy treatment, and I think they do not wish to receive easy treatment. On the other hand, if the conscientious objectors receive no pay, those who have dependents will find that their families will be subjected to great hardship.

I notice that in a report of the Selective Service Administration for 1950, there is a recommendation, appearing on page 339, that conscientious objectors should probably be given more rights and privileges than they were given in World War II, and that serious attention should at least be given to providing them with some pay, and their families with some allowances or allotments. It is not stated that these should necessarily equal those allowed the men who are in the military service, but the principle is there recommended that something be paid to somewhat mitigate the hardship involved. It would not be impossible under this measure administratively to adopt those recommendations, would it, in the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that during the last war the men who were assigned to work on farms for private employers were permitted to retain $15 a month for their out-of-pocket expenses, and they were provided with their board and lodging by their churches, unless their employer was providing it. The remainder of their money coming from private employment was turned into the Treasury of the United States.

I see nothing in the pending measure, as now constituted, which would prevent the authorities from adding to that pay of approximately 50 cents a day, if it was the proper thing to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Selective Service Administration would have the power, would it not, to designate, if it saw fit to do so, a separate division within its own agency, to deal with the civilian supervision of the projects to be carried on in that connection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is as I understand it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been my understanding that General Hershey has tried to administer this matter with great fairness. I believe he is a descendent of a Mennonite family himself, and therefore he understands these problems.

I wonder whether that is the conclusion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, I understand that General Hershey is an excellent administrator, and of course he has had much more experience with this matter than any other citizen has had.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if it is in order, I should like to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief memorandum concerning the work the conscientious objectors did during the last war, in order that the RECORD may be complete.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Conscientious-objector assignees to civilian public service camps in regular work projects and special work projects at the end of October during each year, 1941 through 1946*

| Type of project and technical agency | Year and number | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1941 | 1942 | 1943 | 1944 | 1945 | 1946 |
| REGULAR WORK PROJECT | | | | | | |
| Department of Agriculture: | | | | | | |
| Forest Service | 518 | 2,152 | 1,721 | 1,591 | 1,809 | 249 |
| Soil Conservation Service | 600 | 1,924 | 1,437 | 1,189 | 1,147 | 374 |
| Farm Security Administration | | | 304 | 265 | 266 | 1 |
| Department of the Interior: | | | | | | |
| National Park Service | 122 | 436 | 538 | 744 | 698 | 116 |
| Bureau of Reclamation | | 39 | 428 | 428 | 455 | 30 |
| General Land Office | | | 178 | 124 | 133 | 10 |
| Fish and Wildlife | | 55 | 66 | 152 | 53 | 100 |
| Total in regular work projects | 1,240 | 4,606 | 4,672 | 4,493 | 4,561 | 880 |
| SPECIAL WORK PROJECT | | | | | | |
| Agriculture Labor Administration | | | 650 | 815 | 1,123 | 49 |
| Department of Commerce: | | | | | | |
| Coast and Geodetic Survey | | | 14 | 42 | 43 | 4 |
| Weather Bureau | | | 17 | 73 | 63 | 1 |
| Health | | 31 | 91 | 153 | 185 | 55 |
| Hospitals | | 143 | 1,260 | 1,885 | 2,235 | 210 |
| Scientific research: | | | | | | |
| Office of Scientific Research and Development | | | 44 | 156 | 224 | 5 |
| Office of the Surgeon General, U. S. Army | | | | | 102 | 10 |
| Miscellaneous | | | 66 | 77 | 107 | 125 |
| Total | | 174 | 2,142 | 3,201 | 4,082 | 459 |
| Grand total [1] | 1,240 | 4,780 | 6,814 | 7,694 | 8,643 | 1,339 |

[1] Includes Civilian Public Service Reserve.

THE FOREST SERVICE CAMPS

The Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture was the technical agency of Civilian Public Service Camps located in National and State forests, primarily for the control of forest fires. It carried on a year-round program of disease control; fire presuppression; construction and maintenance of roads. trails, fire towers and communication lines; nursery operation; reforestation; and other work. All of this tied into the protection and preservation of forests.

The bulk of the work in these camps was manual labor, strenuous and exhausting in the case of fire fighting, and it required young, physically fit objector registrants. However, the Forest Service needed and secured, or trained, Class IV–E assignees having any one of a variety of skills or specialized knowledge. This ranged from the operation and maintenance of motor vehicles, tractors, and other power machinery through construction, surveying, and engineering, to the scientific knowledge and experience that could be used in the forest experimental station. Objectors were used additionally as office workers and in the construction, operation and upkeep of communication equipment, including radios and telephones. One camp was organized which trained and used a selected group of assignees as parachute fire fighters for the control of fires in remote and inaccessible forests. Forest Service camps were widely scattered in order to provide as much fire protection as possible with the few men available.

THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CAMPS

Camps under the supervision of the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior were located in many National and State parks. All the parks had fire-fighting and forest-protection projects similar to those of the Forest Service and, in addition, had to perserve and maintain the park improvements, which represented a large Government investment.

THE SOIL CONSERVATION WORK

CPS camps of the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture were located in farming areas where they carried on a program of erosion control, water conservation, drainage, nursery operation, development of pure strains of seed and preservation of land. The type of conservation work done varied with each camp unit. One camp was engaged in the rechanneling and reclamation of a large drainage canal, and the labor of another was largely confined to a nursery which provided trees for field planting and new varieties of grass seed. A unit was assigned to an experimental station to provide technical assistance in the study of water run-off and erosion control. Basically the soil conservation work required intelligent manual labor, but there was a need for assignees with skills, such as mechanics, clerks, and equipment operators, as well as those with technical training in engineering, farm planning, and the laboratory work of the experimental stations. In addition, the CPS camps supplied the bulk of the emergency farm labor available to the surrounding area for the production and harvesting of essential crops when other help was not available.

THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CAMPS

The Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture was engaged in arid-land reclamation at the farm level. This work consisted of clearing, land leveling, construction of lateral ditches, roads, buildings, and other improvements on land which is fertile when watered. Several of these units were completed and brought under farm cultivation through the activities of the CPS camps. A total of 8,100 acres were brought under irrigation cultivation during the war as a result of such projects of the civilian work program of selective service.

THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CAMPS

The Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation with the assistance of CPS camps completed the construction of three large earthen dams for water-storage purposes. This construction work had been started by the Civilian Conservation Corps to provide water for civilian consumption and irrigation. The projects had been approved, and were granted material and equipment priorities, by the War Production Board.

THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE WORK CAMPS

Camps of the General Land Office in the Department of Interior (later known as the Bureau of Land Management) were located in the West on forest lands which had been recently acquired by the Department. In addition to fire protection, roads and trails were needed and a large amount of surveying, mapping, and timber cruising was necessary. This required assignees with engineering training to make maps and lay out roads and trails, others with the ability to make timber surveys or tabulate the results and those with the usual skills needed in forest camps of the system's civilian work program to operate the road-building machinery, fall timber, and do maintenance work.

THE FISH AND WILDLIFE CAMPS

Under the sponsorship of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, a group of class IV–E registrants were assigned to the experimental station at Bowie, Md., for work on a variety of research projects. Some of this was manual labor, but other jobs required selected men with scientific training. This agency also operated the Government camp at Germfask, Mich. The work at the Germfask project consisted of developing and maintaining a wildlife refuge which had been established in compliance with the terms of a treaty between the United States and Canada on the preservation of migratory wild fowl.

MENTAL HOSPITALS AND TRAINING SCHOOLS

This project group as well as the remaining projects which are discussed, constituted the ones usually referred to as "special projects." Registrants who were assigned to the Veterans' Administration and State mental hospital work as well as to the farms and other projects yet to be covered, were individuals who had first been assigned to regular camp activities for a minimum of 90 days. During that time the objector had to demonstrate his ability to accept discipline and to work under normal conditions before being considered for a special-type project.

In the beginning of the mental hospital and training school phase of the civilian-work program, medical officers from the institutions themselves often visited the civilian public service camp and selected men for the projects. These medical men thus determined the adaptability of the individual for the hospital and school activity.

Approximately one-fifth of all the class IV–E assignees of selective service worked in mental hospitals or training schools. Many of these institutions were finding it impossible to maintain staffs of qualified

employees; their employees were constantly leaving to take positions in industry where the wages were much higher and the work less confining. However, their inmates were wards of society and must be given care. The work involving, as it did, service along humanitarian lines, had a strong appeal to the conscientious objector.

Assignees from the CPS camps performed work at the hospitals and schools as attendants, technicians, clerks, farm laborers and the like. Doctors who were assigned as objectors were practically without exception placed with these hospitals.

AGRICULTURAL LABOR ADMINISTRATION WORK

The use of conscientious objector assignees by the Agricultural Labor Administration of the Department of Agriculture as year-round laborers and technicians in food production resulted in 786,326 man-days of labor and the earning of $1,549,152.28 in wages up to the end of the civilian-work program. An additional 138,674 man-days of emergency work was performed by men in regular civilian public service camps who supplied day labor for the production and harvesting of vitally needed farm crops within a 15-mile radius of the camp units. Wages earned by these emeregency day laborers on farms amounted to $711,596.55. In addition, these and other assignees worked thousands of man-days of labor in the production of food for consumption at the mental hospitals and training schools and at the work-camp units themselves. This was not recorded as farm labor, however.

The farm labor camps were divided into three general groups: Those for individual dairy-farm laborers, those for Dairy Herd Improvement Association herd testers, and those for State college agricultural experiment station workers. As had been pointed out, wage payments were required for all types of farm labor. The general standard used was the going wage of the community for year-round single farm hands where room, board, and laundry were furnished. The only exception to this rule was that the hourly wage rate for day labor was the standard used in setting wages for emergency farm labor. A ruling of the Comptroller General required that all moneys paid as wages for assignee farm labor, less necessary expenses, be deposited with the United States Treasury where it was placed in a special fund to be held until the termination of the national emergency.

DAIRY FARM LABOR

The acute shortage of labor in some dairying areas led to the development of a plan, in conjunction with the War Food Administration and the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, under which qualified selective-service assignees, who volunteered, were transferred from the regular camps to jobs on dairy farms. These objectors worked as farm laborers an selected dairy farms in counties recommended and approved by the War Food Administration as being important in dairy production and having a shortage of dairy-farm labor. The employer paid the prevailing wage of the community for this help, as stated above, and the money, less an allowance to the assignee for the purchase of clothing and other necessities and a deduction for administrative operating expenses, was paid into the United States Treasury.

DAIRY HERD TESTING

A number of camp assignees from the system were selected and trained by State agricultural colleges for work as herd testers with various dairy herd improvement associations. A few of these objectors were also used as technicians in artificial dairy herd breeding associations. The 108,105 cows tested yearly in six States averaged 512 per tester. The associations paid for the services of these registrants under the same arrangement as that followed by the individual dairy farmer on the dairy farm labor project.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Assignees were placed with a number of State agricultural college experiment stations to relieve the labor shortage and enable these institutions to carry on with work that otherwise would have been discontinued. Some of the experiments had been under way for 50 years or more, and a great deal of their value was in the continuity of the work and records. Higher yielding strains of seeds were being developed and propagated and considerable time and effort was being devoted to the study of animal and plant diseases. A few qualified men were engaged in research work, others had technical jobs, and the remainder supplied the farm labor needed at an experiment station. In general, such men were employed under the same financial arrangements and other conditions as the men on dairy farms.

MALARIA AND HOOKWORM UNITS

Two State health projects of the Civilian Public Service Camps involved disease control, one in Florida, consisting of three units, and the other in Mississippi, with one unit. The work was largely malaria and hookworm control and the teaching of general sanitation through mosquito elimination, the screening of houses, and the construction of sanitary privies. These special projects of the civilian work program were sponsored by the United States Public Health Service and supervised by the State boards of health at no cost to Selective Service. Funds were provided by the religious organizations operating the camps and by the States and communities in which the work was done.

PUERTO RICAN MEDICAL UNITS

A medical unit project was set up for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. This special camp project was divided into a number of small units dispersed throughout the islands. Centers were established to provide medical, surgical, hospital, ambulance, dietetic, and welfare service for people in areas which previously were without any of this kind of care. Out-patient service was provided along these lines and the population was given instructions in health and sanitation, and trained in home nursing. Objectors assigned to this duty by the System had special qualifications and included doctors, nurses, and technicians of various kinds. The project was jointly operated and financed by the Brethren, Mennonites, and Friends under the sponsorship of the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration with the approval and some assistance from the insular health department.

SPECIAL EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS

A group of selected volunteers from among camp assignees were used as experimental subjects in various medical research projects under the supervision of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the Surgeon General of the Army. Besides acting as subjects for tests, the assignees assisted with investigations and experiments of various kinds having to do with problems of diet, nutrition, climate, altitude, and certain diseases. These projects were quite important, and had a high priority among the various special phases of the civilian work program.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce had experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining qualified men for its field staffs while, at the same time, the mapping of certain areas of the country was urgently required. A unit of class IV–E assignees was therefore organized by Selective Service to assist with this work.

WEATHER BUREAU

In addition to its other duties, the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce had undertaken during World War II to compile data from past weather reports and plot it on a series of weather maps. The information was badly needed, but the work was delayed due to a shortage of civilian personnel. In consequence, a CPS camp of objectors was established by the system under the supervision of the Weather Bureau to carry on this special project.

Approximately $2,500,000 was turned into the Treasury as a result of labor performed for wages.

It would be difficult to designate as most important any one project of the civilian work program for class IV–E registrants of selective service. It may be of interest, however, to point out a few accomplishments which were very noteworthy. For instance, the assignees to CPC camps constructed and maintained 2,000 miles of fence, 475 miles of new telephone and electric-power lines, 814 miles of new truck trails, and 7,640 miles of stock and foot trails. Some 173,000 man-days were spent in tree-nursery work and approximately 40,000,000 trees were planted in areas needing reforestation. One thousand eight hundred miles of new fire-hazard reduction work was done on firebreaks, trails, and roads, and 48,000 man-days were devoted to fighting forest fires. Several dams were completed which provided water for irrigating large tracts of arid land. Adding together the days spent on wartime food production in all of this type of project, there were more than a million so contributed. Much other forestry, soil conservation, and national parks works that had been handicapped by the loss of manpower was, through the camp program of the System, provided with labor to carry on these activities of conserving and preserving natural resources.

In the field of conserving resources 1,512,896 man-days were spent in State mental hospitals, 120,403 man-days in veterans hospitals, and 105,473 in public health work. Additionally the Office of the Surgeon General of the United States Army and the Office of Scientific Research and Development benefited through the use of 150,713 man-days in special projects and research work.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon a question or two. Do I correctly understand that the amendment which the distinguished Senator is now offering places an over-all ceiling of 3,500,000 on all branches of the armed services?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Do I also correctly understand that the committee itself estimated as a total for the armed services as of this time 3,462,000?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Further, am I correct in understanding that all the Senator is here proposing is, that this ceiling be imposed by the Congress itself upon the military arm of the Government?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct—with the understanding that it can be modified upward in case of changing events, when the military appears before us and makes a case for upward revision, and when there is future action by the Congress carrying out their recommendation.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to ask the Senator a further question. I am very much impressed by his amendment. I am impressed by it for many more reasons than one. In the first place, it makes an assertion of certain power in the Congress, in a very vital field. But how can any limitation be put upon the expenditures of the Government, if the military itself is to control the size

of the Army, without coming to the Congress for approval?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia, that one of my arguments is that if the ceiling is kept as an open-ended affair, so to speak, and we let the military exercise the discretion of taking into the service men in addition to 3,500,000—which it can do, if we do not place some limitation upon them—then, in the Appropriations Committee, we shall be confronted with an after-the-fact situation. The military will argue and we know what the result will be. "We are sorry, but we have all these men in the service now, and we need this money in order to finance them." The Senator knows what will happen. In the usual course of events, the members of the Appropriations Committee will vote the money; we on the floor of the Senate will vote it, and we will slap someone's wrist, with a speech or two to the effect that the military should have obtained the money first. That is about what we shall do. If we want to avoid such a situation which amounts to locking the stable after the horse is stolen we will adopt my amendment providing for 3,500,000 men as of now.

Mr. GEORGE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Oregon. Furthermore, it will be impossible to put any ceiling upon the budget, will it not, if the military men increase the size of the army as far as possible under the laws which now exist, or as they may be modified? I believe it is estimated that it costs something like $4,000 to maintain a man in the Armed Forces. Is not that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is the estimate given to us in the hearings by the military.

Mr. GEORGE. So the Senator's amendment may be properly designated, may it not, as an amendment to preserve the solvency of the Government, as well as to retain in the Congress the power which rightfully belongs in the Congress?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Georgia is absolutely and completely correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be pleased to support this amendment. I do not understand why the committee cannot accept it, because it seems to me to be a very reasonable limitation. It is in excess of the number which is now said to be necessary, and we are still in peacetime, except for the Korean War, of course.

Within the past 10 or 15 years there has been a notable drift toward the delegation of authority by the Congress to the Executive and to other branches of the Government. It has occurred in every phase of our life, and if, in the matter of such vital concern to the men and women and families of America as the size of the Army, the Congress is not to assert some authority, then I think we have arrived at a tragic point in our history.

It reminds me, Mr. President, very forcefully of the graphic language of the great historian Gibbon, when he was writing of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. He said that the Roman Senate, with absolute complacency, voted the power to raise additional legions without any limitations or restrictions upon it; and of course, that meant the bankruptcy and the downfall of Rome.

I am willing to go as far as I can, and would like to support the committee, but I certainly hope that the committee may see that this over-all limitation on the size of the Armed Forces is not hampering, is not crippling, and, in the language of the proponents of the amendment, is not intended to be such. It seems to me to be altogether reasonable as a proper limitation, in this instance, upon the power of the military.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Georgia will permit me to say that I am exceedingly grateful for the comments he has made in support of my amendment. I mean no idle flattery to the Senator from Georgia when I say that my admiration for his analytical abilities in connection with constitutional and financial questions, and all other great issues which come before the Senate, is so great that it is very reassuring when the Senator from Georgia comes to my aid in support of an amendment by which I seek only to safeguard what I believe to be the constitutional responsibilities of the Senate.

I most certainly think we should impose this constitutional check upon the military, by saying to them in no uncertain words, "We are going to fix ceiling on the military manpower provided for in this bill. When you can show us that you need more men, come before us; you will get a prompt hearing, and, as in this instance, when you have proved your case, you will get the men." I have taken the military officials at their word in this amendmenet. I have allowed them the figure for which they themselves have testified; and I have taken the President of the United States at his word. This is the figure which the President himself announced as the top figure which is contemplated for the time being. When they want more, let them come forward and ask for it. But, Mr. President, I think the Senate of the United States would make a great, historic mistake if it were to delegate to the Pentagon the legislative policy which I think is inherent in this bill.

We should determine the ceiling, and when we do that we shall give the taxpayers of the country the best possible guaranty that we are checking military expenditures before the fact, and not allowing the Senate to become sucked into such a position that after the obligations are incurred in the first instance, the military can come before the Appropriations Committee to ask for the money with which to liquidate them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator resumes his seat, will he yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Georgia had the floor. I was merely responding to his questions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon whether it is not a fact that in the hearings on Senate bill 1, on January 22, at page 687, exhibit A, entitled "Objectives Met by the Manpower Plan of the Department of Defense," includes as item No. 1, "Long Range Security Program for the Nation," as presented by the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that at page 688 of the same volume there is set forth exhibit B, entitled "Possible Alternatives To Meet Manpower Needs of the Armed Forces"?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not also a fact that at page 689 of the same volume there is set forth Exhibit C entitled "Estimated Number of I–A Available Men Remaining in Selective Service Pool, Based on Maintaining Armed Force of 3.5 Million After 30 June 1952"?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that in the next two charts, set forth on pages 690 and 691, 3,500,000 is the figure used by the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact, also, that on page 691, in a chart relating to the draft of 18½-year olds, the Assistant Secretary of Defense also uses the figure 3,500,000?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct, too.

Mr. WHERRY. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, will the distinguished Senator from Oregon say whether or not there has been any change, or whether any evidence has been offered to the committee in any way, shape, or form by the Assistant Secretary of Defense or anyone else otherwise than for a 3,500,000 military force?

Mr. MORSE. I know of none.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator recall that last Friday I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact, which has not anything to do with the pending amendment, because the amendment does exactly what I think should be done, that Secretary Marshall was quoted in the newspapers stating that we should prepare for an Army of 4,000,000?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and that is why I believe we should check his discretion by adopting my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether Secretary Marshall or anyone else has come before the committee offering any additional testimony justifying raising the ceiling from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000?

Mr. MORSE. I know of none.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I felt that the Congress should make the determination of 3,500,000 as the ceiling. If I remember the words I used, I said that we should cut the goods to fit the pattern, rather than proceed blindly and use a flexible figure, on the basis of which neither the Committee on Appropriations or any other legislative committee could plan in determining the size of the Armed Forces. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree, and I thank the Senator from Nebraska for fortifying by his questions the points

I sought to make in my main speech on the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, who desires to ask me a question.

Mr. CASE. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, whether it is possible to put a ceiling successfully on Federal expenditures if we give a blank check to the military in the matter of manpower.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been a Member of the Senate 8 years and a few months, and most of that time have served on the Committee on Appropriations, and my answer is that from experience I would say it is almost impossible to put a ceiling on appropriations under such circumstances. There is no possibility of doing it unless we know what the ceiling is going to be in the case of the military forces.

Mr. CASE. It is my understanding that the Constitution reposed in the Congress the power over the purse and sword.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. The two go together.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I can remember, as I am sure the Senator can, when we used to take the multiplication table and say that $2,700 was the cost per soldier, then the figure went to $3,000, and now it is $4,000; and if we lift the ceiling so that the military has a blank check over the manpower, we give them a blank check on appropriations, do we not?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his observation. He has had great experience in the House of Representatives, and would make a valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. Too often we make authorizations, just as we are asked to do now, and yet expect to control appropriations, which is an impossibility. Once we authorize in a sort of loose, flexible fashion such as that proposed, there is no other alternative than to provide the appropriations. I have seen that situation arise time and time again. A loose authorization is made for a project, and those in favor of it say, "you authorized it, you knew what you were doing, therefore now we want the appropriations," and we have had to make the appropriations to save face.

In this case we are acting with our eyes open, and Congress is determining the policy, if we place a ceiling on the manpower. I am as much in favor of having an army as is the chairman of the subcommittee, I am for an air force and I am for a navy, but I believe the Congress should determine the policy, and we should write it down so that we will know what it is going to be.

One of the sad features of this matter is that it is necessary to take a lot of castor oil in connection with this bill in order to get an army and a navy and an air force, and I do not like that. There are many things in the bill which I do not think have anything to do with determining a national policy, and I want the RECORD to show that in my opinion it is correct that Congress should make provision as to the size of the military forces. I believe we should have an army of the size necessary; we should have a navy and an air force of the necessary size; but I believe the Congress has the right to determine the size, and the right to determine the approach, how we are to spend the defense dollars on the three branches of the service.

In addition to what I have already said, I should like to say that the figures 3,500,000 are recommended by the Secretary of the Defense and by the Assistant Secretary of Defense. It has nothing to do with the Chief of Staff advising the military. Of course, Secretary Marshall is a military man, but the recommendation comes also from the civilian side. So, with this recommendation of 3,500,000, the Assistant Secretary specifically stated, as appears on page 696 of the hearings, that they did not need to draft 18-year-olds in order to get the size of the force they wanted, and that they would be able to get it with the formula submitted by the Committee on Armed Services, which reported the bill.

That is why I voted against drafting the 18-year-olds. With the statement made by the assistant Secretary of Defense, the evidence brought forward that we have to reach down lower is absolutely destroyed. If we put the ceiling at 3,500,000, we comply with the testimony of the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, and if we draft the 18½-year-olds, we can get that number without reaching down to the 18-year-olds.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has named the Secretary of Defense and the assistant Secretary of Defense as testifying on the basis of a military manpower figure of 3,500,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. All the witnesses representing the military establishment testified on the basis of the 3,500,000 figure. The whole case presented by the military to the committee was based on that figure. I think we should write that figure into the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I do also, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I feel that under the oath which I took when I assumed my responsibility as a Member of the Senate, it is my duty to vote upon that or some other amendment fixing a limit. I believe this to be possibly the most serious aspect of the bill, which we have under consideration, whether we are to give a blank-check authority to the military to dictate the size of the Army we shall have in the future, and thereby indirectly dictate the cost it will entail to the American taxpayer.

The second most important issue that may come before the Senate in connection with this matter, and related subjects, will be raised when we reach the question of whether the Congress or the President should have the power to send the Armed Forces into foreign countries. They have been in Korea, and now the President is asking us to ratify his sending them to Europe. In my judgment that is solely the responsibility of the Congress.

We have been drifting away from congressional responsibility. We have been drifting into administrative policy-making powers, to the danger of our liberty, and when we begin to drift as the Army seems to be drifting from what they have been suggesting in the bill, and what they need to work out through universal military training, it seems to me we should recur once in a while to the basic charters of our liberty.

I want to read into the RECORD at this particular point, article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, in order that all Senators may determine their duty under their oaths. It says:

> The Congress shall have power—
>
> * * * * * *
>
> To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;
>
> To raise and support armies.

That certainly implies a responsibility and a duty on the Congress of the United States to determine the number who shall be in the Army of the United States.

The Constitution emphasizes the congressional responsibility and the recurring duty of Congress to consider the job year by year by providing "but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years."

In other words, it is trying to hold the power within the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States, realizing the necessity for so doing if we are not to have the executive branch of the Government override congressional responsibility.

> To provide and maintain a Navy.

That provision is comparable to the paragraph relating to the Army.

> To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Mr. President, I do not see how the Constitution of the United States could have more clearly fixed responsibility as to the number, as to the rules and regulations, and as to the use and utilization of the Armed Forces than it did in section 8. Every Senator took an oath to abide by the Constitution of the United States. I think we would be recreant to our trust and would violate our oath if we refused to assume our responsibility in determining the size and kind of army we shall have in this country.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I presume the manager of the bill on the floor will give us the reason for not providing a limit in the bill. Many of us are not members of the committee, and we have been listening only to one side of the debate. I should like to ask the able Senator from Texas, who is the manager of the bill, why the administration was given a blank check, and why a limitation of 3,500,000 or 4,000,000 men was not placed in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas will speak on his own time when the Senator from Indiana has finished. The committee was merely following the wishes of the Senator from

Indiana and every other Senator when we did not place a ceiling in the bill. Last August, after listening to the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Senators realized that we could not put a ceiling on Stalin and on the hordes of communism. We, therefore, brought to the floor of the Senate a bill which suspended the ceiling on our Armed Forces. That bill passed the Senate without even one vote being cast against it. Until the present amendment was offered, there was no testimony by any public witness or any private witness before the committee which would indicate that Congress had acted unwisely last August. The Senator from Oregon, in what appeared to be a punitive amendment, when it was first offered, namely, requiring the military to reduce its personnel to 3,000,000, suggested that limitation. The following day it was suggested that 3,100,000 should be the limitation. When the Senator from Texas went to lunch today, he was informed that the amendment had been changed from 3,100,000 to 3,200,000. Upon returning from lunch, the Sneator from Texas inquired at the clerk's desk, and it now appears that in a moment of desperation, when he has got to have a little blood and put somebody into a strait-jacket, in an attempt to get votes, he has amended it again and inserted a ceiling of 3,500,000.

The Senator from Texas has no desire to deprive Congress from exercising any authority that Congress desires to exercise. The Senator from Texas would remind the Members of the Senate and the chairman of the committee that the committee, at the time it heard testimony on the bill which it has now reported, was told by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that as of that time, as of that day, and as of that moment the security of this country required that we built up a force of 3,462,000. At the same time Admiral Sherman—and if he does not know more about the needs of the Navy and how its men should be deployed than does the Senator from Texas, we have been wasting a great deal of money on Annapolis—testified before our committee as follows:

> I believe that unless international conditions improve we may well have to set a new target as we approach this target [of 3,462,000].

General Collins testified:

> I do not regard it [3,462,000] as an ultimate figure if the world situation stays in its current state or worsens.

I merely wish to remind the Senate that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended an active duty force of 3,462,000 as soon as we could get it. What does that mean? It means that they must have the facilities to take care of the 3,462,000 men as fast as they can get them. It means that when they have available the indoctrination facilities, they must also have the training facilities available in order to take care of that many men. They must have combat equipment. So, at the moment, keeping in mind the concentrations of Communists which may be shaping up in dangerous parts of the world, it has been decided that we should get 3,462,000 men as quickly as we can get them. For that reason the members of the committee, bearing in mind that no Senator had objected to the suspension of the over-all ceiling last August, did not think they should come in and say:

"General Marshall, you are responsible for the security of this Nation, but you are responsible only to the tune of 2,000,000 men. If you need more beyond that figure, in order to add to the strategic defense of our country, you have got to come up here and go through 2 months of hearings, and satisfy all the Senators and a few of the Monday-morning quarterbacks." We thought the Senate meant what it said when it said: "We will suspend the ceilings until 1954." The present bill provides that any time a majority of the Senate desires to do it, they can reduce the term of service by adopting a concurrent resolution, and can thus in effect immobilize the Army and the Navy and the Air Force.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the committee was following what the Senate did last August in eliminating entirely any ceiling on the armed services?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; last August the Senate and Congress did not eliminate ceilings entirely.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought the Senator said a moment ago that last August ceilings were taken off our Armed Forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I finish my statement? Will the Senator show me that much courtesy?

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do know that it did not eliminate any ceilings. That is the first part of the Senator's statement which is wrong. In the light of conditions which prevailed in the latter part of June last year, the committee, in July, upon recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, brought into this body legislation which suspended the 2,000,000 ceiling on the Army, Navy, and Air Force until 1954.

The Senator from Oregon sat in the committee's hearings for 5 or 6 weeks. If the Senator from Indiana will read the record of the hearings, he may even get curious as to why the Senator is opposed to the bill. But the Senator from Oregon did not offer any suggestion on ceilings in the hearings of the subcommittee. The bill went to the full committee, and after 3 days the committee wrote the pending bill. There was no suggestion by the Senator from Oregon that we establish a ceiling of 3,000,000, 3,100,000, 3,200,000 or even 3,500,000, because only a few months earlier the Senator from Oregon had said that we ought to suspend the ceilings until 1954.

There is no ceiling on our enemies. If the Senator from Indiana and other Senators who share his viewpoint want to establish a ceiling or a floor they can do so. All they are actually doing is kidding themselves and putting their own leadership in a straitjacket.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator recall that a moment ago he made a statement which shows that possibly he does not know what he is talking about when he says that the Senator from Indiana wants to do this? How does the Senator know what the Senator from Indiana wants to do?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We will let the roll call show. I do not assume to speak for the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the Senator from Indiana tell me whether or not he favors a ceiling?

Mr. CAPEHART. I refuse to answer, except to say——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then I refuse to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana happens to have the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I happen to have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is the same old story which I have observed here for nearly 7 years. Every time we question any Member who desires to give the New Dealers a blank check, he becomes angry and sarcastic, and wants to push someone's ears back. In other words, they are not willing to stand on the floor and debate and argue these questions, as they should do.

A moment ago I rose to ask, and did ask, the Senator in charge of the bill, what the position of the committee was. I was sincere, conscientious, and honest in my question. Instead of getting an honest answer to the question, I received criticism.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I will yield in a moment. I want the Senator from Texas to know that I do not like that sort of treatment. Again, I repeat that it is typical of what has been going on on the floor of the Senate for the past 7 years. I believe that my inquiry was an honest and fair one. My question was, What is the position of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will yield, I shall try to answer the question. I thought the Senator's question was, Why did not the committee establish a ceiling?

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say any such thing. I rose to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what the position of the committee was. I said, "What have you to say about this? I have now listened to the argument on the other side, and not having been a member of the committee, I have not heard your side of the argument. What is your idea?"

Instead of getting the position of the committee—and I can well understand it—I was immediately criticized for something; I do not know what. I want Senators to know that I do not like it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I repeat that it is typical of what has gone on during the

past 7 years. Here we are, discussing a proposal to give the President or the Pentagon a blank check. I do not know whether the Army should be 3,500,000, 4,000,000, or 5,000,000. I do not know whether it should be 3,000,000. I believe that the Congress of the United States ought to say whether it believes that at the moment we should have an Army of 3,500,000, 4,000,000, or 4,500,000. I am trying to find out why the Congress has given up its constitutional responsibility and duty of determining the number of men who should constitute the forces of the United States.

The able Senator from Texas has stated that last August the Congress eliminated the ceiling of 2,000,000 men. It must have had some good reason for doing so. If we eliminated the ceiling last August and said that there should be no ceiling, I might well ask this question, and the Senator might also. Why are we trying to establish a ceiling of 3,500,000 at the moment? I do not know. That was the thing I wanted cleared up.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague and friend from Indiana that I am a member of the committee. I voted for the committee bill. I am not a member of the New Deal. I voted for the bill as a Member of the Senate because I believed it was the right thing to do for the protection of the security of our people at the present time.

Specifically to answer the Senator's question, no one wants to send our boys to war. Certainly I do not.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is not answering my question, when he says that no one wants to send his sons to war. I do not want to send my sons to war. My question of those in charge of the bill is, "What is your reason for not wanting to establish a ceiling?" That is all I want answered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not want a lecture. I do not want the Senator to lecture me. The Senator does not need to lecture me. He does not need to tell me that we are at war, or are going to send someone to war. What is the legitimate reason for not wanting to establish a ceiling? That is the only question I want answered. I do not want any other answers. I know that the Senator from Massachusetts is a member of the committee, and a great member of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will give the Senator the answer.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do not give me a lecture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not going to give the Senator a lecture. I know that I am not capable of giving him a lecture. That is not the spirit in which I rose. I rose in the spirit of answering the Senator's question without getting into an argument. I shall try to give the Senator my reasons.

Last August the Congress repealed a law which placed a limit on the armed services. It did so because of the situation in Korea. The situation at that time was very bad from our point of view. We were falling back on Pusan. We did not know what the situation was going to call for. We did not know whether Russia was going to come in. We did not know whether we had troops enough to support our position in Japan. We did not know what world conditions were, so we eliminated the ceiling on the Armed Forces and went back to the situation in World War II. So far as I know, that measure was passed unanimously by the Congress.

This year our committee considered this bill to implement the armed services. In all the meetings—and I think I attended all but one or two—I never heard any question raised about the top limit, or about Congress placing another limit on the armed services after it had repealed the limit last August. In other words, if it were to establish a limit it would be reversing its position within 8 months. Conditions in the world have not changed to such an extent as to permit us to do so.

We did go into the question as to why the military wanted 3,200,000, or 3,462,000, which was a later figure. The first figure was 3,200,000. My understanding as to why 3,462,000 are wanted is that that number will give the Air Force a striking power on M-day, and will provide a sufficient number of ground forces and a sufficient number for the Navy to support that striking power and to follow it up. It will give us a sound base on which to rapidly expand if we are forced into world war III, which we pray will never happen.

That is the situation in which we found ourselves. That is why we adopted this bill. The bill will not, by itself, raise enough men, without volunteers and without reenlistments, to maintain a force of 3,462,000 unless we call back the veterans of World War II who have done their part and are now a part of the civilian community.

What is our position today? Why should we reverse our action of last August? What is the position in Japan today? What is the danger? Why are we sending two more National Guard divisions to Japan? What is our position in Europe today? Why are we sending four additional divisions to Europe? What is the position in Iran? What is the position in the Mediterranean? What is the position in Indonesia, Indochina, and the Far East? Certainly the situation is uncertain all over the world.

If another war comes, we are not going to have time to enlarge our armed services to meet the initial attacks. We are going to be hit hard and quick. What we must do is to be ready. We must trust someone. To a certain extent we must trust men like General Marshall, Mr. Finletter, Mr. Pace, Mr. Matthews, and others in the Pentagon, both civilians and military.

I do not have the tremendous distrust of those men others seem to have. We want to keep them from getting power. We want to guard ourselves respecting appropriations. We want to investigate their proposals for authorizations. We want to make them more efficient and use their manpower more ably. At the same time we have got to give them a little more discretion.

That I say to my distinguished friend and colleague from Indiana, I hope is not a lecture. That is an effort to give the Senator the reason on which I base my position.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, much as I respect the able Senator from Massachusetts—and I have great respect for him—I think he has missed the point entirely. The question is not whether we should have an Army of 3,000,000, 3,500,000, or 5,000,000. The question is not what the situation is in Japan or any place else. The question is one of principle.

I do not know whether or not three and a half million is the proper figure. I am perfectly willing to leave that up to the persons mentioned by the Senator. But there is a principle involved. Are we going to give the military a blank check to have any number of men they say they wish, or shall we limit them, let us say, to 4,000,000? Perhaps the amendment of the able Senator from Oregon should be increased to 5,000,000. Maybe it should be four and a half million. Maybe it should be 5,000,000. But there is a question of principle involved. Is the Congress going to relinquish the right to prescribe the number of men who will constitute the armed services? I do not think it should. I have not heard any argument by the able Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] or the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that convinces me that the Congress should give up its constitutional right to prescribe the number of men.

We might well be debating whether it should be 3,500,000; maybe it ought to be 5,000,000, and perhaps someone ought to offer an amendment—and maybe I shall do it—to substitute 5,000,000 for 3,500,000. But I am convinced—and no one has persuaded me to the contrary—that no emergency exists today, or will exist tomorrow, or next week, or any time in the next thousand years, which would justify the Congress of the United States in giving up its right under the Constitution to determine the number of men in the Armed Forces. I believe the Congress has the right to debate, and its members can well disagree as to how many men are needed, but Congress, after debating the subject, should arrive at some number, and that number should be written into the law.

Mr. President, I say to the Senate that Congress is making a grave mistake, as it has for many years, by giving to the administrative branch of the Government a blank check. Congress has written bills, since I have been a Member of the Senate for 6 years by which we have delegated the power and the responsibility of the Congress to the President of the United States. Then we wonder why we get the kind of government we have. We are fighting now against dictatorship, against one-man rule. Yet, with respect to almost every bill that comes before Congress, before we are though with it we end by giving to the President of the United States the power to do most anything he sees fit to do.

We give as the reason for doing that that we have got to fight dictators and fight one-man rule.

Let us stand on principle. Let us debate principle. If the number 3,500,000 is not sufficient, I am willing to vote to put the figure 4,000,000 in the bill. If Senators do not think 4,000,000 is a sufficient number, I am willing to vote to put the figure 4,500,000 in the bill. But let us stand on our constitutional right and let us name the number of men who will constitute the Armed Forces.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. May I first yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am thankful to the Senator for yielding to me. I shall be very brief. I want to get the RECORD corrected, because, on the basis of the impression left by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Massachusetts, I think an injustice has been done the junior Senator from Oregon on the record of the committee. I am perfectly willing to submit the transcript of the record of the executive sessions of the Armed Services Committee, and have assigned now to some member of the staff of the committee the task of taking out of that record the statements the junior Senator from Oregon made over and over again throughout the discussions as to the need of saving military manpower waste now indulged in by the military and putting some limitation upon them.

The Senator from Texas is correct. I thought we could make a saving of about 500,000 men on the basis of the military's own figure of three and one-half million by putting in a three-million ceiling. I said when I first made that announcement, that I thought it ought to be somewhere near three million or three million one hundred thousand. Then I had discussions with colleagues, and took into account the figures the military itself first proposed before the committee, of three million two hundred thousand, on which they presented their charts in the first instance. I gave consideration to proposing a ceiling based upon the first figure suggested by Mrs. Rosenberg in her testimony on January 10, 1951, namely 3,200,000 men. Then they came up to three milion five hundred thousand..

I have tried, I may say to the Senator from Indiana and my other colleagues in the Senate, to be fair and reasonable in the consideration of this whole manpower bill, and when I fixed the figure of three million five hundred thousand, after conference with colleagues today, I did it because we thought we ought to take the military at its own words and accept its final figure of three million five hundred thousand upon which it finally based its entire case for this bill.

Those are the figures of the military. The Senator from Indiana says he does not know whether the ceiling figure ought to be 4,000,000 or 5,000,000, or some other figure. I say on the basis of the military's presentation to date they have used the figure of 3,500,000. I say: Let us take them at their word and adopt a ceiling of 3,500,000 until they prove a need for more.

As I have said before, Congress will continue to remain in session. If the difficulties which the Senator from Massachusetts sets forth to us by way of conjecture today should arise, does he or any other Senator think the Secretary of Defense will have any difficulty in getting the ceiling raised if he shows the need for raising it? Does he think there will be any delay in raising the ceiling when the need for it is shown? The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] knows just as well as I do that this Congress or any Congress can be counted upon to respond quickly to an emergency. However let him not forget that it is basic constitutional doctrine under our system of government that an emergency does not repeal the Constitution of the United States or its system of checks and balances. Those checks should be applied to the military, too, in time of emergency.

Let us also take into account the fact that the military will not be able to absorb for some time in the future—possibly for the greater part of 2 years—the manpower of 3,500,000 Congress is authorizing. Congress is going to be in business during that period. I think the time to pass judgment on whether or not Congress ought to raise the figure above the present absorption ability of the military is when they are fully absorbing the number of men Congress now allows them under this bill.

The point is made in the debate by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that Stalin does not have a ceiling on his manpower. I want to say, Mr. President, that I am not going to vote to surrender the constitutional powers of the Congress because Russia is operated on the basis of a military dictatorship. We will have that kind of a program in this country if Congress starts throwing away its constitutional checks upon the military. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], in quoting from the Constitution this afternoon, I think made an unanswerable argument as to our obligation to check the military by imposing a ceiling in this bill.

Let us take the other argument of the Senators from Texas and Massachusetts, that last August this body waived all ceilings. I repeat, Mr. President, that we ought to learn from reflection and experience. Even last August it would have been better for the military to have come forward and proposed a figure within a number with which they were satisfied they could meet the then Korean crisis. Mr. President, they were then operating on the basis of 2,000,000, and they have not gone so far above 2,000,000 yet in their program since the Korean crisis arose.

The Senator from Indiana is completely right when he points out that there is a fundamental question of principle involved. So far as I am concerned, I shall not vote any more for an open-ended ceiling in this bill. It is very important that we do less talking in the Senate about our system of constitutional checks and balances and do more applying of those constitutional powers of ours to the various Government departments, including the Military Establishment. Here is a good place to start with my amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the able Senator from Oregon accept an amendment to his amendment to make the figure 3,750,000 or 4,000,000 men?

Mr. MORSE. There is no evidence that would justify such an amendment. As the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has pointed out, all the charts offered by the military were finally prepared on the basis of 3,500,000 men.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the Senator's best judgment, and the best judgment of those who testified, including the Secretary of Defense, was that they needed 3,500,000 men.

Mr. MORSE. That is the record they made. I say, adopt it now as a ceiling, and if they want a larger number, let them make a request starting tomorrow in hearings for a larger number. I am satisfied that every witness for the military would admit that 3,500,000 men will meet their needs as of now. If conditions change then let them come before us and show their needs. They need have no fear that we will not allow them what they can show by clear evidence are their true needs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to make a very brief remark. The Senator from Indiana argues that this is a question of principle. I agree with him wholeheartedly. The first responsibility of Congress is to see that the Nation is secure and that it remains at peace.

Congress has the responsibility of the purse. Congress has the responsibility to hold down the military. Certainly Congress has the ability of getting representatives of the military to appear and testify before it at any time.

On the other hand, the thought which appeals to me, and which was compelling in my own mind, was that today the United States is in a situation of real danger. If we try to say that X number—3,000,000 or 3,200,000 or 3,500,000 or 4,000,000 men—is the correct number of men, we may be right or we may be wrong; we may decide on a number in excess of the necessary number. We hope that will be the case rather than to decide on a number which is too small under the circumstances.

However, if we are to give the necessary responsibility to the leaders of our young men, we must allow them a certain amount of discretion, within the power which we have to compel them to come before us at any time. We should not be too specific as to the number of men; because if we are too specific we might cause ourselves great complications in connection with the international situation, inasmuch as at the present time we cannot foresee what may come to pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. Let me say that I am sorry if anything I may have said offended the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator must have misunderstood me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No doubt I did misunderstand the Senator.

Mr. President, several days ago I would have been shocked if the Senator from Oregon had made the statement he made a few minutes ago. However, since the Senator from Oregon has been changing his figures overnight to the extent of 200,000 or 300,000 or 400,000 men at a time, in his statements of what he believes the correct figure to be, I was not so much shocked as I might otherwise have been.

However, when the Senator from Oregon tells the Senate that they have not yet reached the 2,000,000 number.

Mr. MORSE. I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then what did the Senator from Oregon say?

Mr. MORSE. I shall ask to have the Official Reporter read what I said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has yielded for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is possible, I should like to have the Official Reporter read what the Senator from Oregon said in that connection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, in order that we may ascertain exactly what was said.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is any misunderstanding as to what I have said, I shall be glad to correct the RECORD, or I shall be glad to have the Official Reporter read what I said. On the other hand, if the Senator is willing to take my word for what I said—and, of course, the other Senators who are present can verify what I said—I think I can be entirely accurate about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well if the Senator from Oregon can recall.

Mr. MORSE. I said that, so far as taking off the ceiling is concerned, we then had a ceiling of 2,000,000, and at this time we have not gotten very far beyond it. That is what I said—not that we now have less than 2,000,000, but that we have not gotten very far beyond 2,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then the Senator from Texas misunderstood what was said.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to read into the RECORD what was said in the House of Representatives last July when the ceiling was lifted.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. CASE. The other day the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] said that the Senator from South Dakota was then a Member of the House of Representatives and had voted for the lifting of the ceiling. Therefore, I should like to present to the Senate the argument which was used in the House of Representatives on the basis of which the ceiling was lifted.

Mr. COLE of New York asked a question. At one time he was ranking Republican member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives; and he is now a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

I read now from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 25, 1950, at page 11086:

> Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of the RECORD to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the reason why the time limitation originally contained in the bill was stricken out.

Mr. VINSON, of Georgia, the present chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, then said:

> I may say to my colleague from New York that the Draft Act expires on July 9, 1951. At that time the entire subject will again be reviewed.
>
> Mr. COLE of New York. My purpose in raising the question was to indicate to the members of the committee that this is not a permanent lifting of the ceiling on the size of our Military Establishment.
>
> Actually, the whole problem will be reevaluated in July 1951, when the Draft Act expires.
>
> Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from New York is absolutely correct.

The only difference is that instead of waiting until July 1951 for the extension of the Draft Act, we are taking up that matter at this time.

The bill providing for suspension of the ceiling was passed in the House of Representatives, and I acceded to it at that time on the express statement of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives and the statement of one of the leading Republican members of the committee that the entire question would be reevaluated at the time when the Draft Act was taken up for renewal and the question was referred to.

Let me point out that at that time, in the course of the debate in the House of Representatives, Mr. COLE stated that the lifting of the ceiling which was made at that time was "not a permanent lifting of the ceiling on the size of our Military Establishment," but that "actually the whole problem will be reevaluated in July 1951 when the Draft Act expires."

In reply, Mr. VINSON said that was "absolutely correct."

Mr. President, we have now reached that point, in connection with the consideration of the extension of the Draft Act. It seems to me that if there is ever time when the Congress should make clear its intention to exercise the power it has over the purse and, in that connection, its power over the sword, this is the time. How can we avoid the possibility of the establishment of a military dictatorship at some future time if we lift permanently, or for years, the ceiling upon our military manpower, knowing that when we do that, we also lift the ceiling on the budget? After all, if we say "The sky is the limit" in regard to the number of men who may be inducted, the sky will also be the limit in regard to the appropriations which will have to be made.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall yield the floor in a moment. However, before doing so, I wish to say that I did not rise to argue the question as to whether the ceiling should be 3,500,000 men or more or less; but I rose to endeavor to understand the reasoning behind the decision of the committee not to provide a ceiling.

I believe that we should provide a ceiling. I do not think we should compromise on principle, and I think a principle is involved here. In times such as we are passing through today, when we are actually at war in Korea, I think we should be liberal in establishing the ceiling; and if we possibly can do so in good conscience, we should follow the recommendations of those who are at the head of our Military Establishment. In that connection we should be liberal and generous; we should lean over backwards in giving them the power to acquire all the men they think they need. However, I honestly and sincerely believe that we should accept our responsibility and our duty to establish a ceiling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment.

We have heard a great deal about the exercise of the power of the purse by the Congress. Every time any Member of Congress attempts to impose any limitation of any kind on any subject dealing with the military, the statement is made, "Congress must not interfere with the military. The power Congress has is the power of the purse."

However, Mr. President, in this instance Congress will lose the power of the purse unless it exercises that power, because as a practical matter once the program is made on a certain basis, the Appropriations Committee is so far committed that, for all practical purposes, it can no longer have the power of the purse.

So if we wish to impose a limitation and to establish a program, now is the time for us to do so.

Of course there was good reason to set aside the ceiling in respect to Korea, for the emergency there was a sudden one. No one then knew what it would amount to; no one had time to make plans on the basis of the new situation.

However, today we have had 6 months in which to do so, and the Army has been busy making plans. Now the Army has a plan calling for 3,462,000 men. I do not think that plan has been critically examined. However, so far as I am concerned, at least for the purposes of this limitation, I am perfectly willing to accept that as the program.

Mr. President, this amendment will not tie the hands of the military. The representatives of the military have come up very slowly, indeed, to the total of 3,462,000. They will have ample warning; by the time that they are within 100,000 men of that limit, they will know whether they wish to have any more. It will take them a month or so to get the next 100,000.

There can be no sudden emergency which cannot be met by having Congress meet and decide whether the limit should be a little higher.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has said that the question we face at this time is that of preserving the liberty of the people of the United States. Mr. President, I say to you that, by increasing the Military Establishment, we are threatening the liberty of the people of the United States. It is quite as important today to have the limit not too large, as it is to have it not too small. We must decide that question; and it is not a military question. It is a question of how far the people of the United States can go in time of peace and still successfully maintain a Military Establishment. I submit to the Senate that an armed force of 3,500,000 men goes to the very limit of that capacity. No one is perfectly certain of the total cost, but so far as I can judge, the cost of 3,500,000 men for ordinary maintenance, after they are completely equipped, and after we have built up all the different kinds of airplanes and equipment and heavy machinery and everything else that is necessary, will run at least to $35,000,000,000 a year.

So far as I can judge, the President's estimate for the next 12 months is $41,500,000,000 a year, and that certainly is before the program really begins to roll. The figures which have been submitted are fairly vague, but we had the figures submitted to the Appropriations Committee when the request was made, on December 15, for a total army of 2,766,000. That figure has been boosted 700,000 men in 30 days, without any increased emergency in the world; but, on December 15, 1950, the cost shown at that time was $41,000,000,000 for 2,766,000 men. I should estimate that the actual cost per man was about $7,000 or $8,000, plus about $2,000 more in what we might call current equipment—the small stuff which is necessary to go along with the men, to be renewed every year. Ten thousand dollars per man is the estimate made by the military themselves, as I remember, for the period of 2 or 3 years while we are building up the great equipment which is necessary, the ships and the airplanes and the heavy artillery. It is going to cost something like $5,000 a year per man in addition to that, or a total cost of $52,500,000,000 for the Armed Forces alone. At least $50,000,000,000 per annum, is, I think, a most conservative estimate.

Adding to that the sum of $5,000,000,000 for equipment for Europe makes $55,000,000,000; and if we add $30,000,000,000 or $25,000,000,000 more, in the President's budget, for all kinds of domestic expenditures, including a great many things which are related to the war—the Maritime Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other things—we get a total budget of more than $80,000,000,000 a year. I say when we have reached that point we threaten the liberty of the people of the United States and the solvency and economic strength of the United States are threatened.

At that point we must have approximately $80,000,000,000 in national taxes, plus about $20,000,000,000 for local and State taxes, or $100,000,000,000 out of a total gross production of $300,000,000,000. I maintain that that is certainly the very limit, the very last point at which we can hope to balance the budget and prevent inflation.

Of course, in time of all-out war we can do more. In the late World War, we took about $97,000,000,000 out of a total production of $205,000,000,000, representing 47 or 48 percent of national production. We did it by cutting out all civilian expenditures which could be cut out, all progress in the construction of school buildings, and public buildings, all progress of every kind; and we reduced the standard of living of the people. That is what we could do in all-out war.

But we do not face an all-out war today. We face a condition of semimobilization, which may continue for a period of 10 years. We do not know how long it will continue. I should hope that it could be limited to a much shorter period than 10 years, but during that time we would have the job of maintaining the solvency of the country and preventing the inflation which is inevitable in time of war.

The late World War brought about an increase of 70 percent in prices, depreciation of the dollar down to 55 cents, a permanent devaluation of everyone's savings and insurance policies, and a condition of increasing hardship. If such an inflation takes place in time of peace for a period of 10 years, this country is going to be very weak at the expiration of that time when we get through. We are not going to be able to maintain the very strength upon which today the freedom of the entire world depends. In other words, 6 percent of the entire population of the world cannot hope to carry the whole world on their shoulders and maintain a completely military economy.

We take military advice. The military could very properly say, "If you really want 100-percent protection we have got to have $100,000,000,000 for the Army alone. We can spend it. There are that many projects we can spend it on. We can put troops all over the world."

I think we must recognize the fact that there are definite limitations on the capacity of a people, and those limitations are shown when we get to a condition of inflation or of reduced production.

The size of the Armed Forces is at the heart of every problem we are going to face in this Congress. It is at the heart of our production problem. All of us receive complaints from the farmers whose boys are being taken away, that they are not going to be able to make good the agricultural program which they intended to follow last year. In industry we have a shortage of manpower to continue the production which is necessary, in order to manufacture the very equipment we are trying to provide for Europe.

There is a definite limitation on manpower, and there is a definite limitation, in time of peace, which we do not have in time of war. Consider the question of controls, alone. Consider wage control. In time of war management and labor were brought together. They agreed to a compulsory arbitration of disputes. They agreed in effect to hand over to a board the fixing of wages. Today, labor has walked out of the conference with the Government. I doubt very much whether it is possible today under present conditions, to get management and labor to agree to the Government's fixing of wages. Our price controls are running up against the greatest problem we have ever encountered—much more so than in time of war. In time of war, the fellow who is put out of business takes his medicine; he is simply a casualty of the war, as much so as his son, who perhaps has been killed in some foreign country. But in time of peace such a man does not take his medicine.

Today we see the result, in the fact that the controls are breaking down. In time of peace, it is possible to limit the freedom of the people only to a certain extent. It is impossible to go all out, as could be done in time of war. The result is that inflation is going to come sooner. It is going to come whenever we get to a point where we cannot balance the budget. When that time comes, we are going to have inflation, and, I think, even if we balance the budget, we are going to reach a point where the taxes alone will bring inflation.

Consider the situation today. The American people are paying $55,000,000,000 in Federal taxes, which is the largest sum this country has ever collected in time of peace, or in time of war. It is nearly $10,000,000,000 more than we collected at the very height of World War II. Yet if we are now going to adopt the program of having 3,500,000 men in the armed services we will have to add $25,000,000,000 in taxes to what we have today, if we are going to balance the budget. I do not know where we are going to get $25,000,000,000. From all the personal income taxes paid today, there is collected about $26,000,000,000 under the increased taxes we levied last year—$26,000,000,000. We are now told that we are going to have to increase it by $25,000,000,000. If it is all to be taken out of personal income, we shall have to double the personal income taxes in the United States. That means a good deal more to those in the lower brackets than in the higher brackets, because it is impossible to double it in the case of a man who already is paying 80 percent. With 3,500,000 men in the armed services we would face a problem which is almost impossible to meet.

I say it is fair for Congress to say to the military, "Here is the point at which you had better stop." Let us take another look around before we go any further. Let Congress determine whether the world situation is such that it is in fact war, or is it at the point of all-out war, requiring us to throw away all the local freedoms, all the protections of the sovereignty of the country, the soundness of our prosperity and our entire economic stability and economic foundation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator concede that the Congress, in effect, limits the size of the Armed Forces, when it classifies those who may be inducted through age limitation and through other devices? If the Senator will turn to page 6 of the report, he will notice that the entire manpower pool of those aged 19 through 25 is 7,957,156. If we deduct from that amount, World War II veterans who are excluded by law and who number 2,862,960, it would leave available 5,094,196 men.

Then if we subtract from the remainder, the IV–F's, aggregating 799,513 men, the balance remaining will be 4,294,682 from which to draw. If we go a step further and deduct from that number those who are deferred as students and for occupations, and who amount to 763,062, we have left 5,331,620 men from which to draw.

Now, if we go another step and take the class I–A men, numbering 1,631,249, and cut that number in half as being the actual number that are available, as shown by the report, or about 816,000 from that category and deduct that from the last figure of available men I have just mentioned, it would leave 2,716,621 men who are now eligible under the law and the rules and regulations now in force.

Mr. TAFT. There are several answers to the Senator. In the first place, General Marshall testified before the House committee last week that one reason why he wanted the 18-year-olds included was that he might want to increase the Army from 3½ million to 4 million, and he indicated that if he got the 18-year-olds included, he could go to the 4,000,000. Mrs. Rosenberg has testified the 500,000 18-year-olds, or those under 18 years 6 months, are not needed for 18 months, but obviously they could be taken.

Furthermore there is nothing to prevent the President from removing the deferment of men under 26 years of age with dependents, and there are 1,184,000 of them. There is no limit on the manpower pool. There is no limit on the number of men who could be taken into the Army today.

The President could raise an army of 5,000,000. He could reduce the physical requirements. He is counting on getting only 600,000 out of 980,000 18-year-olds, owing to the fact that probably 350,000 will not pass the examination. He can change the examination. There are about a dozen ways by which the President could build up an army of 5,000,000 men.

Mr. ELLENDER. He would have to go afar and change the rules and regulations which now prevail.

Mr. TAFT. He would have to change his own regulations; but he can do that. We do not limit him.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes, however, that in order to make the number of men appreciably greater than three and a half million, the Department of Defense would have to come back to Congress for further changes in the draft law.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not concede anything of the kind. The President does not have to defer men with dependents. The only ones he has to defer, as I see it, are the veterans of the last war, who are exempted by law. Otherwise he has complete power to change his regulations.

Mr. ELLENDER. He would violate almost every rule and regulation adopted by the executive department during World Wars I and II.

Mr. TAFT. No. We drafted men with children all through the world wars, and the committee in the bill has seen fit to exempt a million of them who were not in the last war, and who are not yet 26 years of age, merely because they have children. The President can take them all if he desires to do so.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the fact be as the Senator has suggested, that under law as it is drawn it is physically impossible to increase the Armed Forces above 3,500,000 men, what objection could there be to nominating it in the bond, and writing it into the law?

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator; there could be no valid objection.

Mr. President, I do not care to take the time of the Senate, but there is a question as to how far we can go in time of peace. I myself believe that a budget of $75,000,000,000 can be raised. There was a very good article in Fortune magazine 2 or 3 months ago by Mr. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, in which he figured out how it could be done. That is 25 percent of the national gross income of $300,000,000,000. We must add about $20,000,000,000 for local and State taxes, and the figure we get of the amount to be collected in taxes represents about 30 percent of the national income. I think that if we go beyond that, the hardship of the taxes will be so great that people will not stand for them, they will pass them on and they will be bound to be reflected in increased prices. Controls that are possible in time of war are utterly impossible in time of peace, and the country will be reduced to such a condition that we will not have the economic strength that is necessary to defend freedom.

We hear much today about the morale of Europe. What about the morale of the American people? Congress has an over-all duty of examining these questions, and when we come to the subject of raising 3,500,000 men, we run into many problems besides the military problem. We run into an over-all economic problem, we run into the problem of holding down Government expenses to such a point that there still can be some semblance of freedom in the country, upon the maintenance of which the people will insist. I do not care what the crisis is, we have to deal with this matter on a psychological basis, as well as on the basis of figures.

I talked recently, and I do not think in a confidential way, with General Bradley, and I certainly received the impression that the military people themselves accepted the thesis that there was a point at which the Nation reached its capacity in time of peace. I thought they had accepted that principle, and I thought it was understood that it was 3,462,000, until General Marshall stated the other day, perhaps inadvertently, that, after all, there might be a time when he would like to increase the number to 4,000,000.

Now we hear more and more about the possibility of four or four and a half million men. I think if we put the question to the military authorities they will say, "There is a limitation beyond which we should not go in time of peace." I believe every Senator agrees with that. The only question is whether we shall write into the bill what seems to me a key limitation. I believe the limitation of three and a half million men is the key to everything we have to face, and I believe that if we desire to maintain the liberty of the people and the strength of the country to protect its liberty from abroad, we should limit the total program within the capacity of the people of the United States. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Oregon represents very well the figure which we should set as the necessary limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have decided to support an amendment which will set a ceiling on our Armed Forces, but in view of the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Ohio, I wish to make it clear upon what basis I do so.

I believe it is important that we maintain our constitutional power and perform our constitutional duty to raise armies, which certainly implies that we should fix the number thereof. I supported the figure of 3,462,000 men for the Army, based, as I understood, on the testimony heard before the Committee on Armed Services.

I do not subscribe to the viewpoint of the Senator from Ohio that he is going to measure the willingness of the people of the United States to defend their lives and their liberties on the basis of a mathematical percentage of what can be sliced off their total income, at their convenience, for the purpose of defending their security, and assuring the survival of the Nation.

The Senator from Ohio has persisted all during this debate in referring to the present as a time of peace. As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate yesterday, if these were times of peace we would not be talking about this proposed legislation. The only argument that persuades me is that we have been given a definite requirement by our Joint Chiefs of Staff. They have said that in their opinion we now need approximately three and one-half million men.

I am impressed with the argument of the Senator from Ohio that if it develops that we have to increase the number of the Armed Forces, it will be a simple matter to provide for such an increase.

Of course, if world conditions change so that we must have more troops, and if that is a judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is based on reason and fact, I predict there will be no difficulty in raising that number despite the objections of the Senator from Ohio that three and one-half million men is as far as we can go. I say that because there is no price which the American people will not pay to assure the survival of the Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Oregon by substituting "4,000,000" in lieu of "3,400,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may the Senator from Missouri be recognized before the Senator from Oregon? I think it is only fair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I quite agree with the Senator from Connecticut when he says that this is not a time of peace, and that we are at war. It is a time of grim, bloody war. The scene of the war is in Korea. This state of war has never been recognized by the Congress. I trust the Senator from Connecticut will agree with me that in ordering our troops into war the President of the United States took to himself the power to declare war, which is a power vested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States. The Senator will recall that the first notice the Senate had that troops had been ordered into battle was when a press release from the White House was read to the Senate. The war in which we are now engaged is an unconstitutional war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Chair state the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the number be fixed at the maximum of 4,000,000, instead of 3,500,000. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I should first like to inquire whether the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is in order. It is an amendment in the second degree, and therefore is in order.

Mr. MORSE. I shall speak very briefly on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. I hope that upon further consideration the Senator from Indiana will see fit to withdraw his amendment. However, I wish first to make my argument, and then shall offer the suggestion that he withdraw his amendment.

In the first place, Mr. President, on the basis of the record before the committee, the figure of 4,000,000 certainly is a figure which has been drawn out of the blue. I know of nothing in the RECORD which would support our arbitrarily saying today that we should fix the figure at 4,000,000. The whole record is based upon the presentation made by the Military Establishment in which they used the figure of 3,500,000 men. I think Congress ought to exercise its authority under the Constitution to place a ceiling in this bill and I believe it is our clear duty to do so on the basis of the figures which General Marshall and his staff have presented to us.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to ask the Senator from Oregon if he does not think that placing the ceiling at 4,000,000, 5,000,000, or any other figure, so long as the figure is placed at some definite spot in the bill, would be conforming to the constitutional obligation of Congress?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt that by placing any figure in the bill we would be exercising our check. Of course doing so also involves the merits of the manpower policy we intend to impose. I certainly do not think that we ought arbitrarily to propose a figure in excess of what the military itself has thus far asked for. If we should do so, I am fearful that pressures would be exerted within the military to reach at the earliest possible date the ceiling which Congress itself had authorized. I say that because it happens to be the behavior pattern of the military. If we put the ceiling at 4,000,000 I am afraid the military will try to reach it just as quickly as they can irrespective of their actual needs. We have seen that already in connection with their taking more enlistments than they can handle with any reasonable degree of efficiency.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to yield in a moment. I also think that it would defeat one of the objectives which I hope to accomplish if my amendment is adopted, and that is to get the military to bring about some manpower savings themselves. I do not want to betray any confidence, but I am told that much good will result from discussions we have had already in this debate about the need for saving manpower in the Military Establishment. I am told that the merits of my criticisms of manpower wastes is recognized by some very high officers in the Pentagon. I understand that they are already at work on the problem of stopping some of their most flagrant wastes of manpower. It would seem to be more than likely that my amendment would intensify their efforts toward bringing about such savings, if we give them 3,500,000 as of now, with General Marshall knowing that he will get a higher figure at any time he can come before the committee and show need for a higher figure than 3,500,000. In addition, we would have not only kept faith with our constitutional obligations but I think we would have adopted a measure that would be very helpful in saving our taxpayers a great deal of waste, which otherwise would flow if we gave the military a ceiling beyond one which they have substantiated.

Mr. BREWSTER. From what has been presented thus far has there been any evidence presented to the effect that the military wants anything above 3,500,000? I mean evidence, as opposed to a casual reference by General Marshall that he may go as high as 4,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. Not that I know of.

Mr. BREWSTER. The only basis on which we have been asked to fix the limit is the figure of 3,500,000.

Mr. MORSE. That is all I know about it. I think we ought to fix it on the basis of 3,500,000 which is the military's own figure. Again I want to be perfectly frank, and I should like to suggest to my good friend from Indiana that he withdraw his amendment temporarily, at least, until we have had a quorum call. In the meantime some of us including the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and others, could sit down in the cloakroom, and see if there is any possibility of working out a reasonable compromise which would carry out the principle for which I have been fighting. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hayden | Maybank |
| Anderson | Hendrickson | Millikin |
| Bennett | Hennings | Monroney |
| Benton | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Brewster | Hill | Mundt |
| Bricker | Hoey | Murray |
| Bridges | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Md. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Byrd | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Cain | Jenner | Pastore |
| Capehart | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Case | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chapman | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Chavez | Kem | Smathers |
| Connally | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Dirksen | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Douglas | Langer | Sparkman |
| Duff | Lehman | Stennis |
| Dworshak | Lodge | Taft |
| Ecton | Long | Thye |
| Ellender | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Watkins |
| Flanders | McFarland | Welker |
| Frear | McKellar | Wherry |
| Fulbright | McMahon | Williams |
| George | Magnuson | Young |
| Gillette | Malone | |
| Green | Martin | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

## POLITICAL CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at this late hour I do not intend to detain the Senate very long, but there

Mr. CHAVEZ. Those matters are of concern, and I completely agree with the Senator from California that they should be called to the attention of the country. But what is wrong with the position of the State of Maryland? It has two Senators here, and I am proud of them. Possibly, had I been in a position to do so, I would not have voted for the junior Senator from Maryland, but that is Maryland's business, in my opinion, not the business of the Senator from New Mexico. The people of Maryland are the ones who should elect Senators from Maryland, not the Senator from New Mexico. The only point I am trying to make, and I make it in all sincerity, is that as I understood the remarks of the majority leader, they were to the effect that, while other things should and must be of concern—and they are of serious concern—to the American people, the particular concern of the Senate at this moment is the pending bill, which should be gotten out of the way one way or the other.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he does not agree with me that the Senate, in exercising its investigative power as applied to elections, should proceed according to settled and well-understood rules, and that it should not be merely capricious, picking out charges without the application of settled principles? What I have in mind is, picking out one situation that it decides to investigate and declining to investigate another matter presenting even a more flagrant violation of the laws of the land.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may answer the Senator from Missouri in this way: I have tried to practice law with all the dignity derived from instruction in a good law school—Georgetown. I have tried to act in accordance with the feelings of my fellow men. I have known judges to disagree upon questions of law. I have known one supreme court to make one decision on a particular subject, and another supreme court to make a contrary decision. I am not impugning the motives of any Member of this body merely because I do not happen to agree with the manner in which the proceeding is being conducted.

I want to be fair to the Senator from Maryland. So far as I am concerned, he is seated in the Senate; but, by the same token, I shall not impugn the motives or the procedure of a standing committee of this body which has been instructed to make an investigation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I failed to make myself clear, if the Senator thought I intended to impugn the motives of any committee of this body. I merely asked the Senator whether he did not believe that the committees of the Senate should proceed according to well-settled principles, principles which are known in advance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I favor the application of well-settled principles. I am confident the committee is carrying out the well-settled principles of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. The Senator spoke of being in favor of seating the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CHAVEZ. He is.

Mr. KEM. As I understand, there is no contest, there is no effort being made to unseat the Senator from Maryland. The only effort being made is to cast some aspersions on the way in which he reached this body.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel incensed about any reflection on the honesty and integrity of the Senator from Maryland, and I do not want any aspersions cast on him.

Mr. KEM. All the Members of this body may not have the fine feeling of charity which characterizes the Senator from New Mexico, and makes us love him so much. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks it is entirely in order for the Members on this side of the aisle to be lectured by the majority leader about our conduct in time of crisis, stating that we must march shoulder to shoulder, merely because there happens to be some criticism at this time of certain proceedings before one of the committees. Does such criticism indicate any unwillingness on the part of any Senator not to march shoulder to shoulder in time of national crisis?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Missouri has known me long enough to know that I am not one of those who march shoulder to shoulder if I think something should be debated or that I should vote in a particular way. The Senator from Missouri has been a Member of the Senate long enough to know that a Senator must not be too sensitive about the speeches made by some other Senator. If we were to become sensitive about what every Senator said in this body, we would not get any work done, and I hope the Senator from Missouri will not be sensitive at what the Senator from Arizona may have said.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I merely want to give my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maryland, some good advice. Ten years ago I was in somewhat the same situation he occupies today. My advice to him, knowing as I do the makeup of this body, is to go home and sleep comfortably every night without worrying at all about this so-called investigation. The Senator will find, when it is completed, that he will get an absolutely square deal at the hands of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Including the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, Senator, including the committee. The Senator from Maryland can be absolutely certain of one thing, that so long as the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a Member of the Senate, he will go right down to the very bottom of any testimony that is offered, and regardless of politics, will give the Senator a square deal. Further I can say the same about the many Senators who were here 10 years ago, and are still Members of the Senate.

I hope the Senator from Maryland will not worry and will not let his wife or children worry, because frankly I tell him he can rest assured that he will get an undeniably square deal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what the plans are for the remainder of the evening. Are we to stay here and vote?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think we should make some progress. We have not made much today.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the idea that Senators shall have dinner here?

Mr. McFARLAND. Let us wait awhile.

Mr. WHERRY. It is perfectly agreeable to me to cooperate with the majority leader, but it is now 7 o'clock, and if we are to remain here for a night session, something should be said about the plans so that we can get Senators on the floor if they are to vote on the amendment tonight.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to interrupt the discussion on the investigations, I should like to recur briefly to the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I refer to the revised amendment, which now proposes to fix a ceiling of 3,500,000 men on our total military strength with the world as it is today.

I believe I am as jealous of the rights and prerogatives of the Congress of the United States as are most of the Members of this body. I have an intense pride in the Senate, unique as this body is among all the parliamentary bodies of the world, and I have an unlimited faith in the parliamentary system. It is indeed the cornerstone of all our rights and liberties.

Mr. President, we are confronted today with world conditions which are in my judgment as dangerous to this Nation as those with which we have dealt in my time. We are confronted undoubtedly by much greater strength than was arrayed against us in the last two world wars in which we have been engaged.

There has been discussion here as to the constitutional duty of the Congress to impose a limitation upon the number of men who serve in the Armed Forces. The distinguished Senator from Ohio even went so far as to imply that we were violating our oath of office if we did not support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that while a democracy is undoubtedly the greatest form of government ever devised to extend the maximum of rights and benefits to the people who live under it, it does have certain defects when action is required. There has never been a time in the history of this

country when we have not recognized the propriety of momentarily laying aside technical rights inhering to the Congress of the United States in order to insure the perpetuation of our liberties. We have had to grant blanket powers in great emergencies, even as this bill proposes to extend for 3 years the suspension of congressionally imposed ceilings on the size of our Armed Forces.

If we are guilty of violating our oaths past Congresses have been guilty of that crime in every war in which this Nation has ever been engaged. We have never fought any war under a manpower ceiling. In my judgment we cannot meet today's dangers with rigid limitations on our strength.

The disturbance in Korea has been referred to as police action. In my judgment it is far greater than what I would call a police action. I should certainly not like to have the task of explaining to some boy who is laboring through the mud and mire and ice and snow of Korea at this moment that he is not engaged in a war. I think they are engaged in a war.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but I fear that I know the point the Senator is going to raise, and I regret that he is going to raise it now. At least I think I know.

Mr. THYE. Would the Senator then care to divulge what he thinks I am thinking?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I will not give the Senator ideas he does not have.

Mr. THYE. I am curious to know the Senator's ability.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not want to give the Senator any ideas he might not have. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. I would even take a chance on that. But I ask as to the Senator's ability, because he is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and I want to know how much confidence I can have in his ability.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never claimed supernatural ability, and have never thought I had, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, any such powers that any other Senator does not have.

Mr. THYE. I was serious when I asked the Senator whether he knew what I was thinking. I would say that if we are engaged in a war, we had better start acting as if we are at war. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has spoken words indicating that we are at war, and if we are, the Nation had better begin acting as if we are at war. The President had better not announce that he is going to spend 3 weeks in the beautiful sun of Key West. He had better stay here at his post. Congress is in session. We are dealing with the world's greatest problems, if we are at war. If we are at war, we had better start to use the weapons we would employ if we were fighting a war, rather than fighting at the expense of the blood of American youth in the mud of Korea. That is all I have to say. If the chairman anticipated what I was thinking, I hope he will proceed to ponder my thoughts, and I hope that we may commence to use the implements of war and fight the war as we should fight the war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I frankly confess that I never claimed any such superior powers as the Senator from Minnesota attributes to me, and that I was completely in error as to what I thought the Senator from Minnesota would say. I do not desire to be drawn into any discussion with reference to the duties of the President of the United States. What I am trying to do is to discharge my duty on the floor of the Senate as I see it, as every other Senator is trying to do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course we could get into a discussion of why we have not declared a war. It is a limited war, in the sense that it is limited in some ways which does not appeal to many people of our country. We have no declared war, it is true, but the point I was undertaking to make was that the boys in Korea think that they are engaged in something that is a war.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator from Minnesota that it is a war. However, after 6 months and after an all-out effort we are using in that war 250,000 men in Korea, with perhaps another 100,000 in the Navy and Air Force outside of Korea. Surely the fact that we have a war in which we are using 350,000 men does not justify our Armed Forces being increased to 3,500,000 men. So while it is a war, it is a small war, and I do not quite see its bearing on a limitation of our total Armed Forces to 3,500,000 men, or 10 times as many as we need. We could fight 10 wars in Korea with that number of men.

Mr. RUSSELL. If Korea were the only danger spot on the globe, the statement made by the Senator from Ohio might be compelling. However, as I see it, we are confronted with dangers in other areas of the world. I understood that even the distinguished Senator from Ohio thought it was well to defend Japan and to help keep forces in being in this Nation. I do not think the mere fact that only 400,000 men are engaged in Korea is any strong argument to limit our Armed Forces to 400,000 men, which is where we would arrive if we carried the Senator's argument to its final conclusion.

Mr. President, we can stand on our constitutional rights, if we wish to do so, and we can limit the size of our Armed Forces. Undoubtedly we have such power. We could have adopted the first amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, which would place a limit of 3,000,000 men. We could have adopted the second amendment which he offered, which would have set a limit of 3,200,000 men. We can adopt the amendment which is now pending, or the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana. The latter would set the ceiling at 4,000,000. I do not think it is wise to do so. I do not think it would be justified by the evidence adduced before the committee, which has been referred to here. It is true that the Armed Forces say that they did not intend to have in the ranks by July more than 3,325,000 men, and that thereafter they expected to raise the number to 3,462,000. Is it wise in these troubled times to fix a limit of 3,500,000 men, when the military states that they expect to have 3,400,000 men in the Armed Forces, and when they have frankly told the committee that in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff it would be necessary to have a larger number of men than would be allowed under that limit? I think we would be gambling with the destiny of this Nation if we took any such action as that in these times.

The main argument which has been raised in support of the Senator's amendment has been on the ground of economy. The Senator from Oregon did not originally raise the issue. He raised the argument that it would force the Armed Forces to more properly utilize the men who would be made available by the bill; that is, he would get greater efficiency from those who would be in the armed services. Now the question of economy has been injected. Of course, economy is something to which we should give consideration. Mr. President, there has never been any way of waging a cheap war.

In today's world we will not be able to buy the peace that we hope and pray for at any bargain counter. It will cost money. It will cost a great sum of money to rearm our Nation, but we do not have a bargain-counter nation.

We went through the folly of dismembering the greatest fighting machine which the world has ever seen. It was a wasteful and extravagant process. To get into a position again where we will be able to defend our Nation and where we will be able to help our allies carry their part of the burden will cost money. I do not know of any way that it can be avoided. As I see it, Mr. President, it is better to spend the money, and it is better to levy heavy taxes. The Senator from Georgia is one who is perfectly willing to fight for a substantial tax bill. I, for one, have always felt that we should have gone ahead and applied some of the taxes at this time. I am no expert in that field. However, it would seem to me to be a part of wisdom to collect such taxes as we could, rather than wait and lose some of the funds, or to come back and require people to save up money in order to pay heavy taxes levied on a retroactive basis. If we are to emerge from this war crisis today, threatened as we are with the limitless manpower of Russia, China, and the satellite countries, and if we expect to be able to emerge from present dangers without a war, we may as well make up our minds that it will cost money. If we are not willing to put any money into it in order to build up the defense of our Nation, we might as well surrender now, because we would be better off to have no armed force at all than to have an inadequate armed force, which would not be able to sustain itself. Certainly it would cost less in blood and suffering.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if I correctly state the case. In view of the limitation of 3,462,000, which is now disclosed by the Chiefs of Staff as the number which they expect to have in the Armed Forces within a very short period of time, and in view of the fact that the number of troops in the National Guard which are not yet federalized exceeds 38,000, on the happening of any contingency requiring a swift increase in the size of our Armed Forces the adoption of the pending amendment would preclude the President of the United States from federalizing the National Guards of the several States, which is a part of the next line of defense; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Florida is eminently correct. It would be impossible to call out National Guard divisions and their supporting troops without further action by Congress. Mr. President, I know that we are told that Congress is going to be here. We hope to be here. But we are living today in an atomic age. In my judgment, if war comes to this country it will come in the form of an atomic attack, and the city of Washington and this Capitol Building will be one of the first targets of an aggressor. Mr. President, if the atomic bomb were to be dropped on this Capitol first, wiping out a majority of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, how would we go about then with great rapidity in assembling the Congress to permit the calling up of more troops? Oh, in that time, of course, no one would talk about law, just as Senators do not talk about ceilings when there is any danger confronting them. We would go ahead and disregard the law. Perhaps there would be a provisional government set up. Perhaps two or three such provisional governments would function in different parts of the country. Men would be called, with curses and imprecations leveled against the folly of a Congress that had undertaken to place a ceiling, particularly one so low, upon the manpower available to defend our country.

I believe in economy, Mr. President. I desire to avoid inflation. I am willing to prove that statement by my votes upon bills which will raise the money necessary to carry on the defense program. But I am not willing to hazard the defense of our Nation to half measures. I am not willing to substitute the judgment of Senators as to the number of men we should have in our forces for that of those men who are skilled in the wars, who know the strength of our potential enemies, and who know the necessities of the military action to enable us to keep war away from these shores.

Mr. President, there has been a time within the past few months when this issue was raised here on the floor. Senators cannot say that the bill was hurried through the Senate when the manpower ceilings were suspended, because the RECORD shows that there was considerable discussion of that measure when it was before the Senate. A number of Senators participated in it. The distinguished Senator from Oregon was in the chamber. The Senator from Nebraska raised some questions about it—not as to the constitutional duty of the Congress to fix the manpower ceiling, not as to the duty of Congress to impose even more restrictive ceilings, but merely as to the time limit which was to be affixed to the suspension of the ceiling.

Last summer the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Divisions were being chewed up in the hills of Korea, our pride had received a great blow because the Koreans were able to destroy those two undermanned American divisions which had been sent in there, and there was a feeling of imminent danger on the part of the American people. We did not know what the next move by Russia or the satellite powers would be, and we lifted the manpower ceiling. The only question raised was as to how long we were going to lift it for. I believe that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska stated that the President should have the power——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska raised the point that we should not have an open-end ceiling in the manpower bill without some limitation. When former Senator Tydings presented the proposal, I asked him if he would not agree to removing the ceiling for only a year. He said no, because he felt it should run 4 years because of the enlistments. I stated that it seemed to me that there should be some limit fixed, so that there would not be an open-end ceiling. Finally Senator Tydings said, "What does the Senator from Nebraska want?" I said I would like to have a limit of 1 year or 2 years, but that if the Senator from Maryland would consent only to 4 years, I would rather have that than nothing. He said, "If that is what the Senator wants, all right." My position then was, and now is, that there should not be an open-end ceiling on manpower forever. The Congress should determine the policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator talked about open-end ceilings last summer, and he is talking about numbers of men today.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska did not raise any question then as to any constitutional duty to impose a limitation on the numbers. He merely asked that there be some expiration date for the suspension of any ceilings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The question was that of getting manpower for Korea. If a similar situation were to develop today, my position would be the same. If we got into actual war, as the Senator suggested, I would be the first one to vote to lift the 3,500,000 ceiling on the recommendations of the military, but I would still insist that a suspension of the ceiling should not run indefinitely or permanently, or for years and years to come. My record is clear on that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska is always resourceful. He was in favor of a limitation of time when the ceiling was suspended last summer.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Today the Senator asks for the imposition of a limit on the number of men to be called.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. At that time we were at war in Korea. I was not quarreling with the recommendations of the military, but I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that what the junior Senator from Nebraska was insisting upon was that we should not have indefinitely an open-end ceiling on the suspension. It was then that Senator Tydings agreed. He said, "The Senator has a point." He agreed with it, and he wrote in the year 1954.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the same amendment which the Senator from Nebraska proposed last summer is in the present bill. We extended the suspension of the ceiling for a period of 4 years. However, today the Senator wishes to impose his judgment as to the proper number of men. It is an entirely different proposition from what he talked about last summer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. At that time there was a war. It was said that we needed men. I stated that I agreed with the military. Today, I submit to the distinguished Senator, the situation so far as Europe is concerned—and that is what we are raising the Army for—is not on a war basis. We are providing an army in peacetime. I am perfectly willing to go along with the Senator. I respect his judgment. I would go along with him if the situations were parallel. But I think that in peacetime there should be a limit on the peacetime Army.

The Senator from Georgia is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He knows as well as I do that it is necessary to make appropriations fit the authorization of a peacetime army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I want the RECORD to show that because of the Korean situation I was perfectly willing to lift the ceiling. I would do it again if we got into war in Europe, just as the Senator from Georgia would vote to lift the ceiling. Certainly the Senator will agree with me that the Congress of the United States ought to determine the policy during peacetime, over a long period of years. That is why I am in favor of a ceiling today, and should be.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I should like to answer the statement of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not need an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator does not object, in my own time I shall under-

take to answer it. I have great respect for the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The feeling is mutual.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard that the Korean incident was over yet. The Senator stated that he voted to raise the manpower ceiling at that time because of the difficulty in Korea. The difficulties in Korea have multiplied twentyfold since the Senator made that statement, because the Red hordes of China have poured in and attacked our troops in Korea, thereby making the situation much graver since the time the Senator says he favored lifting any ceiling because of the situation in Korea.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the case, why is it that every witness who came before the committee, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, testified that the Army they wanted today was 3,500,000? I am agreeable to that, but I feel that in the situation we have now, that ought to be the ceiling. Unless we get into actual war, we should not suspend the ceiling now, any more than when the war broke out in Korea. That was a situation when we were at war; and when we are at war we must lift the ceiling.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was undertaking to point out to the Senator from Nebraska that the same language which he insisted on for a 4-year suspension of the ceiling, language which was passed last year, is carried over into the present bill. Exactly the same language which he proposed on the floor of the Senate is in this bill. The situation in Korea has undoubtedly worsened since that time; yet the Senator now says that whereas he was willing to suspend the ceiling in its entirety last summer, he now feels that there should be a rigid limitation upon the number of men in the armed services.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator will remember, if he wants to be fair——

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope I am being fair——

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska did not even suggest that the ceiling be lifted for 4 years. I suggested 1 year or 2 years, on the theory that there should not be an open-end ceiling, and that it was the duty of the Congress to determine the policy. The best I could get from Senator Tydings was 4 years, and I took that rather than nothing. At that time it was a question of suspending a ceiling that was too low to get the Army which the military recommended, so I was willing to suspend the ceiling temporarily.

Now we come to the evidence in peacetime, if you please. No one has come to us and suggested more troops because of the situation over there. The military accepts the figure of 3,500,000. They have not asked for a complete suspension. They have justified their request on the basis of 3,500,000. So far as approving the ceiling now is concerned, the Congress should determine the policy, on the basis of the justification furnished by the military.

There is nothing contradictory about the matter. They wanted to lift the ceiling under the then selective service, and the fact that the junior Senator from Nebraska had to accept 4 years instead of one was because that was the only limitation he was able to secure in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but the Senator previously was willing to suspend the ceiling completely, and I insist that we have less peace in Korea today than we did at the time, because China has come into the war in Korea since that action was taken. A ceiling is more dangerous today than it was last summer when the Senate removed it entirely for 4 years.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Senators from both sides of the aisle have continued to come to me and ask if we are going to vote this evening. I have talked to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. He is willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow. If we can enter into such an agreement, Senators will know that the vote will be taken tomorrow.

Therefore, I propound the unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate vote on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], or any amendments thereto, or any modification thereof——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, before the Senator presents his request, will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to amend the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to increase the number from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 men. However, I want to serve notice that if the amendment providing for 3,500,000 men fails of adoption, I shall submit an amendment to place the limit at the figure of 4,000,000 men.

I withdraw my amendment simply to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on the proposal for a 3,500,000 men limitation. I feel that the Senate ought to vote on that question. But I wish to say that if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon fails of adoption I shall submit an amendment to restrict the number to 4,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, between the hours of 12 o'clock noon and 1:30 p. m., debate on the pending amendment proposed today by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], shall be equally divided and controlled respectively by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; that at the hour of 1:30 p. m. the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the amendment, provided that no amendment or amendments have been proposed thereto in the meantime; that in the event an amendment or amendments have been proposed thereto, debate on any such amendment or amendments shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], provided that no amendment shall be received that is not germane to the subject matter of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, may I ask the distinguished majority leader whether my understanding is correct that the unanimous-consent agreement just now proposed applies only to the pending amendment of the Senator from Oregon, or any amendment thereto?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. And to no other amendments or the bill itself?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, I want to ask the majority leader a question. Am I correct in my understanding that under the unanimous-consent agreement, if an amendment to my amendment is offered, then the time is extended for 20 minutes beyond 1:30, with 10 minutes given to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent request as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

*Ordered,* That on the calendar day of Wednesday, March 7, 1951, between the hours of 12 o'clock noon and 1:30 p. m., debate on the pending amendment (lettered "C") proposed by Mr. MORSE on today (March 6) to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, shall be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. MORSE and Mr. RUSSELL; that at the hour of 1:30 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the said amendment: *Provided,* That no amendment or amendments have been proposed thereto in the meantime; that in the event an amendment or amendments have been proposed thereto, debate on any such amendment or amendments shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment and Mr. RUSSELL: *Provided,* That no amendment shall be received that is not germane to the subject matter of the said amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. I do so in all seriousness, in an endeavor to help, to be cooperative. Is it the intention of the majority leader to have a night session tomorrow night, in view of the lateness of the session tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is our intention. The pending legislation is extremely important. I shall be guided by the situation tomorrow. If action is completed on the bill at a sufficiently early hour tomorrow, we shall not have

a night session. I am sorry we have been delayed today. I thought we could have remained in session until 8 o'clock and made more progress. But that is part of the working of democracy, as it operates in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, and with the expectation that I shall be able to secure at least 5 minutes of time tomorrow to conclude my remarks, I shall have no objection now to yielding to the Senator from Arizona for the purpose of moving a recess.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive businesss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar are in order.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel Holcombe Thomas to be United States district judge for the southern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say that the office of United States district judge for the southern district of Alabama, to which office Daniel Holcombe Thomas has been nominated and confirmed, has been vacant since approximately the first day of November. I ask unanimous consent that the President may be notified forthwith of this confirmation in order that there may not be further delay in the carrying out of the duties of this office. There is great need that the judge may be in his office performing its duties as soon as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to cooperate with my distinguished colleague. Because of the condition of the docket the Senator desires the President to be notified forthwith, does he not?

Mr. HILL. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I hesitate to make exceptions, but in this case, on the word of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, I agree to the immediate notification of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hon. Charles J. McNamee to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul D. Shriver to be United States judge for the district court of Guam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of United States attorneys will be confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of United States marshals will be confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George G. Jeck to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. If we do not immediately notify the President of the confirmation of the nominations, how long a time will elapse before the President can be notified under the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time would extend for the next 2 days of actual executive session of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Daniel Holcombe Thomas to be United States district judge for the southern district of Alabama.

Hon. Charles J. McNamee, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio.

UNITED STATES JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

Paul D. Shriver to be United States judge for the District Court of Guam.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John P. Cowart to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia.

J. Ellis Mundy to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia.

J. Saxton Daniel to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia.

James G. Mackey to be United States attorney for Guam.

Joseph E. Brown to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Edward B. Doyle to the United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia.

Joseph Henry Young to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

James R. Wright to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George G. Jeck to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Iowa.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Mar. 8, 1951
For actions of Mar. 7, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 41


CONTENTS


Adjournment.....6,15
C.C.C.....23
Conservation.....26
Contracts.....3
Cotton.....11
Dairy industry.....12
Electrification.....29
Expenditures.....5,27
Inflation.....4
Labor, farm.....9,24
Lands.....14
Law, administrative.....21
Legislative program...6,15
Machinery, farm.....24
Military training.....7
Nomination.....10
Organization, executive.2,13
Peanuts.....1
Personnel.....10,17,22,28
Prices, control.....11
Prices, farm.....8,24,25
Purchasing.....3
R.F.C.....13,18
Roads.....19
Soil conservation.....16
Taxation.....14,17,22
Transportation.....29
Water utilization.....20
Wheat.....24


HIGHLIGHTS: House passed peanut-quotas bill. House Rules Committee cleared emergency reorganization bill. Both Houses received conference report on contract-renegotiation bill. Senate confirmed Ramspeck nomination. Sen. Ellender inserted and discussed report on farm prices in relation to food prices. Senate debated military-training bill, agreeing to amendment fixing 4,000,000 ceiling on armed forces on active duty.

## HOUSE

1. PEANUTS. Passed, 160-126, without amendment H. R. 2615, to provide for increased acreage allotments and marketing quotas for certain types of peanuts (pp. 2149-75). Rejected, 174-212, a Heselton motion to recommit the bill (p. 2175). During the debate Rep. Beckworth, Tex., criticized controls on small farmers and inserted various letters from this Department on the bill (pp. 2167-70).

2. REORGANIZATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for debate on H. R. 1545, the emergency reorganization bill (p. 2184). The Majority Leader announced that this bill will be debated today, Mar. 8 (p. 2151).

3. CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION. Both Houses received the conference report on H. R. 1724, the contract-renegotiation bill (pp. 2177-80, 2121). (H. Rept. 213.)

4. INFLATION. Rep. Sikes, Fla., said the administration should take a stronger stand against inflation (p. 2148).

5. EXPENDITURES. Rep. Mason, Ill., spoke in favor of reducing Government expenditures (p. 2149).

6. EASTER RECESS. Majority Leader McCormack announced that "the leadership of the House have agreed on a recess for the House from March 22 to April 2" (p. 2151).

## SENATE

7. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military-training selective-service bill (pp. 2105-29, 2131-8, 2145-7). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Morse, as amended by an amendment by Sen. Robertson, to place a ceiling of 4 million on active-duty personnel of the armed forces, by a vote of 49-41

(pp. 2106-19). Rejected an amendment by Sen. McMahon to fix the ceiling at 5 million (pp. 2113-7). Reached an agreement to limit debate on remaining important amendments and to vote of the bill Thurs., Mar. 8 (pp. 2136-8).

8. FARM PRICES. Sen. Ellender inserted and discussed reports of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee on prices of agricultural commodities received by farmers in relation to retail food prices, and on trends in farm income (pp. 2129-31).

9. FARM LABOR. Sen. Ellender announced that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee is to hold hearings beginning Mar. 13 on bills to import foreign agricultural labor (p. 2129).

10. NOMINATION. Confirmed unanimously the nomination of Robert Ramspeck to be Civil Service Commissioner (pp. 2145, 2147). Several Senators commended Mr. Ramspeck (p. 2145).

11. COTTON PRICES. Received a Dallas (Tex.) Cotton Exchange and Dallas Cotton Shippers Assn. resolution relating to the placing of ceiling prices on raw cotton (p. 2139).

12. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Wiley inserted a Wisconsin Dairy Federation statement favoring the allocation of sufficient materials to insure a full supply of milk and dairy products (p. 2140).

13. RFC REORGANIZATION. The Banking and Currency Committee discussed Reorganization Plan 1, regarding RFC, and decided "to take no action on the plan as a committee" (p. D162).

14. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES. Received a S. Dak. Legislature resolution favoring payments to States and local governments of amounts equivalent to taxes when lands are removed from the tax base by Federal agencies (p. 2138).

15. EASTER RECESS. Majority Leader McFarland announced that the Senate is to take a brief Easter recess upon completion of action on the following measures: Call of the calendar for unobjected-to bills; S. 728, to amend the Subversive Control Act; S. J. Res. 39, to continue rent controls until June 30, 1951; S. Res. 8, on sending troops to Europe; and S. 1, the military training bill (pp. 2120-1).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

16. SOIL CONSERVATION. H. R. 3091, by Rep. Granger, Utah, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2184).

17. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3122, by Rep. Perkins, Ky., to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide minimum annuity payments of $100 a month to certain officers and employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 2185).

S. 1068, by Sen. Smith (N.J.) (for himself and Sen. Hendrickson), to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where his is domiciled; to Finance Committee (p. 2141).

18. R.F.C. H. R. 3101, by Rep. Buffett, Nebr., H. R. 3107, by Rep. Kean, N. J., and H. R. 3116, by Rep. Norblad, Oreg., for the liquidation of the assets and winding up of the affairs of RFC; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 2184).

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 7 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

SEC. . (a) Section 12 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the last thirteen lines in the table contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Over $22,000 but not over $25,000 -- $7,720 plus 56% of excess over $22,000.
"Over $25,000 ---------- 100% of excess over $25,000."

(b) Section 12 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence therein.

3-7-51——C

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 7 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 7 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 83, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 19 on page 84.

On page 84, line 20, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d) (1)".

On page 86, line 10, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 86, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".

On page 86, line 18, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

On page 87, strike out lines 14 through 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction; if—

"(A) he is enrolled as a freshman;

"(B) he is enrolled as a sophomore and ranked in the upper half of his freshman class;

"(C) he is enrolled as a junior and ranked in the upper two-thirds of his sophomore class;

"(D) he is enrolled as a senior and ranked in the upper three-fourths of his junior class; or

"(E) he is pursuing, or has been accepted by an established graduate school to pursue, a course of study leading to a graduate degree and ranked in the upper half of his senior class.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'full-time course of instruction' shall mean a course of instruction which requires the enrollment of a student for a period equivalent to at least forty-five weeks out of each calendar year. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the President finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 7 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 116

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 7 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, viz: At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

SEC. . (a) Subsection (a) of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year (in addition to other taxes imposed by this chapter) upon the net income of every corporation accumulating earnings or profits instead of dividing or distributing such earnings or profits, a surtax of 100

per centum of the amount of the undistributed section 102 net income."

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of such section are hereby repealed.

Calendar No. 116

82d CONGRESS
1st SESSION

S. 1

# AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 7 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Please route
TION OF LEGISLATIVE
Office of Budget and
FILE COPY

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1951 No. 41

# Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who hast ordained that in trial we shall find our triumph and who art our hope and strength: We turn from the dust and drudgery of draining toil to the crystal waters of Thy restoring grace. Out of the night that covers us we come groping up altar stairs to the light that never fails. For our day, with all its sinister renewal of injustice, misery, and ruthless regimentation that robs men of their freedom, make us children of the light, harbingers of the day. Thou seest us plunged into the most fateful struggle of human history: To those called to steer the ship of state in mountainous seas, give Thy wisdom and strength of mind and heart to be steadfast for the things that belong to our peace and our salvation.

With the rapture of high resolve, being done with lesser things, gird us with might to clear across the ravaged earth a highway for the feet of our God whose kingdom has no frontiers. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 6, 1951, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 44. An act for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri;

S. 45. An act for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche; and

S. 46. An act for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward;

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe;

H. R. 609. An act for the relief of Carroll L. Vickers;

H. R. 626. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 725. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.;

H. R. 737. An act for the relief of Judith Leone Banks;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Camillo James Albano;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of Bror Rainer Heikel;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge;

H. R. 883. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Hampton;

H. R. 901. An act to provide for the admission of Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1120. An act for the relief of William Yinson Lee;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of Saint Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic;

H. R. 1150. An act for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of Pietro Giannettino;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton;

H. R. 1268. An act for the relief of Dr. Jiri Liska;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden;

H. R. 1438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin;

H. R. 1590. An act for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Chester A. Macomber;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Maria Roza Tarnowska;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 2580. An act for the relief of Alton Bramer;

H. R. 2622. An act for the relief of John J. Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M. Orr Co., and Alex Maier;

H. R. 2713. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh;

H. R. 2714. An act for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte;

H. R. 2726. An act for the relief of Daniel Lindsey Payne; and

H. R. 2791. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the time between now and 1:30 is equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to address an inquiry to my good friend from Georgia as to whether he would join with me in suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time consumed in calling the roll be charged equally to me and the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to agree to the suggestion of

the Senator from Oregon. However, I have had a number of requests from Senators who wish to speak on the pending amendment between now and 1:30. Therefore, I have no objection to inaugurating a quorum call, provided it can be rescinded later. Would the Senator object to rescinding the quorum call later?

Mr. MORSE. It would be perfectly agreeable to me. Does the Senator wish to proceed with the debate at this time? I believe he was in the process of making some remarks when the Senate recessed last evening.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to proceed, because I do not know how much time will be available for members of the committee who wish to express themselves on the pending question. I think the Senator's suggestion is a good one, and I shall be glad to join with him, provided he will not object later to rescinding the call.

Mr. MORSE. Very well. I sugguest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings thereunder be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will take 10 minutes at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to review very quickly the thesis of my argument in support of my amendment to place a limitation or ceiling on the number of men in the armed services at the present time, subject to the understanding that the Defense Establishment is free at any time to come before the Armed Services Committees of the Congress and show that there is need for raising the ceiling. Primarily the basis of my argument is that it is the clear constitutional obligation of the Congress of the United States, under sections of the Constitution which impose upon it the obligation to raise an Army, to impose such a check. It is very important that we safeguard the American people now from the danger of giving to the military a broad discretion to raise in accordance with their discretion and without first clearing the top number with the Congress of the United States, as many men as they deem necessary under the manpower bill which we are presently considering and undoubtedly will pass.

Mr. President, I believe that in the years to come the debate we are having on this issue will be recognized as a historic debate, because we are about to determine whether or not we are going to demonstrate to the world the way in which democracy works, even in an emergency.

It has been said in the course of this debate that Stalin has no ceilings on his manpower; but I assume that that argument must rest upon the implication that we ought to meet fire with fire. I say that there is a better way to meet the fire of communism at the present time, and that is to demonstrate to the world that the operation of constitutional processes in the United States is such that even in an emergency we apply checks and balances under our system of government.

It was argued in a colloquy between the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] last night that if my amendment were adopted, then in time of emergency the hands of the President would be tied so far as calling the National Guard into service is concerned. That is simply not so. I have checked into that question. I invite the attention of the Senate to United States Code, title 32, section 81 (a). Let me say that I checked this morning with the National Guard officials, and they also take the position that the statement made by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Georgia last night does not conform to the way the law would operate so far as the power of the President of the United States is concerned. The section reads as follows:

> Whenever the United States is invaded or in danger of invasion from any foreign nation, or of rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States, or the President is unable, with the regular forces at his command, to execute the laws of the Union, it shall be lawful for the President to call for such number of the militia of the State or of the States or Territories or of the District of Columbia as he may deem necessary to repel such invasion, suppress such rebellion, or to enable him to execute such laws—

I am advised this morning by high legal authority that there is no question, should an emergency develop of the nature envisioned or conjectured last night by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Georgia, that the President would have the authority immediately to act to meet the emergency.

He has another recourse if the emergency postulated by my good friends should come to pass, and that is his power under martial law. However, I assume that the gentlemen in the Pentagon Building are not going to be asleep as world conditions change. As they come near to the point of 3,500,000, if they can make a case for a greater number of men, they will appear at the Capitol and show us the necessity of raising the ceiling to meet new conditions. That is the system of checks and balances in operation.

In this argument I do not intend to let the opposition get away from the fact that what they are actually proposing is that we give blanket authority to the Pentagon to make use of the manpower law which we are passing to raise as many men as their discretion tells them they ought to raise, without obtaining approval from the Congress.

It has been said in the course of this debate that we do not know what may happen in case of the outbreak of war, it might be an atomic war. My good friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] says that the Capitol may be blown up and the Senate and House of Representatives may disappear, and that, therefore, we ought not to establish a ceiling in the bill. I think that is a fantastic argument, quite unrealistic. We know that under such conditions, in that kind of emergency, the country necessarily would be blanketed with what amounted to martial law. We would proceed under the doctrine of self-preservation to use our forces and to call out what forces were needed under a martial law situation. I say that a restriction or ceiling in the bill would have no effect, and no relationship whatsover to that kind of emergency. I believe that what the Senator from Georgia did when he used that argument was to try to substitute fantasy for realism in this debate.

I wish to reply again to the argument about the check which we have on appropriations. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who said on the floor of the Senate yesterday that he intends to support my amendment, made very clear the point that the appropriation check is not an effective check at all, because it is a check applied after the fact. As the Senator from Georgia implied in his argument, we might just as well face the fact that if we give this blanket authority to the Pentagon, and they raise the Armed Forces above 3,500,000 and then come and tell us that that has been done, there will not be a member of the Appropriations Committee who will not then vote them the funds to carry out the commitments which they have made.

As my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] so well pointed out yesterday in support of the argument of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], what is being proposed when we suggest that the Appropriations Committee be used as a check is that the Appropriations Committee pass upon questions of military policy rather than upon pure questions of financing obligations incurred or about to be incurred, or proposed to be incurred by the Government in pursuance of policy previously established by the Congress.

Frequently on the floor of the Senate we protest and object, under the rules of the Senate, if the Appropriations Committee brings in a legislative proposal in a bill reported by it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I will take one more minute.

I say, Mr. President, that the appropriation check is not an effective check. The check that will be effective is to say to the Military Establishment: "Come to Congress whenever you can show the need for more men; we will give you a quick hearing, and we will give you the men that you can show, on the facts, you need."

There is one other point I want to answer at this time in the debate, Mr. President, and if I should run over the remaining minute, I will take the addi-

tional time needed. Emphasis has been placed on the fact that last August, in the Korean emergency, we removed the ceiling. I want to say two things about that. In my opinion, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] made very adequate response to that suggestion when he pointed out the representations which were made, at least on the House side, at the time the ceiling was removed, when it was definitely stated that the action then taken was not to be considered a precedent, and when it was pointed out that the whole Selective Service Act would have to be reviewed by the Congress again before July 1, 1951, and that obviously the number of men then authorized for the Armed Forces was too small, that a 2,000,000 ceiling was too low to meet the then emergency. The military was not in a position to tell us how many men they needed immediately. So what Congress then did by way of lifting the ceiling was a temporary measure, for the time being only. It established no precedent, and was sufficiently explained, at least on the House side, by statements which made clear the intent.

Furthermore, let me say that on the Senate side the bill came up on the call of the calendar. The RECORD shows, I judge from reading it, that probably not more than 10 or 15 minutes were devoted to the matter. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] did succeed in having a 4-year limitation placed in the bill, and I think it was clearly implied by that limitation that we recognized the importance of a congressional check.

I close at this point, Mr. President, by saying that the Senate today should demonstrate to the world the doctrine of the United States Supreme Court that no emergency justifies setting aside the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; that one of the strengths of our Government is that even in an emergency we operate under the Constitution of the United States. I say we are not in any way injuring the Military Establishment when we say to them: "We give you now, on the basis of your own figures on which you made your case for this manpower bill, authorization for raising 3,500,000 men, and we notify you that we stand ready and willing to commence hearings immediately whenever in your judgment you think that ceiling should be raised."

I think it is our duty to impose that check, and I certainly hope the Senate will adopt my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon occupied 13 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington seems to have left the floor. So I yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] as much time as he may desire to use.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with the greatest of sincerity and with a fearful concern for the safety of the Republic that I rise to oppose this amendment.

No man thinks more highly of the statesmanship, the sense of responsibility, and the patriotism of the Senators who would vote for this amendment than I do. But this is no time for delay by adoption of the amendment. I feel that it is my duty to oppose the stand taken by the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators, and to point out the dangers inherent in their position. Only the steady, grinding trend of time can prove who is right. Unfortunately, history shows us that the optimistic view, commendable as it may be, is usually a foolhardy view—usually a view which leads to tragedy and disappointment. I would suggest, if there is question of that statement, that the Members of the Senate review the optimistic estimate made by some Members of this body in the days of 1939 and 1940, and as late as August 1941.

The Senators gathered here today have in their hands the awful responsibility of deciding what course will best preserve the life of the Nation. That is the issue. The issue is not whether or not we wish to take punitive action against the military; whether or not we wish to indulge in recriminations about the past; whether or not we wish to indulge the luxury of partisan politics while the wildfire of communism sweeps around the world and licks dangerously at America's doorstep. It is understandable that with such a grave responsibility we are plagued by anxiety, we become snappish, our tempers become short, and sometimes we lose sight of our true objective and think more of winning the debate than of winning the battle for survival.

Mr. President, I plead that we here today put aside recriminations and undertake to determine how, with the great wealth of wisdom present in this Chamber, we can set about saving this Nation of ours. That is our responsibility to our God and to our country, and the responsibility we hold to the men and women who sacrificed in the past that we may sit here today and debate. That is our responsibility to the millions of unborn Americans who deserve the privilege of living in liberty under God rather than in slavery under the hammer and sickle.

Mr. President, it is but natural that we often indulge in the illusions of hope, as we will observe if we read the remarks of Senators made in this Chamber in 1939, when they said we had nothing to fear from Hitler, and that Japan was not a dangerous threat. It is so easy to shut our eyes against an unsightly truth. It is so easy to drift along hopefully waiting for the best to happen. But this is not the course of wise men to whom the Nation looks for leadership. As for me, I am willing to know the truth, to face it, and to act upon it as may be necessary for the survival of our way of life.

Bearing in mind this frightful responsibility, let us now consider the Morse amendment, which would place a ceiling upon the armed might of America.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States last July, following the brutal attack by Communists in Korea, approved a proposal which suspended until 1954 restrictions on the personnel strength of the Armed Forces. While American soldiers were straggling back, back, back, through the bloody rice paddies of Korea toward the beachhead at Pusan, the Congress in its wisdom said what it has said on every other occasion in its history when confronted with an emergency: "We will suspend the statutory ceiling. We will expand our forces to whatever strength is necessary to defend our freedom, our lives, and our honor."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Texas has made the statement that we have suspended the ceilings on the armed services in all other cases of emergency. Was such suspension put into effect by the Congress after war was declared, or was it done in the period leading up to open war, or during periods of emergency? Can the Senator enlighten us on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have before me the debate on the suspension bill, and as it was being debated in the Chamber and no time limitation was proposed to be placed by it. We were already involved in the Korean affair. The chairman of the committee presenting that bill had the following to say:

> We are advised by the military leaders that it would be better, as is customary in every national emergency, not to fix the limit. Each time we have gotten out from an emergency we have fixed a limit on the Army and Navy and Air Force, and so forth, but we have never done so until the emergency has passed.

I should add here that there were in this Chamber Members who felt that Congress should suspend the ceiling on the number of men, but that the sky should not be the limit insofar as time was concerned, and that we should take another look at the matter at a later date. At that time one of the present Members of this body suggested that he wanted the Army to have the men it needed and the Navy and the Air Force to have whatever men they needed, but he wanted to set a time limit when the Congress again would have to review the size of the Armed Forces. He said, "It matters not whether it is 4 years, 3 years, 2 years, or 1 year; let us write in a time limit."

On the basis of that suggestion, the chairman of the committee agreed to write in a time limit, thus saying that the 2,000,000 ceiling on the Armed Forces which we were suspending would be suspended only until June 30, 1954.

When representatives of the Department of Defense came with their bill to our committee, as the able Senator remembers, it provided that the suspension be continued until 1961, because they felt that we were going to be faced with a long pull and that we should have the machinery which would permit us to meet the situation which confronted us. However, after the committee deliberated over the matter, bearing in mind the amendment which was offered on the floor, requiring a review of the size of the Armed Forces prior to June 30, 1954, the committee decided that Congress had acted wisely last year, and that we should

not give the Department of Defense until 1961, but, on the other hand, that we should follow the wishes of the Senate in inserting the date June 30, 1954.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not wish to take his time, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Assuming that in the period intervening between now and the 1954 date, the Congress for very definite reasons believes that the size of the Armed Forces should be reduced, I understand, as I think all of us do, that that can be controlled, at least to a partial degree, or perhaps completely, through the appropriations. How else would the Senator propose that it be done?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would say to the Senator from New Hampshire that one of the bitter disappointments of all this debate is that apparently the Senator who offered this amendment and the Senators who support it either are unaware or overlook the prudent course taken by the committee.

First, last July this body, without a vote against it, passed a bill suspending the ceiling until 1954. We had reason to believe that the Members who voted for that bill meant what they said. However, in the second place, we were not satisfied merely to leave the sky the limit until 1954; and therefore, we provided—and this is directly in answer to the Senator's question—that at any time a majority of the Members of the House and a majority of the Members of the Senate by concurrent resolution could reduce or eliminate the term of service for any age group or groups, thereby leaving in the hands and in the power of Congress the control of the term of service of every man in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force who would be inducted under the act. We thought that was a second check on any possible extravagance which might be demonstrated, so that when any Member of the Senate felt that the term of service should be reduced—for instance, if he wished to have the term of service cut in half—he could submit a concurrent resolution so providing; and if he could obtain for the concurrent resolution a majority vote of this body and a majority vote of the other body of Congress, the concurrent resolution would be agreed to—of course, without requiring the signature of the President—and that would take care of the situation.

Also, we retained the other check, the one we have in any emergency, namely, the check by means of our control of the purse. Realizing that the military cannot induct hundreds of thousands of men without having provision made to pay, feed, and clothe them, we felt that by means of providing for those three checks the Congress had exercised its constitutional responsibility.

I may say to the Senator that 13 reasonably prudent men, members of the committee, spent weeks on the pending legislation. At no time did any one of those 13 or any other Member of this body ever recommend to the committee that the Senate undo the action it took last July. At no time in the subcommittee or in the full committee was any such recommendation made; nor was it made at any time in the Senate until we had debated this bill for several days.

Then what occurred? The Senator from Oregon said he was going to introduce a punitive amendment; in effect, he would make the military come down from 3,462,000 to 3,000,000. Then, when that proposal did not attract a great deal of attention, the Senator suggested that the number might be 3,100,000. When I went to lunch yesterday, the figure then suggested was 3,200,000; and when I returned to the Chamber, I noticed that another suggestion had been made, namely, to have the figure 3,500,000. That indicates the type of legislating that some Members of this body would have us do now—legislation at the moment, legislation without any testimony, legislation without the recommendation of anyone except the Senator from Oregon, who refused to offer those amendments when we in the committee could call in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and discuss the amendments with them.

I think the Senate ought to have in the RECORD before the roll is called the views of the men who are directing the defense and the destiny of the Republic. Therefore, at this time I wish to give the Senate the benefit of the recommendations of the best military minds we have been able to secure. I shall read now a letter from General George Marshall; here is what he says about the Morse amendment as amended, as amended, as amended:

A statutory ceiling on the size of the armed services at this time would be, in effect, a direct gamble—

A direct gamble, Mr. President—

with national security in the present chaotic world situation. The 3,462,000 figure toward which we are now building is not a ceiling. It is a minimum of strength in the present situation.

The number of men under arms at any time should reflect the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President as to the country's minimum defense need. These men—

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Marshall says—

cannot fulfill their responsibility if an arbitrary limit is set on the size of our forces.

Mr. President, I would ask the Senate to reflect particularly on these next words, as contained in General Marshall's letter:

To tie the hands of our responsible leaders and strip them of any flexibility in manpower goals, is a highly dangerous procedure. Congress always controls the purse strings but the proposed procedure goes far beyond that check.

The Armed Forces have never been throttled with a mandatory ceiling in the midst of a period of great emergency. To do so now would be serious, I believe, far beyond the conception of many who might favor such a procedure in the heat of debate.

Mr. President, I read now excerpts from a letter from General Bradley:

As former Chief of Staff of the Army, as now chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have just completed the third year as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, working with plans for the security of this Nation. Based on this experience, my immediate reaction to this amendment is this: Such a limitation on the mobilization of our armed strength gives the Soviet Union the greatest single fixed factor that any nation could have—

Mr. President, I repeat that statement which is to be found in the letter from General Bradley—

gives the Soviet Union the greatest single fixed factor that any nation could have which would plot the downfall of the United States through attack by armed aggression. I only wish that similar limiting information on the size of the forces of any potential enemy could be passed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It would make our planning immeasurably easier.

I have also a letter from General Collins, in which he says:

Finally, to be forced to request a possible raising of such a limitation during a time of stress might unnecessarily divulge our future plans to a potential enemy. If a ceiling is imposed, and if, because of world tension, it proves desirable to increase the strength of the Armed Forces, congressional action could be labeled as an unfriendly act precipitating world war III.

And, in the last analysis, the Congress still maintains the power to limit the Armed Forces through its power of appropriation. No action can be taken by the Armed Forces to increase strengths without specific appropriations to cover the costs of additional men and equipment needed.

And here is a letter from the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, who has the responsibility of mounting the retaliatory attack. He says:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am seriously disturbed with the press report that the Senate, as a corollary action to their consideration of the universal military training and service legislation, proposes to vote on an amendment which would prescribe a statutory military personnel ceiling on the armed services. Such an amendment, if enacted, would in my opinion be detrimental to the security of our Nation.

* * * * *

As you know, the Congress does control the strength of the armed services through appropriations made available to support our program. Also, as you know, the Armed Services Committees of both Houses are kept fully and currently informed of the military conditions which influence all aspects of our programs. Future adjustments in the strength requirements of the armed services can be effected through existing congressional procedures. In my opinion, this existing system lends itself more suitably to the international situation we face.

As Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force and in my capacity as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I therefore urge that your committee oppose the proposed restrictive amendment.

Admiral Sherman, in effect, took the same position in the committee, when he warned the committee that this was not a ceiling, but the goal may well have to be adjusted upward if conditions worsen. I submit to the Senate that there is not one word of evidence in the 1,200 pages of hearings from any responsible person in the Pentagon or out, who said the United States is going to restrict itself to the use of only 3,462,000 men.

Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be defeated. I think it is a very dangerous amendment. I believe I am

safe in saying that the Senate would have been wiser to have merely extended the draft act which is now on the books, rather than to tie the hands of the Joint Chiefs by crippling amendments fashioned on the floor of the Senate, with hour-to-hour changes. What change in international conditions came about which justified the Senator from Oregon in jumping from 3,000,000 one day to 3,200,000 the next and finally to 3,500,000 the next day? No, Mr. President, I do not think international conditions dictated this amendment. I think it was other conditions. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to take some of his time now?

Mr. MORSE. I thought I would.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit, I shall yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and, when he has concluded, I shall then yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to take only 2 or 3 minutes to make my position clear with reference to the pending amendment. I shall vote against it. If an amendment is offered raising the limit to a figure which will provide a proper leeway, so that the military will be able to exercise some discretion in meeting unforseeable contingencies, I shall support it. The military should not be so restricted and hampered in the interim between the time such contingency may develop and the time they can come back to the Congress to get a further increase in numbers that harmful delay will occur, or, Mr. President, if the conditions warrant, for the Congress to obtain legislation removing all restrictions and limitations as to manpower.

As I understand, it has been determined and is generally agreed that by July of this year, the military expect to have 3,462,000 men in the armed services. Those estimates of need are based upon conditions as they are seen to exist today. As I understand, the military authorities definitely intend to go to that figure and to that strength. We should provide a ceiling with a substantial margin above that.

I agree with those who contend it is the responsibility and duty of the Congress to place a limitation on the armed strength of the country in time of peace, and, in emergencies that are short of all-out war. When all-out war comes, of course, the sky is the limit. Our full capacity is then the limit. We of course would remove all restrictions, then, so there would be no hindrance to all-out mobilization. When such a crisis comes, if it comes, everything we have and can do will be required to us.

Mr. President, in conclusion I may say I think the military should come to the Congress with a figure, and should request a limitation which provides for the immediate foreseeable needs, together with a reasonable margin to enable them to meet any contingency which may arise, until such time as they can come back to the Congress and we can have an opportunity to consider the issue further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, now that General Marshall and his associates, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have confessed by the letters which they have sent to the Senate through the Senator from Texas that they want unchecked power over manpower within the terms of the manraising abilities of this bill, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in the hope that he will express his views on the significance of those letters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] said:

> In view of the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Ohio, I wish to make it clear upon what basis I do so.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I do not subscribe to the viewpoint of the Senator from Ohio that he is going to measure the willingness of the people of the United States to defend their lives and their liberties on the basis of a mathematical percentage of what can be sliced off their total income, at their convenience, for the purpose of defending their security, and assuring the survival of the Nation.

Of course, I said no such thing. The American people are going to have the Armed Forces which are necessary, weighing all the circumstances of the particular emergency which faces them. The only question is, Shall we today turn this whole power over to the military? Shall we turn over to them the complete determination not only of manpower but, if manpower, then of taxes which are to be levied on the people; then, of controls, which will have to be imposed on the people? This is no military question. The question is, How shall we best meet the emergency which we face? What kind of plan shall we make?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. Excuse me. I have a limited time, and I should like to finish first, if I may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. All the talk about the suspension of the ceiling because of the Korean crisis has nothing to do with the present situation. We were suddenly faced with an attack, which looked as if it might develop into all-out war. No plans had yet been made to meet the attack. We had no idea what the figure ought to be, if there should be a figure. Today, however, the Korean War has no relation to this figure. The largest number of personnel that anyone has suggested we should use in the war is 350,000, and here we are asked to place a limit of 3,500,000, 10 time the number of men necessary for the Korean War.

For the purpose of this limitation the Korean War is not a war. That is not why we are building to 3,500,000. We are building the Armed Forces up to meet a potential attack by the Soviet Union. I have gone along with the idea that we have to build up a very substantial force.

The question is, Is there any limit on that force? I say that at 3,500,000 we have reached the point where we have come to the very economic limit this country can stand unless we are prepared to face inflation and domestic disaster. All this amendment does is to put up a red light in front of the military chiefs and say, "Gentlemen, at this point you have involved us not only in a military question, you have involved us in an economic question, you have involved us in a question involving the domestic liberties of the United States, and you will have to let us have another look at the situation." That would be the only result of the proposed limitation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assure my distinguished colleague from Ohio that I am perfectly willing to vote for a limitation, but I would not want to vote for any limitation that would not give the authorities a reasonable leeway.

Will the Senator be good enough to discuss the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to the effect that the limitation of 3,500,000 would give a limit of only 38,000 from what they have been between now and July 1?

Mr. TAFT. At one time the military authorities asked for 3,200,000, they went to 3,300,000, they went to 3,240,000, then they come to 3,462,000. The 3,500,000 gives a reasonable leeway over what they may finally ask for. I say there is a point at which Congress has to step in, when it is no longer a military question, when Congress must say, "We have to look at this again." The whole argument of the Chiefs of Staff relates to war. We are not in war. The bill contemplates a long period of semimobilization.

We asked for a plan as to Korea, and we had no plan. No one had a plan. The military have had 6 months to develop a plan. They certainly have been very slow in trying to develop one.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot yield under the time limitation.

They have finally developed what looks like a plan. They say, "We think 3,462,000 will give us an all-out force sufficient to provide for all present emergencies."

What is the emergency? There is only one big emergency anticipated, and that is an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States. If that comes, all limits will be off. We will probably have a declaration of war, and take the limits off as fast as we can enact a declaration of war.

If what happens is less than war, then I say we should reexamine the situation. If it is not a war emergency, we should examine the situation so that we can determine what the economic effects will be.

I have estimated the cost of the Armed Forces at $50,000,000,000, plus $30,000,000,000, a total of $80,000,000,000. That is my estimate. I believe that is beyond what we ought to do. Personally I would put the limit at 3,000,000 men, but I am willing to go to 3,500,000, because the military authorities have testified that is what they want.

Their requests will grow. There is an unlimited capacity for spending money on military forces. There are a hundred projects in the world we could take up. We could send troops to Indochina, we could decide to send some to Iran, we could decide we wanted a radar screen not only around the north but around the southern part of the United States. If we are to make this country 100 percent safe, so to speak, we can spend $100,000,000,000 and put 10,000,000 men under arms, because we can point to many things which could be done with those men. But when we are at peace we have to say, "There are certain limitations beyond which we cannot go." We have to balance the various methods proposed to prevent possible foreign aggression, with the limitations on freedom at home, through taxation and controls, and the serious danger that would be done at home by inflation, which is going to be difficult to prevent, even if we have the proposed limitation. The problem of preventing inflation will not be easy to solve, along with the problem of rising prices; and we see that. But unless we have a plan, unless the Government will say, "This is what we are going to do," unless we have something on which to base our action, we are completely at sea.

Why has the Congress lagged in passing a $10,000,000,000 tax bill? It is because the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee has felt that we would like to know what the total bill is to be, we would like to see the needs in one picture, we would like to know whether it is necessary to raise $10,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000. We would like to have a definite plan, and until we put under the whole structure of everything that Congress does a definite military program, in what the military say is an emergency with which Congress can deal, I say we are going to be completely at sea, and do not know what taxes to levy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator a question for the RECORD. If such a limit as three and one-half million is imposed, would that be any encouragement to Mr. Stalin that we would not go further in case of emergency?

Mr. TAFT. Of course not. Consider the argument made by General Bradley. He says:

> Such a limitation * * * gives the Soviet Union the greatest single factor that any nation could have which would plot the downfall of the United States.

Mr. President, if we impose appropriation limitations, Stalin will know how many troops we will have, he will know that Congress can provide more money and that we can have more troops. If Congress can provide more money and we can have more troops, he will know Congress can raise the limit. In my opinion, the argument of the Chief of Staff is about up to the standard of the usual argument made by military gentlemen when they get into a discussion of matters beyond the scope of military operations, attempting to estimate the psychology of someone the Chief of Staff knows no more about than I do.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator would say, then, that by fixing the limit at 3,500,000, we are not, in his judgment, in any way telling the Russian people we are not prepared to go to any length to which we have to go in order to meet any emergency?

Mr. TAFT. Of course. As a matter of fact, I think the Soviet might be encouraged if they thought we were saying to our military people, "You can take an army into Indochina without talking to us, you can increase your army and go to Iran," or some place else. I think that is what Soviet Russia would like to see us do, wasting our substance on side issues throughout the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the Senator from Ohio two more minutes.

Mr. TAFT. The letter from General Marshall seems to me the most convincing argument for the particular limitation now proposed. He says, in effect, that the number of men in the Army at any time should reflect the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President. If that is our position, we might just as well adjourn and go home, if we are to surrender to the President and the military people the complete authority over the size of the Army. We would be turning over to the generals who are directing affairs from the Pentagon the complete discretion as to how much we shall spend; we would be delegating to them not only that, but complete discretion about what we have to do as to levying taxes, and controls, and every other feature relating to the domestic economy.

Mr. President, the question is not a military question alone. It involves every question of psychology and economy as to which Congress must necessarily make the final determination.

The Secretary says:

> The Armed Forces have never been throttled with a mandatory ceiling in the midst of a great emergency.

The fact is they have never been throttled in time of war.

Mr. President, that is the fundamental question. We must distinguish between the condition we face and a condition of all-out war. If we do not, it means we are surrendering the power of Congress, giving up the responsibilities which must necessarily lie upon us under the Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the Senator from Ohio one more minute.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to suggest one other matter. I cannot think of anything that would be better for the Army than a limitation of 3,500,000 men. It would force upon them the necessity of choosing between different projects. It would force upon them the necessity for economy in the use of men. It would force them to find ways in which a given number of men could produce a greater fighting force. It would force them into a position in which they would sympathize with us. If we leave them, as General Marshall says, in the position that the 3,462,000 is not a ceiling, but a minimum of strength, we are in effect, being warned that once he gets that figure he is going to go to 4,000,000, or 4,500,000. Incidentally, the military has increased the figure, between December 15 and February 15 from 2,700,000 to 3,500,000. Probably it will be 4,500,000 next year, unless we impose a figure at which we will stop.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to speak only from his own deep conviction that the pending amendment is not in the best interests of our Nation in this uncertain and critical period, and ought to be defeated. I take this position for the same reason that prompted me to concur with the action taken by Congress in suspending the ceiling last July, 8 months ago.

What did we do at that time? With the urgency of Korea facing us, we temporarily suspended for a period of 4 years the manpower ceiling of two million imposed by existing law. We took this action without any reservation. It did not involve an abrogation of the control of the Congress over the military. It simply suspended the ceiling for a specific period of time, until 1954.

Mr. President, I feel that the situation today is as urgent as it was last July. The mere fact that the immediate tactical situation in Korea is not so desperate as it was last July—but it is tragic enough and bloody enough—does not in any way imply that the over-all strategic situation throughout the world is any less urgent.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the world situation today is just as serious, if not more serious, than it was at the time Congress suspended the then existing manpower ceiling. Apparently, on the basis of our convictions 8 months ago we knew what we were doing. I contend that it is unrealistic and unwise for us at this time to set a sort of interim ceiling. We did not put our Armed Forces under such a monstrous handicap in World War II. Even before Pearl Harbor we recognized the fact that they must have room to grow as the danger grew. Does anyone contend that the peril is less great today? Has the pace or the potential of war, or its destructiveness, diminished since 1941? The fact is that we are in more immediate and deadly danger than we ever have been in our national history.

The effect of such a ceiling would be to morally commit us to reach the ceil-

ing. It would have the effect of telling the Armed Forces to go ahead and build up to that number, but they would have to meet the urgency of any situation within that total. The responsibility for any possible failure to meet the future emergency will rest with Congress, not with the Armed Forces. Through this amendment we would effectively tie their hands and we would limit their efforts to certain numbers. At no time during the hearings have we been led to believe that three million four hundred and sixty-two thousand was a firm figure and that it would not be necessary to expand above that number should some future emergency develop.

The only real security lies in a force that is adequate to do the job we have to do. That number will change up or down every time there is any basic shift in the situation. We cannot ask the Joint Chiefs of Staff to live with any number as a maximum and still guarantee the safety of our country. The question we must decide is: Do we want a number or do we want security?

Mr. President, for the reasons stated the junior Senator from Washington strongly urges the Senate to avoid at this time the fixing of any interim ceiling. I recommend that we adhere to the action we took 8 months ago, in July, and wait until 1954 or until we have a sound reason to make a reexamination of an admittedly and extremely vital and complicated question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have studied the question of the needs of our military forces. I have followed very carefully the debate on the floor of the Senate. I believe I know what the junior Senator from Oregon is endeavoring to do. He is endeavoring to obtain the best use of the personnel in the Armed Forces. He is endeavoring to obtain economy. He is endeavoring to eliminate the use of men in the Armed Forces as housekeepers, orderlies, and chauffeurs for the officer personnel of the Army. I believe that is what he is endeavoring to do. I share with him the same conviction.

However, Mr. President, I believe that a 3,500,000 ceiling would be too low in view of what many of us feel is the absolute military necessity at this time and in the very near future. For that reason I asked for 2 minutes, in order that I may suggest to the junior Senator from Oregon that he accept a substitute to his amendment, or an amendment to his amendment, which would raise the ceiling to 4,000,000 men. I know if the situation warranted we could reexamine the subject at a later time and, if necessary, we could lift the ceiling at a future time. In any event the junior Senator from Oregon would accomplish what he is endeavoring to accomplish, namely, to bring about the best use of our military personnel and to eliminate the needless use of military personnel in housekeeping operations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia and I could have an understanding with reference to the remaining time. I understand I have approximately 13 minutes left. I should like to yield 5 minutes at this time, then the Senator from Georgia could take some of the intervening time, and I should like then to take 3 minutes before the last 5 minutes, thus leaving the last 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be agreeable to me. I think I have 6 minutes remaining. The Senator would not object if the time ran 1 minute either way?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly not.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is agreeable to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, judging by the debate on the floor thus far, there is no general understanding on an over-all defense policy. The absence of such a defense policy reinforces the statement I made when I submitted Senate Resolution 8, to the effect that we have the cart before the horse. I said we should decide first what we shall do about implementing the North Atlantic Treaty and should know where our forces are to go before we try to fix a ceiling of 3,500,000 men, as the military recommends.

The distinguished Senator from Texas has said that Senators who oppose his view change their position from hour to hour. If anyone has changed his position, it is the military. The military came before us not more than a year ago and said they wanted 2,000,000 men. Then they wanted 2,700,000. Later they wanted 3,100,000. Later still it was 3,200,000. Then it was 3,462,000. Now they do not want any ceiling at all. Why? Because they want to determine our national defense policy. They want to say where the troops are to go. They do not want the Congress of the United States to determine the defense policy, as Congress should do under the Constitution. The people of the United States realize that we are their representatives, and that Congress should speak on the subject.

Throughout the debate reference has been made about the Senator from Nebraska agreeing to take off the limitation last June. The remarks made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], while he did not mention my name, were directed at me. When, in hysteria, former Senator Tydings said, "We must take off the ceiling; we must let the military do as they wish," I rose and said, "All right; we will do that. However, the Congress should retain its power over the subject. Let us suspend the ceiling for a year, or for 2 years, so that Congress may have an opportunity to review the situation." After all, Congress must make the determination as to the national defense policy.

I should like to place in the RECORD my answer to former Senator Tydings with regard to the congressional powers which we were abdicating at that time. That was my position then, and it is my position now. I say now that the Congress should determine the policy. It should consider any program recommended by the military; but at the same time, Congress should make the determination. I ask that the statement made by me be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WHERRY. I agree completely with the observations of the distinguished Senator, with one exception. I am willing to expand the Army to the number the Army requests for the need which is to be confronted. The number of men, the number of units, and the appropriations, are one thing, but I think that after that is done, there should be some time limit on these extraordinary powers. That is what I am discussing. I think some year should be inserted. If 1 year is not enough, make it 2 years. Certainly the Congress will be in session, and if there is a desire to extend the power and fix another limitation, that is all right so far as I am concerned, but not only as to this bill, but as to any other bill which comes before the Senate which asks for extraordinary powers, whether it has to do with appropriations, the number of men in the Armed Forces, or whether it relates to powers to be imposed upon the economy, I believe there should be some time limit during which such powers should exist.

Mr. WHERRY. What becomes of all the arguments made during the last 2 days about a 3,500,000 Army? What becomes of the argument so far as the 18-year-old boys are concerned? Time and again Senators rose and said, "It is a 3,500,000 Army, we are told by the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense. We are told that if we allow them to draft 18-year-olds, and leave the figure at 3,500,000, possibly they will not even get to the 18-year-olds."

If there is no ceiling, and the military have their way, they will not only draft boys 18½ years old, but they will take the 18-year-olds. If no ceiling is to be imposed on the military, they will have to search to get the manpower they want. So the argument with respect to taking 18-year-olds, on the ground that possibly they would not be drafted, is knocked into a cocked hat when the military say, "We want no limitation or ceiling whatever. We want to decide exactly what to do."

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to something else. Consider the testimony of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, and of the Secretary of Defense himself. They do not call the present situation another Korea. They say, "This is a long-range program. This represents the orderly growth of the Armed Forces, together with adequate military training. It is all a part of a long-range peacetime program for the Armed Forces of the United States." That is the only program they come here with. They do not give us any idea where the troops are to be sent. Do those in charge of the bill say that we are to have an invasion by Russia of the homeland? Do they advise us whether the Armed Forces are to be integrated into an international army in Western Europe? Do they say that these forces are to be sent outside the European countries? Are they to be sent to Iran and Iraq as morale builders? Why do they not give us the program? Why do they not say what the national defense policy is to be? If we had the policy be-

fore us, we could properly deal with this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Unless we know the policy, we are legislating in the dark. We do not know what the ceiling is to be. We cannot match the appropriations with the operation.

I wish to conclude by stating to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon that I confirm what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said. I have served on the Appropriations Committee since I have been in the Senate. It is a physical impossibility to know anything about what the appropriations are to be, what the taxes are to be, and what the expenditures are to be unless we know what the program of the military is. If the ceiling is to have a loose end, or if it is to be 4,000,000 instead of 3,500,000, or if it is to be some other figure about which we know nothing, we cannot cut the cloth to fit the pattern. It means disastrous effects, not only upon appropriations but upon allocations, price controls, cost of living, and everything that goes with it. It means a cheapening of the dollar.

I hope the ceiling will be imposed and that the Congress will not abdicate its power, with the understanding that if there is an emergency, if there is need, the military can come to the Congress and we can suspend the ceiling, as was done before.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope that the ceiling of 3,500,000 will not be established. I have just listened to the Senator from Nebraska. Yesterday I read his colloquy with Senator Tydings last July. He was right in advocating a 4-year limit at that time. I approved of it. I think it was a proper amendment.

I spoke on this subject yesterday. I wish to add merely this: It seems to me that the argument of the Senator from Nebraska and the argument of the Senator from Ohio do not so much concern abdication of the powers of Congress as they concern a lack of faith in our military leaders.

It seems to me that in these difficult times we must place our confidence and faith in the leaders of our Military Establishment, at least, to the extent of giving them credit for not carrying us down into economic depths without giving Congress an opportunity to go over the figures.

The Senator from Ohio stated that General Marshall said that this was a minimum figure. It is a minimum figure for the safety of the country on M-day. He does not assert that because it is a minimum figure he is going to jump it up. We must have confidence in our leaders. I agree that we cannot support a force much in excess of three and one-half million. But we must trust our leaders more than some of our colleagues do and at the same time keep a closer eye on the appropriations to see that they are not exceeded and our economy ruined thereby.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has 8 minutes. The Senator from Oregon has 6 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I were testing this issue in a court of competent jurisdiction and had to find a witness in support of the proposition advanced by the Senator from Oregon, I think I would select my old colleague from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JOHNSON], for when he recites the language of General Marshall to the effect that this is a dangerous gamble, the implication, in my judgment, is quite clear that the military authorities want no ceiling.

When he recites the language of General Bradley that this proposal offers a fixed factor which might be useful to the Soviet Union, I think the implication is plain that the military want no ceiling at all. I believe that all the recitals which have been made are definitely water over the wheel of the Senator from Oregon, and certainly support the amendment, which I expect to support when the time comes.

Let me say to my friend from Massachusetts that I recall when I was a GI in France in World War I. Old George Clemenceau, the Tiger of France, once said that war cannot be trusted to the military, because it is too serious. He did not mean to voice any lack of faith in Marshall Foch, General Petain, General Giraud, General Mangin, or any of the other generals whose names were familiar to me in that day and age. He simply meant to say, of course, that the policies, the implications, the commingling of economic forces, were such that we could not repose the conduct of war solely in the hands of the military. It was a classic statement, and I think the truth of it is manifest today. There must be some ceiling, if for no other reason than to take account of the extravagant language, the overstatement of the military, which has been a patent thing ever since I have been in Washington—and that goes back for 18 years.

I remember all the averments that used to be made on the other side—"This course leads to disaster. Do not impose a ceiling, because to do so would be to toy with the destiny and the solvency of the well being of our country."

It has always been the same. In every case there has been constant overstatement. We see it today in the recitals which were read to the Senate by my friend from Texas when he brought to bear the statements of the generals. They constitute the best argument I know for the imposition of a ceiling. The ceiling can be removed any time circumstances warrant.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

The Senator from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining. The Senator from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Georgia wish to consume all his 8 minutes at one time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have received no further requests for time. If the Senator from Oregon does not object I shall consume all of my 8 minutes of time.

Mr. MORSE. Then, I will take my 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I was shocked by the letters from General Marshall and his associates that were read to the Senate earlier today, because they confess that the Pentagon wants unchecked power in determining the size of our Military Establishment.

I am sure objection will not be made if I report to the Senate a very pertinent remark which was made to me in conversation by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] about those letters. Remarking about one argument made that if we impose ceilings and then take ceilings off it will be a signal for world war III, the senior Senator from Georgia said to me "Wayne, why would not leaving them off now then be a signal for world war III?"

Mr. President, by imposing ceilings we demonstrate to Stalin what we mean by democratic processes, and I think we also demonstrate to the world that we are proceeding now for defense purposes, not for war purposes.

The second point I wish to make is that we take the military at their own word respecting 3,500,000. We took the ceiling off in August. It was a 2,000,000 ceiling then. How many men have been added? We have added somewhere between 500,000 and 600,000, for I am advised this morning that the present strength of our Military Establishment is between 2,500,000 and 2,600,000.

Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] that if we put a 3,500,000 ceiling on now it will take many months to reach that number, and the Pentagon will have all those months to watch world conditions to determine whether or not they need to come to Congress and ask for a higher ceiling. I say to the Senator from Arkansas, there is a cushion of safety both in numbers and in time in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon proposing a ceiling of 3,500,000.

Then along this line, Mr. President, what do we find in the newspapers this morning? We find headlines showing the most recent decision of the Pentagon that they are going to reduce the number of men to be inducted in May by some 25 percent. The fact is, as I have argued throughout the debate, that they cannot absorb for a long period of time the men they are already authorized to take.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying, if Senators want a constitutional check upon the military, they should adopt my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, during the course of this entire debate I have

found myself wishing that I might find escape from the grim realities of today's world as readily as do some of my colleagues. However, I shall not undertake to deceive myself with the fanciful dream that in today's world we shall be able to have security from dangers that are to me very real, while at the same time enjoying the utmost economy in the size and operations of our Armed Forces.

As I stated yesterday, Mr. President, we will not find any bargain counter from which we may pluck a bargain in the defense of these United States. This is not a bargain-counter country. The things that are at stake today are not cheap. They are things that are priceless, above all computation, things desired by the other 2,000,000,000 people who inhabit the earth; things for the possession of which we are greatly envied by those who threaten the security and the peace of the world.

Mr. President, I repeat that, for my part, I shall not cast a vote that I regard as being a useless gamble with the security of the Nation and the freedom of the American people.

The balance of power in the world which has protected us for past decades, has disappeared. The oceans which we once regarded as ramparts that would give time have now become mere puddles of defense in the waging of war. We cannot expect to have the time we have always heretofore had in which to prepare the country for defense. Confronted with that knowledge, the danger of the situation should be apparent to every Senator, as well as to every American citizen. To talk about our constitutional duty to impose such restraints upon the men who are charged with directing our national defense to me is fantastic, unreal. I think we are facing a testing time in America and in the Senate. We either propose to defend this country or we do not.

Senators may place their judgment that 3,500,000 is the number of men who will be needed above that of our military leaders who have been so severely and, I think, unfairly berated during the course of this entire debate, or they can rely upon the checks and balances upon which we have depended in every other period of emergency.

Senators talk of peace. They say this is a peacetime army. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] both stated several times that we are dealing with a peacetime army. Is there peace in Korea? Is there peace around the entire perimeter of the iron curtain? Is there security even in the homes of the American people? No, Mr. President, we are engaged in a cold war in addition to the shooting in Korea. We hope that limited war and the cold war will be the only kind we shall know and that we shall be able to prevent a world conflagration; but we have no assurance that that will be the case. We do not know at what hour our Nation may be subject to attack. This is indeed a testing time for us in the Senate and for the whole American people.

Are we tough enough to endure through a long period of costly cold war? Have we the character to raise the taxes which are necessary in order to safeguard and maintain the security of the United States? Do we realize the value of the blessings we enjoy as American citizens? Are we willing to take chances, unnecessary chances, by imposing a limit of this kind upon the number of men we may have in the armed services?

Mr. President, no one has stated that 3,462,000 are all the men necessary to defend the United States. The military, which by some seem to be so much despised, have told us that more men will be needed. Almost all the current increases which have been referred to as an illustration of inconsistency on the part of the military, have been brought about through the doubling of the Air Forces. One would think that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska, who have consistently stressed the importance of air, would welcome increases in the Air Force, instead of saying that we should impose ceilings that may make the number of men inadequate even to have the air power that is so vital for protection, for preventing attack, and for retaliation if attack should come.

Mr. President, I can understand General Marshall's confusion when he stated that some members of the Congress had hardly ceased denouncing him for not having enough men in the Army when Korea erupted, before they started proposing restrictions and limitations which will make it impossible for him to secure the men he believes he should have to prevail in Korea and protect the country. I can appreciate that confusion, because I share it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not believe that the proposed ceiling is so tight that it will adversely affect the rotation of men who are now in Korea?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. President, men may call this peace, but in my judgment it is a dangerous peace that may be terminated momentarily with the greatest holocaust ever seen. I do not think we should rely upon that kind of uneasy half-peace to such an extent as severally to curtail the adequacy of our defensive preparations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator from Georgia think the limitation of 3,500,000 is so tight that it might greatly embarrass us this year in case of sudden and violent actions which could occur in various places in the world?

Mr. RUSSELL. It might well prove disastrous. The action it is now proposed to take by means of the adoption of the pending amendment might well prove disastrous in such a situation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator from Georgia think that if we were to adopt this amendment we would be playing directly into the hands of the Soviets, if we were thus to disclose the top limit on the Armed Forces we would be willing to conscript? Does not the Senator also think that no one is justified in disregarding the warnings of our great military leaders, such as General Marshall, General Bradley, General Vandenberg, and the others upon whom we must rely?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we adopt this amendment we shall be telling Stalin that we are prepared to defend all that is America, provided we can do it with 3,500,000 men and $50,000,000,000, but that if it requires more than 3,500,001 men, and their equipment we are willing to let America go down the drain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that under the unanimcus-consent agreement it is in order to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Amendments to the amendment are in order, under the agreement. There is a limitation of 10 minutes to a side in the case of any amendment which may be offered to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McMAHON. Therefore, Mr. President, to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, in line 6 of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, strike out the words "three million five hundred thousand" and insert the words "five million," so as to make the amendment at that point read: "a total of five million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this act."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 6, of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, it is proposed to strike out the words "three million five hundred thousand" and insert the words "five million."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Speaking merely as an individual member of the Armed Services Committee, and not speaking for the committee, let me say that it seems to me that the Senator from Connecticut has approached this problem in a constructive way, because his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon meets the problem of those who have been concerned about a wide-open end limitation. At the same time, we still have the assurances of the Joint Chiefs that three and one-half million is the absolute minimum we should have for the defense of the country. Between the figure three and one-half million and the top figure of five million, which the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would establish as a ceiling, there would be sufficient flex-

ibility to enable the Congress, through its appropriating power, to limit the number according to the need which might exist. Does the Senator agree that would serve the purpose of those who do not wish to leave a wide-open ceiling?

Mr. McMAHON. I believe it would.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, we must remember that what we are seeking to do by this bill is to prepare defenses for the protection of our civilization and our way of life. The dictionary defines the word "civilization" as the rule of civilians.

As I stated yesterday, I believe that the Congress must be vigilant in exercising the powers it is given by the Constitution and in performing its duty thereunder. There can be no question that under the Constitution the Congress has the responsibility of raising an army, which of course includes determining or prescribing the size of the army.

I have conferred with the members of Armed Services Committee on both sides of the aisle. I have listened to the reading of the letters from the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, and from the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am impressed by their perturbation at the proposal to fix a limit of 3,500,000 men. I am not willing to snub them or turn them down, in view of their protestations of necessity; and under the circumstances, I am not willing to hold them down to the figure 3,500,000. To that extent I change my position.

However, I do not change one iota my basic position that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to set a limit on the size of the Armed Forces.

One year ago I stated on this floor that we were faced with a period of regimentation and regulation in which our budgets would go up and up and up and our liberties would go down and down and down. Of course, Mr. President, developments during the past 12 months have borne out that prophecy.

I say that in the business of preparing ourselves so that we may protect our way of life and may assure our survival, we must also be vigilant in seeing to it that we do not turn over to the military gentlemen in the Pentagon the powers which the Constitution gives to the Congress of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit that wisdom demands that we set a limitation that will conform to and comport with our constitutional duty, and still will give the armed services sufficient latitude to enable them to collect the forces necessary to protect the national security.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Without going into the merits of the matter at all, let me ask whether the Senator has made any estimate of the cost of maintaining a force of 5,000,000.

Mr. McMAHON. I would say to the Senator that I have not. I say to him, and, in replying to the Senator I am also replying to an observation the Senator from Ohio made the other day, that perhaps we are going to have to forget the question of cost in connection with this matter. We are not going to be able to decide, on the basis of convenience to the American people, the question of how much they are going to have to give up in order to survive, because he who thinks the American people will not give up all they have in order to maintain their liberty, does not know what is in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I phrased my question so as to eliminate argument as to the merits of whether the number should be 3,000,000, 4,000,000, 5,000,000, or whatever it should be. I think it is quite a relevant question to ask what the cost may be, so that we also can avoid burdening the Nation with excessive expenditures.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, let me make a very brief response to the Senator from Colorado. Of course, by setting 5,000,000 as the limit, the Senator realizes that will not necessarily mean that we shall have 5,000,000 men in the Armed Forces.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Senator's amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon—increasing the number to 5,000,000—shall not prevail, does the Senator from Connecticut propose to offer an amendment increasing the number to 4,000,000? I can support the Senator from Connecticut in regard to the figure 4,000,000; but a limit of 5,000,000, I may say to the Senator, in connection with the question asked by the Senator from Colorado, does not mean very much in the way of a limitation, but could mean a great deal in the way of expense.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to have my response?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; I do.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall make up my mind on that matter when I find out what the vote is on the amendment I have now offered to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I announced yesterday, if the amendment calling for 3,500,000—the figure we were considering then—fails, I shall offer an amendment to provide for 4,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I think the time in opposition to this amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is in my control. However, this amendment involves directly a conflict not only with the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, but with the bill as reported by the committee. Therefore, in the interest of fairness, I think I should assign to the Senator from Oregon 3 or 4 minutes on this matter.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Georgia is quite correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that if we set the limit at this figure, we may easily have it reached, because the figure proposed for the Armed Forces has increased steadily. In December the situation was no worse than the situation today; in fact, the need then was probably less than the need today. However, at that time the military raised their estimate, in 30 days, from 2,700,000 to 3,500,000 men.

Now we are told that on the basis of an Armed Force of 3,500,000, we shall not have to draft 18-year-old boys. That is why many Members of the Senate voted against the amendment in regard to the drafting of boys 18½ years of age.

If we now raise the limit to 5,000,000, that will be an invitation to those in charge of the Armed Forces to increase the size of the Armed Forces to 5,000,000; and so far as I can judge, according to the statements of those in charge of the Armed Forces, even after all the equipment is prepared, a force of 5,000,000 will cost $50,000,000,000 to maintain. Fifty billion dollars plus the figure, as I estimate it, of $15,000,000,000 a year for additional equipment, totals $65,000,000,000. If we add $5,000,000,000 more that will be $70,000,000,000. If we add $25,000,000,000 more for domestic expense that will be $95,000,000,000—or as much as we spent at the height of the Second World War, although there is no such war going on today. Of course, such a war may come; but if it does, we shall have to act in many ways, and then we can take off the ceiling.

It seems to me, Mr. President, it is most unwise to invite the military to push this ceiling up. In fact, in the light of General Marshall's letter, it seems to me they have it in mind. I thought they did not; I thought they were willing to confine themselves to their present request; but apparently that is merely a minimum, and they are going right on from there. I think it most unwise to invite them to go on toward a goal of 5,000,000 men in the Army. The expense which would be entailed would make it practically impossible for the country to operate. For a period of 10 years, apparently, or whatever the period may be, we are going to face all the dangers of war or at least a continuance of the Russian threat. It seems to me the amendment should certainly be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining, in opposition to the McMahon amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to say—and I would have the Senator from Minnesota take note of this—that the McMahon amendment would de-

stroy the primary objective of my amendment, which is that the Congress exercise its constitutional checks upon the military. If the ceiling is put at 5,000,000, then we shall have really destroyed that principle of checks, because we shall have fixed a figure so far beyond anything the military itself has presented in this case that it seems to me it would merely be making a gesture in behalf of the principle. We are in effect giving the military all the discretion it wants, anyway.

Certain statistical facts should be kept in mind as we consider the McMahon amendment. It will take many months for the military to reach the figure of 3,500,000 men, if my amendment is adopted. We took the ceilings off last August, and since then the Military Establishment have increased the Armed Forces only to 2,500,000 or 2,600,000 over what was then a ceiling of two million. We need to remember also that they have not only presented their case before the Armed Services Committee on the basis of 3,500,000 armed force for the months immediately ahead, but they are presenting data on the House side before the Appropriations Committee now for a budget based upon that figure. Not only their manpower request of us, but also their budget request on the House side, is for three and five-tenths million. If the McMahon amendment to my amendment should be adopted, the effect of it would be to disrupt the entire budgetary presentation of the military.

In view of the fact that the military will have months ahead of them before they can reach their goal of three and five-tenths million, they will have ample opportunity to present to us any need for additional manpower, in case world conditions change.

We should not participate in an empty gesture today, and I respectfully say that is what the McMahon amendment amounts to. We would be making a gesture toward a constitutional check, but would give the military a figure which permits of such a wide exercise of discretion that, it seems to me, we would destroy the effect of the application of the principle.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon, or any other Senator who can answer the question whether, if we undertake to build a standing army of 5,000,000 men we shall not only be jeopardizing the economy of the country but also making it necessary to call back into the armed services many of the boys from 19 to 25 years of age who have already given years of service?

Mr. MORSE. I may say, Mr. President, the point made by the Senator from Vermont is well taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Oregon that his time has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield five of the remaining minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have pending before us the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], with a proposed amendment to that amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. The McMahon amendment would place on the Armed Forces a ceiling of 5,000,000 men. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon would place the ceiling at 3,500,000 men. It was not the view of a single member of the committee that a ceiling should be placed in this draft bill. That view was due largely I think to the fact that, only last July, on the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], a 4-year suspension was placed on ceilings, and they were suspended until 1954. The committee therefore felt that there should be no ceiling in this bill.

Furthermore, the committee felt that we had been reasonably prudent in leaving the size of our armed force to the judgment of Congress. We provided in the bill now before the Senate that when, at any time, a majority of the House and Senate decided to reduce the term of service, they could do so by concurrent resolution. We felt that this was a reasonably safe check on the size of our Armed Forces, bearing in mind that the only check we have ever had in any emergency was the sole check of the purse—the Appropriations Committee.

So, as the result of the committee's action, we have three checks: First, the ceiling must be reviewed before 1954; second, at any time the Congress desires to reduce it, it may do so by concurrent resolution; and, third, we may restrict the size by limiting the amount we appropriate.

Mr. President, the committee does not favor any ceiling, but in view of the fact that the Senator from Connecticut has proposed a ceiling of 5,000,000, which is less disastrous than a ceiling of 3,500,000, the Senator from Texas proposes to support the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, and, in the event it is adopted, to vote against the amendment, as amended.

I think the Senate and the country should know, when we vote on this amendment, that if we vote for the Morse amendment it will be in total disregard of every injunction given us by the outstanding military leaders of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point, letters from General Marshall, General Bradley, General Vandenberg, and General Collins. I may say we would also have a statement from Admiral Sherman, because he made one in committee, but he is overseas at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington D. C., March 7, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR JOHNSON: A statutory ceiling on the size of the armed services at this time would be, in effect, a direct gamble with national security in the present chaotic world situation. The 3,462,000 figure toward which we are now building is not a ceiling. It is a minimum of strength in the present situation.

The number of men under arms at any time should reflect the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President as to the country's minimum defense need. These men cannot fulfill their responsibility if an arbitrary limit is set on the size of our forces. to tie the hands of our responsible leaders and strip them of any flexibility in manpower goals is a highly dangerous procedure. Congress always controls the purse strings but the proposed procedure goes far beyond that check.

The Armed Forces have never been throttled with a mandatory ceiling in the midst of a period of great emergency. To do so now would be serious, I believe, far beyond the conception of many who might favor such a procedure in the heat of debate.

With warm regards.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

---

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
*Washington D. C., March 7, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: I have just been informed that an amendment has been offered to the bill on universal military service and training which would limit the size of the Armed Forces to 3,500,000 men.

As former Chief of Staff of the Army, and now as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have just completed the third year as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, working with plans for the security of this Nation. Based on this experience, my immediate reaction to this amendment is this: Such a limitation on the mobilization of our armed strength gives the Soviet Union the greatest single fixed factor that any nation could have which would plot the downfall of the United States through attack by armed aggression.

I only wish that similar limiting information on the size of the forces of any potential enemy could be passed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It would make our planning immeasurably easier.

This amendment, in my opinion, would do great harm.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
*Washington, D. C., March 7, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*Chairman, Preparedness Subcommittee, Senate Armed Services Committee, United States Senate*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am seriously disturbed with the press report that the Senate, as a corollary action to their consideration of the universal military training and service legislation, proposes to vote today on an amendment which would prescribe a statutory military personnel ceiling on the armed services. Such an amendment, if enacted, would in my opinion be detrimental to the security of our Nation.

The many and complex factors, which together dictate the military strength requirements of our country, are so variable that it is impossible to predict the future adequacy of any numerical ceiling. Establishment of a statutory military personnel strength presupposes a continuation or lessening of the international situation and conditions which generated this strength requirement. For the Congress to make such an assumption at this time would, I believe, seriously retard the over-all defense effort.

As you know, the Congress does control the strength of the armed services through appropriations made available to support our programs. Also, as you know, the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress are kept fully and currently informed of the military conditions which influence all aspects of our programs. Future adjustments in the strength requirements of the armed services can, therefore, be effected through existing congressional procedures. In my opinion this existing system lends itself more suitably to the international situation we face.

As Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force and in my capacity as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I therefore urge that your committee oppose the proposed restrictive amendment.

HOYT S. VANDENBERG,
*Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.*

---

UNITED STATES ARMY,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
*March 7, 1951.*

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: There are several compelling reasons, both in the short range and in the long range, why there should not be a statutory limitation on the strength of the Armed Forces in the universal military service and training legislation.

In the short range, the Army would be adversely affected as to combat effectivness and morale. For want of authority to go overstrength from time to time—a condition which cannot be accurately predicted because of battle conditions in Korea and fluctuations in current international tensions, our present plans for rotation of personnel in Korea might be completely upset. A large number of men have been in continuous action in Korea for many months. We must provide them with rotation and relief. They are tired. The speed with which we do this should be limited, not by act of Congress but by our physical ability to train, house, equip, and transport the men necessary to do it. We are doing this today as fast as we are able. A statutory limitation on the strength of the Armed Forces will extend the time the combat-weary veteran may look forward to relief.

Similarly, recalled veterans might have to stay in service longer. A statutory limitation on the strength of the Armed Forces would curtail our ability to train replacements and thereby extend the time when recalled veterans can be released. Our plans are geared to release them as soon as possible.

Despite considerable pressures, the Army did not call out the entire National Guard when the President declared a national emergency. We limited calls originally to four divisions and three regimental combat teams, and I testified that we would call up additional National Guard divisions to meet Joint Chiefs of Staff requirements as they could be properly equipped, housed, and trained. It has been necessary to increase our National Guard divisions on active duty to six and I can foresee, partly as a result of our having to send two divisions to Japan, the necessity of ordering two additional divisions into the active military service before this calendar year is out. This would not be possible if current ceilings of 3,500,000 were fixed by law at this time.

In the long range, our friends might well interpret such a limitation as irresolution in American determination to contribute to the common defense. Our enemies might well interpret it as a sign of weakness and further Communist aggression, instead of being inhibited, might well be encouraged as a result. Such a restriction might also paralyze the powers of negotiation of General Eisenhower at a critical time in the reconstruction of the defenses of Europe.

Both in the short and long ranges, the flexibility of organization of the Armed Forces would be impaired. An expansion in one service could only be made at the expense of the others. The Air Force might be denied the ground strength it needs for base protection; the Army might be denied additional tactical air support because of a numerical limitation on strength.

Finally, to be forced to request a possible raising of such a limitation during a time of stress might unnecessarily divulge our future plans to a potential enemy. If a ceiling is imposed, and if, because of world tension, it proves desirable to increase the strength of the Armed Forces, congressional action could be labeled as an unfriendly act precipitating world war III.

And, in the last analysis, the Congress still maintains the power to limit the Armed Forces through its powers of appropriation. No action can be taken by the Armed Forces to increase strengths without specific appropriations to cover the costs of additional men and equipment needed.

For all of these reasons, the universal military service and training legislation should not include a limitation on the strength of the Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

J. LAWTON COLLINS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to call to the attention of Senators briefly what the writers of these letters have to say about the Morse amendment proposing a ceiling of 3,500,000. I quote from General Marshall, in part:

These men—

He is speaking of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

cannot fullfill their responsibility if an arbitrary limit is set on the size of our forces. To tie the hands of our responsible leaders and strip them of any flexibility in manpower goals is a highly dangerous procedure. * * * The Armed Forces have never been throttled with a manpower ceiling in the midst of a period of great emergency.

General Bradley says:

Such a limitation on the mobilization of our armed strength gives the Soviet Union the greatest single fixed factor that any nation could have which would plot the downfall of the United States through an attack by armed aggression.

General Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, has this to say:

Such an amendment, if enacted, would in my opinion be detrimental to the security of our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the time yielded to the Senator from Texas has expired, the Senator from Georgia has remaining 1 minute; the Senator from Connecticut, 2 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the 1 minute, I merely wish to observe, in answer to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that, if the Senate should adopt this amendment, it would not mean that we must have 5,000,000 men in the armed services. We could not have them without the armed services coming before the Congress and the Appropriations Committees to obtain funds for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In fact, does this not give to those who believe that there is need of it as a matter of principle, assurance that Congress would retain control of the ceiling and that it does not set the minimum size of the Army, which is still within the constitutional appropriating power of the Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, believing that 5,000,000, while I do not approve of any ceiling, is infinitely better than the 3,500,000 which is proposed in the amendment, which I regard as being potentially disastrous to the United States, I shall vote for the substitution of the 5,000,000 for the 3,500,000, when the vote is taken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield any time to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the amendment offered to the Morse amendment should be rejected, would the Capehart amendment, as proposed, or as the Senator from Indiana will offer it, be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it could be offered as a separate proposal, not related to the pending amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I surrender the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness, and is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—32

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Holland | Magnuson |
| Benton | Humphrey | Maybank |
| Chapman | Hunt | Monroney |
| Connally | Johnson, Tex. | Nixon |
| Douglas | Kefauver | O'Mahoney |
| Duff | Kerr | Pastore |
| Fulbright | Knowland | Russell |
| Gillette | Lehman | Smathers |
| Green | Long | Sparkman |
| Hayden | McFarland | Stennis |
| Hill | McMahon | |

NAYS—56

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Frear | Mundt |
| Bennett | George | Neely |
| Brewster | Hendrickson | O'Conor |
| Bricker | Hickenlooper | Robertson |
| Bridges | Hoey | Saltonstall |
| Butler, Md. | Ives | Schoeppel |
| Butler, Nebr. | Jenner | Smith, Maine |
| Byrd | Johnson, Colo. | Smith, N. J. |
| Cain | Johnston, S. C. | Smith, N. C. |
| Capehart | Kem | Taft |
| Carlson | Kilgore | Thye |
| Case | Langer | Tobey |
| Chavez | Lodge | Watkins |
| Cordon | McCarran | Welker |
| Dirksen | McClellan | Wherry |
| Dworshak | McKellar | Wiley |
| Ecton | Martin | Williams |
| Ellender | Millikin | Young |
| Ferguson | Morse | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clements | Hennings | Murray |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Vandenberg |
| Flanders | Malone | |

So Mr. MCMAHON's amendment to Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment. I move that the figure "3,500,000" in the pending amendment, as modified, be stricken out and the figure "4,000,000" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "3,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "4,000,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have several inquiries. First I should like to inquire whether the amendment to my amendment is in order, in view of the fact that the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday required that amendments be submitted prior to 1:30 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is mistaken. Under the rule the amendment is in order.

The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I deem it to be unnecessary to detain the Senate for any extended debate on my amendment. The membership is familiar with what is involved. The majority of us have indicated that we thought a limitation of 5,000,000 was not very realistic. In other words, from our standpoint it was too high. It has been brought out in debate that if we fix the limit at three and a half million it may give our military leaders a leeway of only 38,000 men. Many Senators feel such a limit would be too drastic a restriction. The legislative intent has already been made crystal clear, namely, that this would not be final action by the Congress. This would be a temporary peace time, let us hope, restriction upon the number of men we may have in the Defense Department and upon the demands that may be made upon our economy. Therefore, I hope that my colleagues will unite with me in voting for the compromise proposal.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. The Senator's amendment would provide a margin or a leeway of over 500,000 men in the Armed Forces beyond what the military authorities have established before the Committee on Armed Services as the limitation of its present plans?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Virginia such a number is ample.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield further.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I should like to make an observation. I opposed the amendment which was defeated a few moments ago, because I think that whenever it becomes necessary to have 5,000,000 men in our military forces, the time has come for all limits to be taken off, and for an all-out preparation. I believe it to be the duty of Congress in the twilight zone in which we now find ourselves, between peace and actual war, to place some limit on our Armed Forces, in the hope that if the situation clears up we shall not have overextended unnecessarily the resources of the Nation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with my distinguished colleague. It is the recollection of the Senator from Virginia that we had only 4,000,000 men in our Armed Forces in World War I, which was an all-out war. I fully agree with the Senator from Arkansas when he says that if we are to have a limit of 5,000,000 men, we might as well have no limit at all. If we do not face, as I hope we do not, any immediate threat of an all-out war, it seems to me that if we give the Armed Forces a leeway of a little more than a half million men more than they have indicated to the Committee on Armed Services they expect this year, it will be sufficient at this time.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. In order that we may have clearly stated on the RECORD the intention of the author of the substitute, may I ask whether he means that the 4,000,000 figure should be a maximum, and that it would be possible to have a lesser number?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course; that is correct. I hope it will not be necessary to reach the figure of 3,462,000, which is the figure the military have indicated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not intend the figure to be an invitation to the military to increase the Armed Forces to 4,000,000 men, does he?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely no. The amendment is offered in the spirit of not wanting to create the psychological impression that we are not serious about the situation. We are serious. We do not want to give the military any more men than are absolutely needed; but we are willing to give them some leeway for any contingency which may suddenly occur, concerning which we are not advised at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I shall oppose the amendment, because I am afraid the military would take it as an invitation to go to 4,000,000. However, I am glad to have on the RECORD the Senator's statement that it is not intended as such an invitation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the very definite opinion of the author of the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I understood the answer of the Senator from Virginia to the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Virginia agreed that the national-defense authorities had asked for 3,462,000. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Three million four hundred and sixty-two thousand is the latest figure. The Senator from Ohio says that in recent months they have raised the figure several times. I am not familiar with that fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Nevertheless, they have not asked for 4,000,000?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They have not asked for more than 3,462,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia should be agreed to it would give the military an opportunity to raise the figure to 4,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would give them the privilege of doing so. However, it is not my intention that they do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Being especially concerned with the raising of revenue, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia how much it

would cost to maintain a military establishment of 4,000,000 men.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia is no longer a member of the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Armed Services, but he believes we will have a military budget of approximately $50,000,000,000, whether his amendment is adopted or the amendment fixing the figure at 3,500,000 is adopted. I do not think it would make a great deal of difference in the actual expense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Since I asked the same kind of question of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], I have been advised that it has been estimated it would cost about $13,000 per man a year, which would place the total figure in the neighborhood of the figure which the Senator has been discussing, namely, $52,000,000,000. That is an indication of what we are faced with.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his fairness.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that my fairness did not pay off very well in the last vote.

Mr. MORSE. I nevertheless thank the Senator from Georgia. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon that we should have a vote on the 3,500,000 figure. The defeat of the Robertson amendment would permit a vote on my amendment proposing the figure 3,500,000. The Parliamentarian tells me that thereafter it would be in order to offer an amendment for any figure differing from the figure offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], be it only a difference of one.

We have had a clash of opinion on the issue as to whether or not a ceiling of 3,500,000 should be fixed on the basis of the figures of the military, and I think the Senate ought to be willing to come to a vote on it.

As to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, he has repeated what has been previously stated on the floor of the Senate, that 3,500,000 would give the military a cushion of only some 38,000. I do not know where he gets that figure. I do not know on what basis he presents the figure. Here are the statistical facts:

At the present time we have a military establishment of between 2,500,000 and 2,600,000. The Pentagon officials cannot give us the exact figure, but it is somewhere in that neighborhood. As I have previously stated, it will require many months to get up to 3,500,000. In view of these facts, I am at a loss to understand the statement that we would have a cushion of only 38,000 men if my amendment were adopted.

It has also been stated on the floor of the Senate that such a limitation would create great difficulties for the National Guard. As I stated in my earlier speech today, the National Guard legal authorities have advised me this morning—and I do not think it is subject to dispute, if anyone will read the United States Code, that in case of emergency the President of the United States has the authority to call out the militia to meet the emergency, irrespective of any ceiling. That has been the interpretation of the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I shall not yield.

As I say, for years that has been the interpretation of section 81 (a) of title 32 of the United States Code.

Mr. President, if we adopt a ceiling of 4,000,000, we again confuse and contradict all the representations which have been made by the military themselves on the basis of 3,500,000 for the months immediately ahead, both as to manpower and as to budgetary requests.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot yield under the time limitation.

Time will be available to the military, in those months, if world conditions change, to come to Congress and ask for 4,000,000, 4,500,000, or 5,000,000, or whatever number the facts may then warrant.

We have a very simple issue before us. Are we going to take the military at their word, on the basis of the figures they have presented, which they say will meet their needs for the immediate future? When that time period passes, then I think we should consider whether we want to raise the ceiling. If in the intervening time they have evidence which would justify raising the ceiling, then will be the time to consider raising it. But if we give them the additional 500,000 men proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I am very fearful, knowing the military behavior patterns as they have been demonstrated both to the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees in the past, that they will proceed at once to cut their cloth for 4,000,000 rather than for 3,500,000.

We would also defeat the second purpose of my amendment—if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]—which is that we must prevail on the military to inaugurate some manpower savings in their operations. I am satisfied that they can do it and relieve between 300,000 and 500,000 men for combat duty. I think they are guilty of wasting at least that many.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have made my case, and I am perfectly willing to stand on the record. I close by asking, Do we want a check in fact, or do we want to give the military more than they have asked for, more than they have substantiated by way of any proof? Do we want to say to the military, "Under our constitutional system we stand ready and willing to let you show cause for an increase in manpower as you need it"? That is the issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Oregon raises an interesting question. If this amendment should be voted down, and then the three-and-one-half-million proposal should be voted down, would it be in order for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to reoffer his amendment providing for 4,000,000, as he has stated his intention of doing?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the pending amendment should be voted down, the status would be the same as before the amendment was offered, and any amendment would be in order.

Mr. TAFT. Would any amendment be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; because it would be an amendment to the bill and not to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, any other figure, such as 4,000,001, would be in order on this amendment, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator state the question again?

Mr. WHERRY. If the figure were different—for example, 4,000,001—it would be in order on this amendment, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order, after this amendment is disposed of. But if the pending amendment is agreed to, then the matter is closed so far as the number is concerned; or if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon were agreed to, no further amendment would then be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. My parliamentary inquiry related to other amendments being offered if the 4,000,000 proposal is defeated. In that event, of course, a figure of 4,000,001 would be in order, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Are we to understand the Chair to rule that if the amendment placing an over-all limitation of 4,000,000 is voted down, and then the Morse amendment for three and one-half million is voted down, the Senate will be privileged to vote again on the same amendment it has already defeated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There would have to be a change in the figure. The Senate could not vote again on the identical amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was the understanding of the Senator from Virginia, namely, that another vote could not be had on the same exact amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot let this vote be had without entering in the RECORD my disagreement with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon with respect to the National Guard. There is no question on earth as to the constitutional power of the President of the United States to call out the militia to suppress insurrection and resist invasion; but if this amendment be adopted he cannot integrate a National Guard unit into the Army of the United States if the ceiling of 3,500,000 is thereby exceeded. He could not give them training, and he could not fill up the ranks of a guard unit with draftees, as it is now necessary to do. Therefore, that statement is misleading, and the statement which I made yesterday stands, that if we impose a ceiling of three and a half million men, the President of the United States cannot call out more than 38,000 National Guardsmen and their supporting units.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am merely stating my opinion. The Senator has stated his. My time is very limited. I cannot yield unless the Senator wishes to take issue with me on the statement. Our respective statements stand in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will read the statute he will see that it contains the language "to execute such laws."

Mr. RUSSELL. I have read it. It deals with putting down insurrection and with maintaining peace within the confines of a community. However, the President cannot fill up the ranks of the National Guard, and cannot make a division of it. This is part of the whole policy of defending the Nation without making any real sacrifice. It is all a part of that pattern. Senators hope to protect the Nation with unpaid and untrained militia. Paper plans, unarmed and untrained men and half-baked legislation will never give us the defense we need and deserve.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I cannot, because I have only 4 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. I did not understand what the Senator was driving at.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was taking the position that if the limitation of three and one-half million men were imposed, in the event of an emergency it would be necessary for the Congress to take action before the President of the United States could call out more than 38,000 National Guardsmen. That is the point I was making.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret——

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator mean if the ceiling is imposed, or if the military reaches the ceiling?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct in his assumption about reaching the ceiling. The figures speak for themselves. I have seen the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the Committee on Appropriations. I know that he is making an argument and not seeking enlightenment for himself. I have seen him figure too rapidly in the Committee on Appropriations to believe that he does not know how the figures are arrived at.

Mr. President, this is a rather sad moment for me. I had hoped we would be able to organize the defenses of the free nations of the earth to such an extent that war could be avoided, or if ever war should come—which God forbid—that we would have the power in being to beat back any Communist forces, whether from China, from Russia, or the satellites, that might be brought against us. Yet today we hear it said that it is necessary to put a blind bridle on the miltiary; that we must have a check upon the military.

There has been expression of lack of confidence in the military. I have stated my views that that was not deserved as to these men, but my views do not appeal to some Senators because they continue to express themselves here. I say, however, it is extremely unfortunate in a time when we are asking the free nations of the earth, particularly the peoples of Western Europe who are living under the guns of communism, to have confidence in our military, to have the Senate of the United States give them a vote of no confidence, say that they must be put in a strait-jacket, and must be dressed up with a blind bridle in order to keep them from destroying the country all of them have served so well and to which they have dedicated their lives. So I have a feeling of sadness in this hour.

Mr. President, I think any limitation is bad. I believe a limitation now as tight as 3,500,000 men is almost criminal. It puts the armed services in a strait-jacket. It puts our potential enemies on notice that is all the men we are going to have trained and ready, and therefore our enemies can train a great many more men than we can. They already have the advantage of being able to choose the time and place and at whom they will strike.

I know that the figure 3,500,000 is worse than the figure 4,000,000; therefore, I shall vote for the amendment providing the 4,000,000 figure, because I shall have the opportunity to vote against any limitation whatever when an amendment making such provision comes up for action.

Mr. President, I am under no illusion respecting this matter. Senators have a right to express their views, but I am expressing my own view, and I hope that Senators who believe in the best possible defense of the United States will vote against the 3,500,000 figure by supporting the amendment providing for 4,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has stated that he is against limitations, and that those who are against the figure of 5,000,000 are against setting any limitations whatsoever. I am against any limitations.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the amendment providing for a 4,000,000-man limitation is adopted, the Senator will still have an opportunity to vote for no limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. All time on the amendment to the amendment has expired. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness and is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—49

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Holland | Maybank |
| Benton | Humphrey | Monroney |
| Byrd | Hunt | Nixon |
| Capehart | Ives | O'Conor |
| Case | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | Pastore |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Douglas | Kefauver | Russell |
| Duff | Kerr | Smathers |
| Frear | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Fulbright | Lehman | Smith, N. C. |
| Gillette | Lodge | Sparkman |
| Green | Long | Stennis |
| Hayden | McClellan | Thye |
| Hennings | McFarland | Tobey |
| Hill | McMahon | |
| Hoey | Magnuson | |

NAYS—41

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ellender | Morse |
| Bennett | Ferguson | Mundt |
| Brewster | George | Neely |
| Bricker | Hendrickson | Saltonstall |
| Bridges | Hickenlooper | Schoeppel |
| Butler, Md. | Jenner | Smith, Maine |
| Butler, Nebr. | Kem | Taft |
| Cain | Knowland | Watkins |
| Carlson | Langer | Welker |
| Chavez | McCarran | Wherry |
| Cordon | McKellar | Wiley |
| Dirksen | Malone | Williams |
| Dworshak | Martin | Young |
| Ecton | Millikin | |

NOT VOTING—6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clements | Flanders | Murray |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Vandenberg |

So Mr. ROBERTSON's amendment to Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon as amended.

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and

nays; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the case of one who voted for a 5,000,000 limitation because it is better than a 3,500,000 limition, and voted for a 4,000,000 limitation because that is better than a 3,500,000 limitation, is it in order to vote against any limitation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order for any Senator to vote as he pleases on anything. [Laughter.]

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness, and is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—49

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | O'Mahoney |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | Robertson |
| Brewster | Ives | Schoeppel |
| Bricker | Jenner | Smith, Maine |
| Butler, Md. | Johnson, Colo. | Smith, N. J. |
| Butler, Nebr. | Johnston, S. C. | Smith, N. C. |
| Byrd | Kem | Taft |
| Capehart | Langer | Thye |
| Carlson | McCarran | Tobey |
| Case | McClellan | Watkins |
| Cordon | McMahon | Welker |
| Dirksen | Malone | Wherry |
| Dworshak | Martin | Wiley |
| Ecton | Millikin | Williams |
| Ferguson | Morse | Young |
| Frear | Mundt | |
| George | O'Conor | |

NAYS—41

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hennings | McFarland |
| Benton | Hill | McKellar |
| Bridges | Hoey | Magnuson |
| Cain | Holland | Maybank |
| Chapman | Humphrey | Monroney |
| Chavez | Hunt | Neely |
| Connally | Johnson, Tex. | Nixon |
| Douglas | Kefauver | Pastore |
| Duff | Kerr | Russell |
| Ellender | Kilgore | Saltonstall |
| Fulbright | Knowland | Smathers |
| Gillette | Lehman | Sparkman |
| Green | Lodge | Stennis |
| Hayden | Long | |

NOT VOTING—6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clements | Flanders | Murray |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Vandenberg |

So Mr. MORSE's amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. I desire to call up my amendment of February 28, lettered "B."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The amendment proposed by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. PASTORE) to the bill (S. 1) was read by the Chief Clerk as follows:

SEC. 22. Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "man of the Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "person of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard,".

## ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PROGRAM FOR THE SENATE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an announcement?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arizona for the purpose of an announcement, without losing my place on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, 2 days ago I announced that we would outline a legislative program which, if completed in time, would make possible a short Easter recess. I submitted such a program to the majority policy committee yesterday. Following discussion, it was suggested that if we could complete consideration of the following measures it would be possible for the Senate to take a brief recess, in order that Senators might have an opportunity to catch up on their committee work and the work in their offices and elsewhere. It seems desirable that the program agreed upon, which I have also submitted to the minority leader, be made known now. Of course, any program such as this, would have to be agreeable to Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I shall outline it briefly. As soon as we finish the bill which we now have under consideration, it is proposed that we shall call the calendar of unobjected to bills, which consists now of 72 bills; that we then take up Senate bill 728, which is the McCarran bill to amend the Subversive Control Act of 1950 to clarify rules and regulations to permit entry into the United States of certain persons who were involuntary members of proscribed organizations; that we then take up Senate Joint Resolution 39, the purpose of which is to continue for 3 months, until June 30, 1951, the Federal Rent Control Act, which expires March 31; and that we then dispose of the question of sending troops to Europe.

Mr. President, I know this is an ambitious program, but I feel sure we can accomplish it if we all try. If we can complete consideration of the pending bill tonight, we can call the calendar tomorrow, or perhaps Friday, and we can then dispose of S. 728 and possibly the rent-control measure this week. That would leave almost 2 weeks for debate upon the proposition of sending troops to Europe. The schedule outlined simply depends upon whether Senators would like to do this work and get away for a short recess. I make the announcement so that the objective will be clear and I am hopeful that we may be able to accomplish and complete this program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator state approximately the dates between which he would suggest that the Easter recess take place?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. If we can complete this program by the evening of the 22d of this month, I think we should then have earned a recess until April 2.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator, if I may, that I think he is thoughtful in suggesting the program. However, when we think of Washington summers and the necessity of our remaining in Washington, month in and month out, as we have done in recent years, I think it would be more to the point if we were to continue in session, to see if we could complete the duties of this session at an earlier date, so that when we recess it may be for a substantial length of time.

I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the distinguished majority leader, and I think he is making the announcement very sincerely, but I believe the practical approach is the one I have suggested.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will yield in a moment. May I first reply to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire? I do not think that this program, if we can complete it, would delay the final adjournment of the Senate. On the contrary, it should result in a gain of time. I agree with the distinguished Senator that we want to get away in the summer, and, in my opinion, I think a short recess will assist us in doing so.

It is an ambitious program, I admit, but, Mr. President, I think that, without overworking, Senators can complete it and leave themselves time to catch up on work in their offices and attend to other necessary matters.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There are two or three questions I should like to ask the majority leader. First, does he intend to take up the bills referred to in the order in which he has listed them?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope we can do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Second, is it the intention of the majority leader, if this program is carried out, to ask for night sessions? I am not asking the Senator to disclose his program altogether, but, on the other hand, if we are to have night sessions, I think that, as we consider this program, we should know what is in the mind of the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is very difficult to announce what we are going to do about night sessions. It is necessary that we take into consideration what the Members of the Senate want to do. When Senators get ready to quit, and when they walk out on us, we might as well quit.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the desire of the majority leader, however, that, in order to complete this program by March 22, there be night sessions, if necessary?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my desire. Speeches, of which there are always a certain number, not germane to discussions of bills under consideration, especially could be made in the evenings, when we were not considering bills.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it the intention of the majority leader to have a night session tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I think that if we can complete action on the pending bill this evening we will be well on our way toward completing the proposed program.

Mr. WHERRY. We should know what the minority is to understand if we are to carry out the program outlined. The program is an ambitious one, but the Senator will have the cooperation of the minority. It is the intention of the majority leader to announce in advance what his plans are, and it is with that understanding, if we are to comply, that we assent to night sessions, if necessary, and that the bills shall be taken up in the order in which the Senator has stated them. If at the end of the evening of Thursday the 22d the program has been concluded, there will be a vacation for approximately a full week, I understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will really cover 10 days, but actually only one workweek, because the Senate never works on Good Friday anyway.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for answering the questions, because we now know what his proposal is. The program is in charge of the majority leader, and it is for the majority leader to set the stage. I will say now that, regardless of what the action on the pending bill may be, we will cooperate with the majority leader to the very best of our ability.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not desire to propose anything not agreeable to the minority. The membership on the two sides is very close, and I feel that the conditions in the country demand that we cooperate to the fullest extent. I appreciate the cooperation we have had thus far. There are also some noncontroversial bills which might be taken up during the period we have been discussing.

Mr. WHERRY. Night sessions usually do not produce the result intended, and I say to the majority leader, with the assurance that we desire to give full cooperation, that I hope a program can be planned so there will not be night sessions. I believe we will accomplish more under such a program than if night sessions are held.

Mr. McFARLAND. If we get through with the program I have outlined, it is likely very few night sessions will be necessary.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York desires to compliment the majority leader for the way in which he is handling the difficult situation now presented. Certainly all the measures to which he has referred must be taken care of before we leave for any length of time. Has the majority leader given any thought to getting a unanimous consent agreement on the bill now pending so that we will not perhaps have to remain in session so long tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall have to determine that a little later. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] states that he is willing to have a limitation of debate on his amendment, and that is probably the amendment which will take the most time. I believe we have disposed of most of the controversial amendments.

## RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I apprehend that there will be no long controversy over any conference reports, but I presume the Senator from Arizona will permit us to bring up conference reports.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, it is always in order to submit a conference report.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that, but I think it is highly important that the conference report on the measure providing for the renegotiation of contracts be disposed of, both for the information of the procurement officers of the various services, and for the information of the contractors.

I ask permission out of order to submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes, so that it may be printed, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table. I shall ask later that it be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD.

(For conference report see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 2177–2180.)

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal-training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment B.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been stated.

Mr. LEHMAN. Subsequent to the offering of the amendment, which is sponsored by eight Senators, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] indicated their willingness to be associated in sponsoring the proposal. I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be included as sponsors of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is as simple as its language. Its only effect is to amend that section of the Penal Code—(title 18, sec. 1114), which makes it a Federal offense to kill, assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with Federal officers in the performance of their duty or to assault or kill them on account of the performance of their duty.

The legislative history of this section is a very long one, going back to very early times. It has long been felt necessary to protect Federal officers by Federal law in the performance of their duty and in actions taken on account of the performance of their duty.

As far as members of the Armed Forces are concerned, the Congress passed a law, away back in 1863, making it a Federal offense to attack or obstruct officers or personnel of the Provost Marshall's Department who were charged with enforcing the draft law. Section 1114 of the Penal Code, which is here proposed to be amended, already, as it stands today, includes officers and men of the Coast Guard among the Federal officers protected against violence or obstruction by Federal law.

Legislative history shows further that the list of Federal officers protected by Federal law has been steadily expanded through the years so that it now includes judges, United States attorneys, United States marshals, deputy marshals, post-office inspectors, secret-service operatives, employees of United States penal institutions, customs inspectors, immigration inspectors, forest rangers, game wardens, and many, many others.

What is proposed in the amendment is the extension of this protection of Federal law to all members of the Armed Forces. As I have said, this proposal is by no means a radical innovation. It is not a proposal to provide special protection to any particular group in the Armed Forces. It is designed to protect by Federal law every member of the United States Armed Forces—our sons and daughters—against violence or obstruction while in this country and while engaged in the performance of duty; it would protect them from violent reprisal on account of the performance of their duty.

Practically identical legislation was recommended to the Congress by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson in a letter to the Military Affairs Committee and by Attorney General Francis Biddle in a communication to the Judiciary Committee, in June 1943. The bill making this provision was favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on January 17, 1944, and was unanimously approved by the Senate on February 15, 1944. The chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee which considered the bill, who reported it, was the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], now the distinguished majority leader of this body. The bill was not acted on by the House at that time. Hence, it did not become law.

The amendment to S. 1 now pending is virtually identical with the bill considered and unanimously approved by the Senate 6 years ago. The situation today, and the requirements of that situation, calls even more demandingly for this kind of legislation than the situation 7 years ago.

Today again we are drafting vast numbers of our youths to serve their country, to insure the security of their country and of the free world. In the pending legislation, we are calling up for military service all youths reaching the age of 18. It is proposed—and I support the proposal—to call our sons out of high school and out of college, just at the threshold of manhood, to put on the uniform of their country, to be gathered in training camps, scattered over the length and breadth of this country. These boys, in many cases, will be assigned to camps, stations, and training centers in areas and near civilian communities of varying and unpredictable local custom, practice, and prejudice.

For their part, many of the civilian communities in or near these camps, stations, and airfields are suddenly having thrust into their vicinity a tremendous number of men—I should say boys—in uniform.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to know what the situation would be with reference to a case I have in mind. If an enlisted man who is home on furlough commits a crime or a misdemeanor, would he be tried in a Federal court?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly he would not be tried in a Federal court. My amendment would not cover such a man. My amendment would cover a man in the armed services while engaged in the performance of his military duty. It would protect him from an attack growing out of his performance of a military duty. It would not cover a man when not on such duty.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator uses the word "duty." Would the amendment cover the scope of a man's employment while in the armed services?

Mr. LEHMAN. It would cover the scope of his employment in the military service. It would also protect him against reprisals and from attacks because he had performed his military duty. It would not protect him in any other way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose that in the performance of his duties a man while off a military reservation commits a tort or crime. Would he be protected from suit, for example?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; it would not protect him against civil suits at all. The amendment covers penal offenses.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us say that he commits a crime. Would the State have jurisdiction over him in such a case?

Mr. LEHMAN. The only way such a man would be protected would be if he were performing his duty in connection with his service in the Armed Forces. It would also protect him against reprisals or attacks on him because of his performance of his military duty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose he is a member of the Armed Forces and is working in the Pentagon Building, and suppose he negligently and willfully kills someone while he is driving his automobile. Would the State law apply to him, and could he be tried in a State court for manslaughter?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, he could be tried in a State court.

Mr. FERGUSON. I fail to understand what the effect of the amendment would be.

Mr. LEHMAN. The intention is to protect him against violence. The purpose is to protect him from attack. It would protect him from being killed, wounded, or maimed. Such an attack upon him or such injury to him would become a penal offense, subject to Federal law, and would be tried in a Federal court. The amendment would not protect him in any other way. All it would do would be to say that the man who attacked him would become subject to Federal law. The amendment would not in any way protect an individual from any action at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand if someone commits an assault or an assault and battery upon a man while he is in the Armed Forces, even though he is not on a military reservation, that only a Federal court would have jurisdiction in such as assault or assault and battery?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I think the distinguished Senator from Michigan is misunderstanding the effect of the amendment. I thought I had made it clear that it would cover a man only in the performance of his duty. If a man were sent by his commanding officer to community X, let us say, to deliver a message or to perform some act in connection with his military duties, and if he were attacked under such conditions, the man who had attacked him would make himself liable under Federal law. However, if the man were off the reservation, on furlough, or if he was simply walking along a street, and was not engaged in the performance of his military duties, the laws of the State would apply. The offense against him would of necessity have to be confined to the performance of his duties in the military service, and would protect him against any attack or reprisal for such duty previously performed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. If a man had previously, in the performance of his duty, excited someone to act against him and the act was not committed against him until he was off duty, such act committed against him while he was off duty would be punishable under Federal law and not under State law. Is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. For instance, if a member of the military police arrested a man in the performance of his duties, and such arrest caused resentment or prejudice against the military policeman and he was later attacked by a mob or by some persons because he had made the arrest, the person or persons who attacked him would be liable to Federal law.

Mr. SMATHERS. The amendment actually seeks, does it not, to take away the jurisdiction of the State in such a case and give it to the Federal Government?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly; in exactly the same way as jurisdiction is taken away from States in connection with the protection of many classes of servants and employees of the United States Government, which I have enumerated. I should be glad to read them again if the Senator desires.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. This sudden influx strains community facilities, and often disrupts the tenor of local life. These youths, coming from every corner of America, of diverse religious, social, economic, national, and racial strains—that great and blessed variety which is America—sometimes appear strange and alien in American communities of closely-knit racial, national, and religious patterns.

This situation is tailor-made for provocation, for violent incidents, and even for tragedy. This situation is not the primary responsibility of the locality. It is the responsibility of the United States Government. The needs of the Nation have imposed these strains and burdens on the localities. The needs of the Nation have exposed, are exposing, and will expose our sons to these dangers.

This, then, calls for national action, for Federal action to protect, as far as possible, the members of the Armed Forces, and to relieve, as far as possible, the primary responsibility of the community for the apprehension and punishment of civilians guilty of wilful violence or intimidation against members of the Armed Forces while engaged in the performance of duty.

It is to be emphasized that the protection afforded by this amendment extends to the members of the Armed Forces, as to other Federal officers under section 1114 of the Penal Code, only in the course of the performance of duty and on account of the performance of duty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the light of the statement which the Senator has made I get the impression that if members of the Armed Forces were on leave or furlough from attendance at camp or reservation and went to town, and there got into a scrape or some difficulty, only the Federal court would have jurisdiction over them.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not quite clear to me why the distinguished Senator from Iowa should get such an impression. I have emphasized that section 1114 of the Penal Code would be invoked only in the course of the performance of duty and on account of the performance of duty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to pose a question to the Senator. The principle runs through all the Armed Forces. It is true, as a general, broad statement, that a member of the Armed Forces who is injured, regardless of where he is, so long as he is within the Armed Forces, whether he be on leave or on a pass to go to town, or on the way to a movie, or whether he be drilling with guns or equipment—if he is without fault himself, that is, if he is not doing something that is violently opposed to Army regulations, he is always considered to be in line of duty. He is considered to be performing the duties of the Armed Forces contingent to which he belongs.

I may be mistaken, but so far as the language, as I understand it, is concerned, and so far as the statement of the Senator is concerned, I have no doubt that as the Senator proposes this amendment it would extend complete Federal jurisdiction over all the actions of the Armed Forces at all times during the period of their enlistment, except during the time when a man might be doing some of the things proscribed by Army regulations. I raise the question as to whether or not the Senator's amendment is venturing completely into that field.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is nothing in my amendment which would indicate that to be the case. After all, no one can tell what interpretation the courts may place upon a particular situation. To me the language is perfectly clear as extending only to attacks made on the man while he is on duty, and performing his duty. Certainly if a boy is off having a good time, or if he goes home on furlough, he is not performing his duty, although he is still in the Armed Forces.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield for another question, I submit that the soldier is performing his duty when he is off on furlough. He is performing his duty under Army regulations. He can be retired because of injuries suffered while he is properly on leave or on furlough. He is given the benefit of being considered in line of duty, except in cases where he is in wilfull violation of some criminal statute contained in the Army regulations. So he is performing duty.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will say to the distinguished Senator that such a man is certainly in the Armed Forces; but when he is on furlough or when he is at some party, he certainly is not performing the duties of his military service. He is still, of course, in the military service, but there is nothing in the context of this law which would indicate that at all. I read paragraph 111 of chapter 7 of title 18 of the penal law:

> Whoever forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any person designated in section 1114 of this title while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 3 years, or both.
>
> Whoever, in the commission of any such acts uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

That makes it very clear. The language is "while engaged in or on account of his official duty."

I ask the Senator from Iowa to listen to this explanation. I will read the language for the benefit of other Members of the Senate, even though the Senator from Iowa may not be listening.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I am listening to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I read the language: "while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duty."

I think it is certainly a very strained interpretation to believe that a man away from his camp or station, on furlough or otherwise, could be construed as performing his official duties.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator would mind giving the junior Senator from Florida a little background on this question: What is the purpose of the amendment? How does the question arise? What is the matter with the present law dealing with this situation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall develop that as I go along.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. What would happen under this amendment if a man in camp simply had a controversy with two or three other men? What would happen to him?

Mr. LEHMAN. If he were attacked?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should think that would come under the Federal jurisdiction, if he were performing his duties.

Mr. GEORGE. What would become of the court-martial procedure?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know what the punishment would be. The punishment might be inflicted after a court martial. I assume, under those circumstances, that there might be a court-martial proceeding.

Mr. GEORGE. Would not the Senator's amendment make such a thing a Federal offense?

Mr. LEHMAN. But a court martial is a Federal procedure.

Mr. GEORGE. That is a part of the Army regulatory method of dealing with crimes and misdemeanors. I am curious to know what would happen if five or six dozen men in a camp were to fall out and have a general riot. Would the Senator try them in a Federal court?

Mr. LEHMAN. If there were a general riot against a man in uniform?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I would. I would certainly try to punish the rioters. If a member of the Armed Forces were attacked in the performance of his duty, or because of the performance of his duty, I certainly would. It is quite possible that the Senator from Georgia disagrees with me.

Mr. GEORGE. It is quite possible, because this entire statute was intended to protect someone in an official position, in the discharge of an official function. Therefore, it is a part of the function of the state. Here we are considering the case of a group of men who are brought into the armed services. Half a dozen of them do not like the way some other member of the Armed Forces is walking on guard duty, and they have a fight over it. Would the Senator make a criminal offense of that?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly this amendment would not supersede military law.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I am asking the Senator. Why would it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think it would. I believe that the men within the camp would probably be subject to court martial, which is a part of the procedure under military law.

Mr. GEORGE. But suppose a man did not like the remedy he was given and was not satisfied with what the court martial did to the crowd which beat him up. Let us assume that they beat him up because they did not like the color of his hair, or the way he walked, or talked, or something else. Would the Senator allow him to go into Federal court, and disorganize and disrupt the Army with a proceeding of that kind?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that if a man in camp were attacked in the performance of his duty, I should think that the higher military authorities would be very derelict in their duty if they did not punish those who attacked him.

Mr. GEORGE. I should assume so; but the Senator is creating another jurisdiction. He is creating another offense. He is taking the situation out of the hands of the military, and making a certain action a Federal offense.

Mr. LEHMAN. A court martial is a Federal procedure. It involves punishment inflicted by Federal authority.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that. However, the statute which the Senator seeks to amend is a statute primarily intended to protect an official who is performing a part of the function of the State or sovereign against any unnecessary impediment or attack or assault on that account. It seems to me that we would be getting into all sorts of confusion if we undertook to apply that statute to the case of several thousand or several million men in military camps. We had better let it alone.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think we are getting into confusion at all. Does not the distinguished Senator from Georgia

feel that the United States Government, having called young men into the service of their country, has a duty to protect them from attack while in the performance of their duties?

Mr. GEORGE. I presume the United States Government will protect them, but that it will do so through court-martial proceedings. The military have military police and court-martial proceedings.

Mr. LEHMAN. How can the military court-martial a man who is not in the military service, and who attacks a man who is in the military service.

Mr. GEORGE. I was not asking about that. I was asking the Senator about a man in the military service who has a controversy, a dispute, a fight, let us say, with two or three of his comrades on the military reservation.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not sure about that. I would rather believe that the military laws would not be superseded under any circumstances, and that if a man in the military service should attack another man in the military service he would be court-martialed. But certainly that would not protect the man in the military service who, while walking along the road is attacked by civilians, over whom the Army has no control whatsoever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not merely the purpose of the Senator from New York and the other sponsors to provide the protection of the Federal law in case of attacks upon men in the armed services which are committed off military premises by civilians? Is it not better to do this rather than for men who are in national uniform to be subjected to local law and local decisions, which in some cases might be prejudiced against the particular persons who wear the uniform of their country? Is it not the purpose to provide that if men are called to offer their lives for their country they should at least be protected from assault when they are walking the streets outside a military reservation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his question. That is exactly the purpose of the amendment. I think there is no adequate protection provided at the present time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. There are military personnel in the home State of the Senator, are there not?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator say to this body that there are not adequate laws in the great State of New York to protect men who may be upon the streets from assault by citizens of the State represented by the Senator?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that if he will bear with me a little longer I shall come to that point in my speech. I go into that matter in my speech in respect to my own beloved State of New York.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator then decline to answer the question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall answer the Senator by reading a part of the remainder of my speech covering that point. I think I will satisfy the Senator that I am not excepting the State of New York.

Mr. KERR. Did I understand the Senator from New York to say that there are not now adequate laws in the various States to protect the bodies or the lives of men who may happen to be in the uniform of their country, and upon military reservations in those States?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; the Senator from New York does not claim that.

Mr. KERR. Is not that the statement the Senator just made?

Mr. LEHMAN. No. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KERR. I ask the Official Reporter to read what the Senator just said.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to have that done. May I explain what I said, or believe I said? If I said something different I shall be glad to correct it. There are adequate laws in every State. What I am quarreling with is the enforcement of the laws in many States.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from New York say what State he has reference to?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have reference to many States, including my own State.

Mr. KERR. The Senator then is saying that in the State of New York the machinery in that State is not adequate to protect the persons and lives of the men in the military service who happen to be assigned to service in his State? Is that the position the Senator takes?

Mr. LEHMAN. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma cannot put words into my mouth.

Mr. KERR. I am not putting words into the Senator's mouth.

Mr. LEHMAN. I myself will put words in my mouth.

Mr. KERR. I am asking the Senator from New York if that is the gist of his statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have already answered that there are adequate laws in all States, but not adequate enforcement of laws.

Mr. KERR. Including the State of New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I told the Senator from Oklahoma I was going to refer to that point later in my speech, and if the distinguished Senator will bear with me I can assure him that I will get to that point in due course.

Mr. KERR. I just ask the Senator to confirm——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I yield. First, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, for whom I have a very high regard, that I believe I have answered his question 16 or 18 times in the last 5 minutes. Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KERR. I will say I was so shocked to hear the Senator say that what he referred to was true in the State of New York, that in order that I might be certain of it, I only asked him to repeat it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has it not been the purpose of the Senator from New York to discuss this matter as a general issue, and has not the Senator been extremely careful not to make any reflection upon any individual State, because he knows that that might rouse sectional pride and passion? Furthermore, his desire for harmony and mutual good will, has he not gone to the extent of admitting that there might be defects in the administration of law in certain northern sections of the country, and carefully refrained from making any reflection upon the practice in other sections? I think it is somewhat unfair to turn the thumbscrews upon him when he has demonstrated his forgiveness and kindness in these matters, and has refused to bring up any sectional issues.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. I ask if the Senator from Illinois was referring to the Senator from Oklahoma when he said he was eminently unfair in putting the screws to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, may I withdraw that and substitute for it an opinion that he pressed the point a little too far?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York may say to the Senator from Illinois that not only has he been meticulously careful not to mention any particular State or locality; but he has also been meticulously careful not to bring into the debate the issue of race, or color, or religious belief.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois for a comment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from New York has proceeded in an eminently fair manner in this matter, and I hope very much we will not make a sectional issue of it. We in the North have many faults. Our administration of justice is not perfect. We are perfectly ready to have people from other sections of the country who come to our section as members of the Armed Forces be protected by Federal law off military reservations.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for an equally brief observation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Illinois wants to make confession in reference to derelictions of his own State, that is certainly his privilege. But the Senator from Oklahoma is going to ask him to refrain from making remarks on the floor of the Senate with reference to the Senator from Oklahoma being eminently unfair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator will discover that I withdrew that. I have already substituted for that the

opinion that the Senator from Oklahoma pressed the debate too far.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to inquire of my distinguished colleague if he does not agree with me that we in New York State do not set ourselves apart from any other section of the United States, and feel we need this type of legislation just as much as do other States.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank my colleague. I shall specifically deal with that point later in my remarks. The situation I have in mind calls for Federal action.

Mr. President, I now wish to proceed with my prepared statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, the Senator from New York asks that he be permitted to complete his remarks before answering any questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York declines to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I can assure the Senator from Michigan I shall be very glad indeed to yield when I have concluded my remarks.

I wish it were possible to frame some kind of provision possible of enforcement to protect members of the Armed Forces against wilful, premeditated and unprovoked violence while off duty. I feel it is vital that our youths in the Armed Forces be so protected by the Federal Government to the maximum extent possible. They are not tough and case-hardened men, trained in restraint and self-dicipline. They are only young boys, fresh from farms and cities, from slums and mansions. They are boys generally unaccustomed to the exhileration of freedom away from parental direction. They are boys suddenly required to become men.

In camp and on station, they act under direction and orders. Off duty, they are generally on their own. They should be protected in every possible way. I expect that the armed services will do everything in their power to see that they are protected and that, on the other hand, the civilian communities are properly protected against vandalism and violence from those in uniform.

But in view of the responsibility being assumed by the Federal Government in drafting these boys and enrolling them in the armed services, it is also the responsibility of the Government—to these boys, to their parents and to the country—to safeguard them, as much as possible, from either harm or indignity.

As I said, there seems to be no practicable legislative means to insure this protection for our servicemen while off duty, but I trust that the executive departments concerned will take every possible administrative step to insure this protection, for these, our sons, are serving and are to serve their country, in some cases with the last full measure of devotion. Every one of them must be regarded as among the first citizens of this land; and there must be no discrimination against them or indignity visited upon them for reason of race, creed, color, national origin, or economic status. The bullets that will seek them out, the shells, shrapnel, bombs, and sudden death in the air and beneath the seas will make no distinction. Their Government should see to it, to the maximum extent practicable, that no distinction is made while they are wearing the uniform of their country, on or off duty. That uniform, which is the symbol of our national security and sovereignty, and which is the symbol of their service, should and must exact from all citizens equal respect and equal consideration.

The pending amendment, however, is strictly circumscribed in its application to members of the armed services while in the performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty.

Among those to whom it would apply would be members of the military police and the shore patrol. Indeed, this provision is of paramount importance for these divisions of the armed services, or for other members of the armed services engaged in police functions, for military police and shore patrol duty is a function which brings members of the armed services in direct contact with the civilian population. This service especially exposes the personnel involved to intimidation, resistance, attack, and reprisal.

It is not rare, I understand, for civilians to try to interfere with military police when these police are trying to take into custody military personnel who have violated military law. Such police should be protected by Federal law, and should have the backing of Federal law when dealing with civilians. I hasten to add that this should be civilian, not military law; and the protection given these police should be by Federal civilian authority.

Of course, I am not undertaking to speak for the Secretary of the Army or for the Secretary of the Navy in urging this amendment. I would presume that the armed services would welcome this amendment, especially in the light of its legislative history and of the original request in 1944 by Secretary of War Stimson for this provision.

That, however, is almost beside the point, so far as I am concerned, and so far as the Senate ought to be concerned. This amendment is essential legislation from the viewpoint of both the armed services and of the national interest. It is recognition that the armed services consist of citizens, and of young citizens at that.

There are many cases on record to prove the necessity for the adoption of this amendment. There are many, many more cases—cases happening every day—which are not on record, but which call for this legislation.

I have data on some of these cases right here at hand. Some of them would fall directly and obviously under the ban of the pending amendment. Some of the acts of violence of which I have record would probably not be punishable under the pending amendment. But all these acts of violence would certainly be discouraged by the adoption of this amendment. In any event, this amendment is so meritorious and so obviously desirable that I do not feel it necessary to burden the Senate with further details along this line.

Among the cases on official record from the last war bearing precisely and specifically on this legislative proposal was the case of a military policeman shot and killed in Louisiana in 1942 by a State Trooper; the case of an investigator for the Internal Security Command beaten up by German sympathizers in Philadelphia while he was carrying on an investigation; and many others.

This is not a regional matter, Mr. President. These incidents can occur in Louisiana, in Texas, or in Pennsylvania, Ohio, or New York. I might again refer to historical background in my own State where there were draft riots in 1863 and where, as a result, the law I referred to earlier in my remarks, making it a Federal offense to assault or obstruct personnel of the Provost Marshal General's Department, was enacted.

The pending amendment is designed to meet all cases and all situations. It is designed to protect every man in the uniform and service of his country, while engaged in performing the duties of that service.

I know that local police authorities are generally doing their best, and have done, in general, an outstanding job in maintaining law and order in areas near military installations. I know that incidents of unprovoked violence against military personnel are, of course, the rare exception, not the rule. However, this amendment seeks to prevent even the exception, and to provide Federal punishment for the exception, in discharge of the Federal Government's inevitable obligation.

If it is a Federal responsibility to protect United States Marshals, and judges, and postal inspectors, and fish and game wardens, and collectors of internal revenue, why is it not a Federal responsibility to protect members of the armed services while on duty? That question cannot be answered except by an affirmative vote on the pending amendment.

This is a Federal responsibility, not a local responsibility. The members of the armed services are as much Federal representatives as are any group of Federal agents and employees now included under the protection of section 1114 of the penal code. Indeed, as I have pointed out, coast guardsmen are already so protected. Why not marines, and soldiers, and airmen, and naval personnel?

Mr. President, I hope the pending amendment will be approved by an overwhelming—yes, by a unanimous—vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask whether it is true that Federal fish and game inspectors now have this same type of protection.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me also inquire whether those in the field service of the division of grazing of the Department of the Interior have the same type of protection.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also the employees of the Indian Field Serivce?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also the immigration patrol inspectors?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also the officials and employees of the United States penal or correctional institutions?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true, and it has been very useful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also any employee or agent of the collector of internal revenue?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If an internal revenue agent finds an illegal still, and if potshots are taken at him, this Federal protection is thrown around him. Is that true?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it also true of postoffice inspectors?

Mr. LEHMAN. It is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also in the case of officials and employees of the secret service?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also in the case of officials and employees in the Bureau of Narcotics?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also in the case of United States marshals?

Mr. LEHMAN. All those are included.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And also in the case of the Coast Guard?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that about the only group not having this Federal protection in line of duty are those who serve in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is also true, is it not, of officials and employees of the Federal Home Loan banks and of the Federal Home Loan Bank Associations?

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that is true, also.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New York if he will yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood, of course, the Senator's reference to the provost marshal's department. I can see that the shore patrol and the military police, who are the peace officers of the Armed Forces, and all of whom are always shown to be such by means of the insignia or other identifications they wear, might require special protection. I was wondering what other kinds of operations and activities the Senator had in mind to protect by means of his amendment. I could not think of any except the ones I have just named.

Mr. LEHMAN. I would have in mind members of the Ground Forces, members of the Air Force, members of the Marines, members of the Navy—all those who are engaged in the military service of the United States. I do not know that I would feel that there should be any exceptions whatever.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, perhaps I did not make my question clear, but, if I understand correctly, the amendment applies to individuals only so long as they are engaged in the official performance of duty. What type of official performance of duty did the Senator have in mind as being covered other than that of law enforcement by military police officers?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Florida it has been a great many years since I spent time in camp, so I am not familiar, as I say, after 30 years, with military duties; but I am quite certain the Senator from Florida would not imply that men in the camps, or in the stations, or wherever they may be, have not military duties to perform, in the performance of which they are entitled to protection. He would not so imply, would he:

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The purpose of my questions is to clarify the RECORD. I can readily see how law-enforcement officers of the military service are in a status comparable to that of United States marshals and their deputies, or enforcement officers of the Alcohol Tax Unit, or law-enforcement officers of the Treasury Department. As a matter of fact, the Coast Guard is a branch of the Treasury Department, as I recall it; but I was trying to discover what type of service off the military reservations, other than that in the military police and the like, was intended to be covered; and I think the RECORD would be clearer if the Senator would state into the RECORD just what kinds of service off the reservations he has in mind.

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot specify in detail. I should think there might be hundreds if not thousands of different services which a man in military service might be expected to perform under orders, while in camp. Of course, I am not confining this amendment simply to the protection of the men who cause arrests to be made, such as members of the military police, although I certainly have included them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. In my judgment, anyone in the military service in uniform should be protected from attack in the performance of his duty. As I say, there might be many different categories; for example, an attack made in reprisal, or otherwise, for some previous action performed in the course of duty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator said he had various incidents in mind, which illustrated his point. I think the RECORD would be clearer if the Senator would put such incidents into the RECORD, so that the Senate could understand just whom he refers to, other than the law-enforcement officers off the Army reservations.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have a number, and I will read one:

Pvt. Raymond Carr, a Negro soldier.

The Senator asked me to read these. I was very anxious not to bring in any reference to racial distinctions in this matter, but the Senator asked me to put this in, and I hope he will understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the desire of the Senator, but I think the RECORD would be clarified if he would put into it illustrations of what he has in mind.

Mr. LEHMAN. I read:

Case in point: Pvt. Raymond Carr, a Negro soldier, a member of the Military Police detail from Camp Beauregard, La., on the morning of November 1, 1942, was shot and killed by Trooper Dalton McCollum, of the Louisiana State Police, in the city of Alexandria, La. This soldier was in uniform and on duty at the time of the killing, and rightfully resisted arrest by the civilian constabulary. The State police seemed to infer that two Military Police (colored) were interfering with the arrest of two colored civilians. They attempted to arrest the two Military Police and take them to jail. The MP's stated that the constabulary had no jurisdiction while they were on Military Police duty, and that they could only leave their post of duty when properly relieved. After obtaining additional help, guns were drawn and attempts were made to force the two MP's into the State patrol car. One of the MP's complied, dropped his club, and ran away, followed by two officers. He was soon captured, and in the scuffle which ensued he was shot in the abdomen by Trooper Dalton McCollum. The wounded soldier was taken to the hospital after some delay, and he died the next day. General Donovan was informed and he requested that this State trooper be taken into custody, pending investigation of this matter. This was refused by the assistant commanding officer of State troopers. Later, on November 11, 1942, Trooper McCollum was removed from active patrol duty and was assigned to desk duty at the State police office in Alexandria. The Attorney General, upon request of the Secretary of War, investigated this case to determine whether it could be tried in the Federal court under section 253, title 18, United States Code, Killing Federal Officers, or section 254, title 18, United States Code, Resisting, Interfering, or Assaulting a Federal Officer. The Attorney General stated that these statutes were not applicable in this case, as soldiers and sailors were not covered by them.

I have many others, but I have read that as an example, as a case in point. That man certainly deserved punishment, because he attacked, wounded, and killed a man in uniform, who was serving his country; and yet the Attorney General found that the laws then in existence were not applicable.

I am trying to make them applicable. I tried to state that I consider these cases somewhat exceptional, but there have been cases of that sort not infrequently. I want to make sure that the men whom we call out to serve their country at the risk of their own lives and at great sacrifice—your son and my son, Mr. President—are protected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would prefer to have the Senator permit me to conclude my questions, if he will.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator asked one question. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, after which I shall be glad to yield further to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that justices of the Supreme Court of the United States are protected by law against assaults and attempts to murder, even when they are off the bench?

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that is true. I am not sure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember a case in California, in the early 1880's, when a citizen of California shot at Justice Stephen J. Field who was, I believe, on a railway train? I believe that the Californian who shot at Justice Field was tried in a Federal court, not in a State court. I think that is correct. So the Senator from New York is merely proposing that soldiers in uniform shall have the same protection as that accorded to other Government officials, including justices of the United States Supreme Court. Is that not true?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I am proposing, and I think there is even greater justification for protecting men in uniform than there is for protecting others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should think it would probably be more popular to protect soldiers than to protect Supreme Court justices.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry I did not make my previous question clear, which I apparently did not do, because I asked the distinguished Senator to place in the RECORD incidents to which he had referred as coming from other than the provost marshals, and other than the military police, the shore patrol, and the like; and I think the Senator from Florida has already stated that he concedes there is a case applicable to law-enforcement officers of the armed services, but he asked the Senator to place in the RECORD cases other than those, to which he felt that his amendment was applicable. In response to my request, the Senator read into the RECORD a case applicable to military police, which does not come within the purview of my request. I repeat my question. If the Senator has numerous cases in mind relative to others in the Armed Forces personnel than the military police, shore patrol, and the like, I would appreciate it greatly if he would put those cases in the RECORD for purposes of illustrating what he hopes to accomplish through his amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should be very glad indeed to do so. I did not think it was necessary to collect the cases and put them in proper shape to be inserted in the RECORD, because, frankly, while I thought it possible there might be some difference of opinion on the floor of the Senate with regard to the wisdom of or applicability of my amendment, I did not think any question would be raised by any Senator as to the fact that there have been attacks by civilians, either in small numbers or sometimes in large groups, on men in the military service. I did not think that would be a subject of debate, because I thought it was a generally accepted fact.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for an observation, unfortunately there have been attacks, and I believe such attacks should be curbed, but in defending his amendment the Senator has stated specifically that the amendment would apply only to the members of the Armed Forces when on actual duty, but not when they were engaged in recreation, or are on leave, or off their reservation on business of their own, even though in uniform. I am trying to have the RECORD illustrate just what sort of cases, other than cases applicable to military police, the Senator expects his amendment to cover. Frankly, I have not been able to think of any myself. That is why I asked the Senator for information as to such cases.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the process of moving men, under orders, from one military establishment to another, they are nevertheless on duty, and therefore should be under the protection of the Federal Government? They are under orders moving from one military camp to another, and they are regarded as being on military duty.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no doubt at all about that, when they are moving from one station to another under orders.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are also truck drivers, messengers, and the like who move out of camps into civilian areas and who yet perform military duties. These would be brought under the protection of the law under the proposal and protected by the Federal statutes against assault.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Florida that we know perfectly well that many times when military personnel are driving trucks in a convoy, or possibly not in a convoy, they are guarding Government property. Of course, such men are entitled to the protection of the Federal Government under those circumstances. They may be guarding property not on the camp grounds at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand from the distinguished Senator that he expects to illuminate the RECORD by placing in it some actual instances?

Mr. LEHMAN. I hope to be able to do that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall appreciate the Senator's courtesy if he will.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to refresh the Senator's memory in regard to an occasion about 7 or 8 months ago when we were debating the extension of the Selective Service Act. At that time I placed in the RECORD, at the request of one of my colleagues, a list of incidents which were brought to the attention of the Government by General Hershey, the National Director of Selective Service.

I should like to point out that the National Director of Selective Service, in his recommendations following World War II, covered the same subject, and the bill extending the Selective Service recommended the very proposal which the Senator from New York has brought to our attention, and has so ably defended and expounded this afternoon. So the record is available, and I am happy to note that the amendment is so clearly defined that its application will be clear.

It is perfectly obvious that someone going into a billiard hall or into a tavern and getting himself involved in some sort of fracas is a local police problem, particularly if that person is off duty, on leave or furlough. But instances have occurred when troops, individual soldiers or other members of the armed services, in small groups, proceeding down a highway, have been accosted or assaulted, without any effective police action taking place. I believe the purpose of the Senator's amendment is to affect such cases as that. So I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would the Senator from Florida like to have me read the letter of the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, written in 1944?

Mr. HOLLAND. It might be illuminating. I have merely asked the Senator to place in the RECORD instances of the kind he has referred to as existing in large numbers, cases in which personnel of the Armed Forces on actual duty, but not including police duty, as members of the military police, would be protected under his amendment. I have not as yet heard any cases cited.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall not consume the time of the Senate in reading the letter from Secretary Stimson, which is quite lengthy, but I ask that it be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 10, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
*Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: There is enclosed herewith draft of a bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers, which the War Department recommends be enacted into law.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the scope of section 1 of the act of May 18, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 780; 54 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 253), so as to include officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States, while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of their official duties.

The mentioned section as it now exists, provides punishment for any person who kills, forcibly resists, opposes, impedes, intim-

idates, or interferes with certain Federal officers, including United States marshals, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, post-office inspectors, Secret Service operatives, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, and so forth, while engaged in the performance of official duties, or any person who kills or assaults any such officer on account of the performance of his official duties. It appears that there is at this time no appropriate Federal statute providing punishment in the case of such an act against an officer or enlisted person of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, or a member of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States, while engaged in the performance of official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties. It seems manifest that similar punishment should be provided in case of such attacks against personnel of the Military and Naval Establishments.

Although section 1 provides only for the offense of killing, it is believed that the suggested amendment to that section would also have the effect of extending the scope of section 2 of the act of May 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 781; 18 U. S. C. 254), to cover officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States in the case of resisting, interfering with, or assaulting such personnel while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of official duties, as section 2 by reference relates to assaults on all persons of the categories named in section 1 of the act.

The proposed amendment, if enacted, will result in little, if any, increased cost to the Government.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
*Secretary of War.*

Mr. LEHMAN. I should also like to point out that the bill to which I have referred was not objected to by the Attorney General of the United States at the time it was presented.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator proposes a law which will extend what he calls protection to all members of the Armed Forces under certain conditions, and the Armed Forces perhaps soon will number 3,500,000. Does the Senator have any corresponding law in mind whereby there would be extended special protection to the civilian population as against unlawful acts of the 3,500,000 men in the service?

Mr. LEHMAN. They are entitled to protection, and I referred to that in my remarks. It is the duty of the camp commanders, the divisional commanders, and the station commanders, to make certain that their men treat the townspeople with full consideration.

Mr. STENNIS. The question was, does the Senator have in mind introducing a bill which would give special protection to the civilian population which will come in contact with the 3,500,000 servicemen?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I have no specific bill in mind.

Mr. STENNIS. It would be logical and would be consistent with the Senator's position to have a bill cover that phase, would it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I do not think it is analogous at all.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator assumed it to be consistent and logical, that would mean probably 7,000,000 people being dealt with, and the Senator would materially change the criminal law and criminal jurisdiction with reference to that number of people without ever having the matter referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate. Would not that be the effect of the Senator's position?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know where the Senator gets his figure of 7,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. If there are 3,500,000 men in the armed services, assuming that, as they move about the country they would come in contact with just one civilian each per day, the Senator's amendment would be affecting at least 7,000,000 people in its operation, would it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it would be affecting only those people who, without justification, attacked or killed men in the service while in the performance of their duty. It seems to me to be no great departure.

Mr. STENNIS. Suppose a difficulty arises between a man who is in the service and a civilian. Suppose a soldier happens to have a difficulty with a civilian, the Senator's amendment would come into effect, would it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. A difficulty would not alter the situation.

Mr. STENNIS. Suppose there should be some kind of belligerent contact, some kind of adverse relation.

Mr. LEHMAN. They might have a difficulty, but it would not come under the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I am assuming there would be one soldier and one civilian involved. The Senator would extend a special law to the soldier and not a special law to the civilian. Is not that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not assume there are going to be disputes with anybody. There may not be five disputes a month. What I have in mind is a man who is unlawfully attacked while he is in uniform in the performance of his duty. I think that man deserves the protection of his Government.

Mr. STENNIS. Let us take a simple case. Suppose a soldier on duty drives a truck to a farm to load some materials and he and the farmer get into a dispute and a fight ensues. The Senator would provide a special law to protect the soldier. What about the farmer?

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly believe that if the soldier attacked the farmer he should be punished. I have no excuse for him. He would be punished under Federal law, as a matter of fact.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senator certain about that?

Mr. LEHMAN. He would be punished under military law, in all probability.

Mr. STENNIS. The matter would be taken out of the hands of the people of the community altogether if the soldier was turned over to a court martial; is not that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether it would be or not, but certainly if the commanding officer did his duty, the soldier would be subject to court-martial proceedings.

Mr. STENNIS. My point is that if there is a law affecting 3,500,000 men in the armed services, the rest of the population is going to be affected more or less directly, and yet the Senator proposes no special law for their protection.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am recommending a law for the protection of members of the Armed Forces, but not a law which would cover every dispute which might arise between a soldier and a civilian. If the soldier to whom the Senator from Mississippi referred was sent to a farm for a special or specific purpose as part of his military duty, I would hold the other man responsible for killing or maiming him.

Mr. STENNIS. What would the Senator do if the soldier was at fault?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would certainly insist that he be punished. We have adequate laws for that purpose.

Mr. STENNIS. But he would not come under the Senator's proposed statute?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; he would come under military law.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator does not propose a special statute to cover his case?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have none in mind.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to make one more observation. While on duty as a civilian officer during World War II I heard of no instance in which a military man was attacked or abused in any way. On the contrary, I did know of many instances in which military personnel—and I am not referring to colored military personnel, but white personnel—ganged up and literally ran civilians out of a community in which they had lived for many years. When it comes to giving special protection of the kind the Senator suggests, I think it would be well to enact special statutes which would protect civilians against a massed ganging up of military personnel. Fortunately such attacks do not occur often, but they do occur at times.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say that certainly if a soldier attacks another man he should be subject to military law, and he is subject to such law, if he is in uniform or on duty. If there is any way of protecting the people of a community in a situation of the kind to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, I should be glad to be informed about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to emphasize one point. In the case which the Senator from Mississippi poses, the field commander, unit commander, camp commander, or any commander in charge of military personnel is held fully responsible for the actions of his troops. Under military law he is chargeable for the actions of his troops. That is the kind of protection which is given to a civilian in reference to his relationship with the military. I think there is sufficient law on the books to correct that kind of abuse.

It is my feeling that there has been some abuse on the other side as well. There is no law on the books today which permits the correction of an abuse so far as a civilian's relationship with a military person is concerned, although there is a military law which provides protection against an abuse by a military man against a civilian. In such an instance there is no military law which permits the correction of an abuse on the part of a civilian against a military person. I believe the Senator's amendment would bring about equality of treatment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has been very patient in allowing me to make observations. I should like to make one more. As the Senator knows, when he was serving as Governor of New York I served as Governor of my State during a good portion of the war.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was very happy indeed that we were able to cooperate so frequently.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I saw some instances of abuse on both sides of the fence, both by civilians and by military personnel. Again I am not referring to any matter of color. To make the Senator's amendment comparable with the existing Federal situation in other fields I believe it should be confined to law-enforcement officers of the Military Establishment, that is, to military police and shore patrolmen, who are properly identified by the wearing of the uniform of their service. I believe that for that sort of limited application the amendment has merit, and that it would accomplish some good.

Wholly without reference to any color line, because shore patrolmen and military policemen of both colors have had their difficulties from time to time, I can very easily see how personnel charged with the enforcement of law and order for the United States—and that is what they are doing when they are out in uniform as shore patrolmen or military policemen—should be entitled to the same protection which is afforded a United States marshal, tax collector, wildlife enforcement officer, or any other similar personnel who can identify himself, and who is not protected except in the discharge of his duty.

I am frank to say that as drawn the amendment of the Senator would always put the civilian public upon inquiry whenever they were threatened with any sort of abuse or any sort or arbitrary tactics on the part of members of the Armed Forces, to be certain that such members of the Armed Forces were not then and there engaged in the performance of some military duty or in the carrying out of some order, lest they be held to have gotten themselves in serious trouble under Federal law simply by standing up for what they thought were their rights.

Since the amendment offered by the Senator does not pretend to apply to men when on furlough and when off the reservation for private business or recreation it seems to me that the Senator might well consider rewriting his amendment so as to confine its application to the law-enforcement officers of the armed services. In that way he would have something which, it seems to the Senator from Florida, would be almost on all fours with the present statutes covering civilian law-enforcement officers while engaged in the performance of their law-enforcement duties and giving protection to such officials of the Federal Government, by making any assault or breach of the peace against them, a Federal crime.

I can see how the Senator could make his case if he would limit the application of his amendment to law-enforcement officers. Otherwise it seems to me it would impose a vastly greater burden upon the millions of people of our civilian population who are daily coming in contact with soldiers and sailors in uniform, but who cannot tell to save their lives whether such soldiers or sailors are under military orders. It would put them under great disadvantage and always upon inquiry. It would impute to them knowledge of whether or not individuals of the Armed Forces whom they meet are or are not under military orders. It seems to me it would create a tremendously difficult and intolerable situation.

Therefore in all kindness and cooperatively I make the suggestion to the able Senator that he consider limiting his amendment to law-enforcement officers of the armed services in uniform and identified by their appropriate uniform.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida. I do not feel that an amendment of the character which he suggests would accomplish the purposes which my associates and I have in mind.

### MOTION TO RECONSIDER

During the delivery of Mr. LEHMAN'S address,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may make a motion?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield, if there is unanimous consent that I do not lose my place on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska moves that the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as amended, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. I move that that motion be laid on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. The motion can only be entered, I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is in order, but there is already a motion before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator from New York to yield that I might make a motion, and he said he would yield if he did not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would be necessary in order to enable a Senator to make a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion may be made.

Mr. McFARLAND. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire what is the status of the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider has been entered.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 44. An act for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri;

S. 45. An act for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche; and

S. 46. An act for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet.

### INCREASE IN FOOD PRICES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that this morning the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided to hold hearings beginning next Tuesday, March 13, on two bills relating to agricultural workers from foreign countries. They are Senate bill 949 and Senate bill 984. I am hopeful that the hearings will be concluded within a few days so that a measure on the subject may be considered by the Senate at an early date.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is continuing its investigation of food prices. It will be recalled that about 2 weeks ago the committee issued a statement with reference to the rise in price on beef and certain canned goods. The committee finds that, in spite of the recent increase in prices, more food can be purchased by an hour of factory labor than in any recent period. I invite the special attention of Senators to the table on the second page of the statement, which I expect to file for the record. As an example, an hour's factory labor today buys 9.9 pounds of bread, in contrast to 6.1 in 1925–29 and 7.3 in 1935–39. Percentagewise, a factory worker today can obtain 109 percent more eggs for an hour's work than he could back in 1925–29, 35 percent more than in 1935–39, and 31 percent more than in 1947–48. I hope Senators will take the time to read this statement.

I wish to also call the special attention of Senators to the trend of farm income. The net income realized by farmers during 1947 was $18,000,000,000; in 1948, $16,500,000,000; in 1949 $14,000,000,000; and in 1950, $13,000,000,000. Notwithstanding the fact that farm production was as large in 1950 as it was in 1947, the net farm income decreased from $18,000,000,000 to $13,000,000,000.

On the other hand, the hourly earnings of manufacturing employees have steadily increased. In 1947 the hourly

pay was $1.22; in 1948, $1.33; in 1949, $1.40; and in 1950, $1.46.

With respect to the weekly earnings of manufacturing employees, there has also been a steady increase, from $49.97 in 1947 to as high as $59.27 in 1950.

With respect to corporate profits before taxes, in 1947 they were $30,500,000,000; in 1948, $33,900,000,000; and in 1950, $40,200,000,000. In other words, the average hourly earnings of employees and their weekly take-home pay have been on the increase from 1947 up to 1950, whereas we have had a constant decrease with respect to farm income from 1947 to 1950.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which was issued this morning by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry together with all accompanying data be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CURRENT POSITION OF FOOD PRICES

Continuing its investigation of current food prices under the direction of Chairman ELLENDER, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry finds that in spite of recent increases in prices, more food can be purchased with an hour of factory labor than in either recent or earlier periods. Average hourly earnings of factory workers have increased more than retail food prices as compared either with 1947–48 or with prewar years.

Farm prices, although 110 percent of parity in January, were lower in relation to prices paid by farmers than in 1947–48 when the parity ratio averaged 118. Thus a given volume of farm products in January 1951 would purchase 7 percent less products used by farmers than in 1947–48. The detailed data are as follows:

*Amounts of food which could be purchased with an hour's factory labor*

| Item | January 1951 | 1947–48 average | 1935–39 average | 1925–29 average | Percent additional which could be purchased in January 1951 over— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1947–48 | 1935–39 | 1925–29 |
| Bread, pounds | 9.9 | 9.6 | 7.3 | 6.1 | 3 | 36 | 62 |
| Milk, quarts | 7.2 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 3.9 | 16 | 44 | 85 |
| Butter, pounds | 1.9 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 36 | 19 | 90 |
| Cheese, do | 2.6 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 30 | 18 | 86 |
| Eggs, dozen | 2.3 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 21 | 35 | 109 |
| Meats: | | | | | | | |
| Round steak, pounds | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.4 | −7 | −18 | 0 |
| Pork chops, do | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 18 | 11 | 33 |
| Oranges, dozen | 3.6 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 24 | 89 | 260 |
| Potatoes, pecks | 2.4 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 60 | 50 | 140 |
| Canned peas, No. 2 cans | 7.2 | 8.4 | 3.9 | 3.3 | −14 | 85 | 119 |
| Canned tomatoes, do | 9.1 | 7.2 | 6.6 | 4.5 | 26 | 40 | 102 |
| Lard, pounds | 6.2 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 48 | 55 | 121 |
| Sugar, do | 15.7 | 13.5 | 11.0 | 8.0 | 16 | 43 | 96 |
| Farmers' price parity ratio | 110 | 118 | 84 | 89 | [1]−7 | [1]31 | [1]22 |

[1] Change in amounts of all goods used in production and in the home which could be purchased by farmers with a given volume of farm products.

Computed from BLS and BAE statistics,

CHANGES SINCE JUNE 1950

Since the outbreak of war in Korea in June of 1950, both retail prices and wage rates have been rising at approximately the same rate. The consumers' price index, often called the cost-of-living index, was 6.7 percent higher on January 15, 1951, than in June 1950. Retail food prices were 8.5 percent higher in January than 7 months earlier.

During this same period, hourly earnings of workers in manufacturing industries increased 6.7 percent and weekly earnings increased 7 percent, or fully as much as the cost of living and almost as much as retail food prices.

FURTHER INCREASES PERMITTED BY DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Based on retail and farm prices reported for February 15, a further increase of 4 percent in the retail food price index would be required if all farm prices then below parity moved up to the parity level. This compared with increases of 4.5 percent estimated as of January 15 and 5.5 percent as of December 15.

The revised consumers' price index gives food a weight of 34 percent, hence a 4-percent increase in the retail food price index increases the over-all consumers' price index 1.4 percent.

But not all farm prices below parity on February 15 are likely to move up to the parity level in the near future. Potatoes, eggs, oranges, and apples are the most important products with prices substantially below parity. They account for over half of the difference between February 15 price levels and minimum levels for price ceilings provided in the Defense Production Act. It is unlikely that the prices of these products in ample supply will increase much in the near future. For this reason further increase in the cost-of-living index arising out of the minimum-ceilings provision of the Defense Production Act should not exceed 1 percent and may be even smaller.

TREND IN FARM INCOME

In contrast to steadily rising corporate profits and hourly and weekly earnings of manufacturing employees in recent years, farm incomes have declined for 3 years in a row. The comparative figures are as follows:

| | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Net income realized by farm operators (billions) | $18 | $16.5 | $14 | $13 |
| Hourly earnings of manufacturing employees | 1.22 | 1.33 | 1.40 | 1.46 |
| Weekly earnings of manufacturing employees | 49.97 | 54.14 | 54.92 | 59.27 |
| Corporate profits before taxes (billions) | 30.5 | 33.9 | 27.6 | 40.2 |

These are the important relationships which should be kept in mind when considering relative price increases in recent months.

*Parity status of foods in the Retail Price Index as of Feb. 15, 1951*

AT OR ABOVE PARITY

| Item | Percentage of index [1] |
|---|---|
| Round steak | 5.1 |
| Rib roast | 4.5 |
| Chuck roast | 2.0 |
| Hamburger | 2.1 |
| Veal cutlet | 2.4 |
| Tomatoes, fresh | 1.8 |
| Rice | .3 |
| Cabbage | .4 |
| Prunes | .5 |
| Pork chops | 3.6 |
| Bacon, sliced | 1.7 |
| Ham, whole | 2.1 |
| Salt pork | .3 |
| Lard | .8 |
| Carrots | .9 |
| Shortening, hydrogenated | .5 |
| Salad dressing | .7 |
| Margarine | .6 |
| Lamb, leg | 3.1 |
| Total | 33.4 |

BELOW PARITY

| Item | Percentage of Index [1] | Contribution to increase |
|---|---|---|
| Eggs, fresh | 5.4 | 0.81 |
| Bread, white | 8.3 | .11 |
| Flour, wheat | 2.2 | .06 |
| Corn flakes | .5 | .01 |
| Cornmeal | .4 | .01 |
| Rolled oats | .7 | .01 |
| Fryers: | | |
| New York, dressed | 2.1 | .123 |
| Dressed and drawn | .7 | .123 |
| Butter | 5.4 | .26 |
| Cheese | 1.6 | .09 |
| Milk, evaporated | .9 | .04 |
| Apples | 1.8 | .28 |
| Oranges | 2.6 | .49 |
| Lettuce | 1.4 | .15 |
| Onions | .6 | .13 |
| Potatoes | 2.3 | .84 |
| Sweetpotatoes | .4 | .04 |
| Navy beans, dried | .8 | .03 |
| Peaches, canned | .5 | .01 |
| Corn, canned | .5 | .03 |
| Tomatoes, canned | .4 | .04 |
| Sugar | 3.0 | .32 |
| Peas, canned | 1.2 | .01 |
| Milk, fresh: | | |
| Delivered | 5.6 | .02 |
| Grocery | 4.1 | .02 |
| Beans, green | .9 | .05 |
| Total | 54.3 | 4.11 |

OTHER FOODS NOT AFFECTED BY PARITY

| Item | Percentage of index [1] |
|---|---|
| Fish (fresh or frozen) | 2.3 |
| Salmon, pink | 1.2 |
| Coffee | 4.8 |
| Pineapples, canned | 0.4 |
| Vanilla cookies | 1.8 |
| Bananas | 1.8 |
| Total | 12.3 |

[1] As of November 1950, The relative importances shown represent purchases of priced items as well as related unpriced items, e. g., purchases of all beef are represented in the index by round steak, rib roast, chuck roast, and hamburger,

NOTE.—No adjustment has been made for seasonal variation. Such adjustment is customarily made for eggs, milk, pork, and butter,

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the committee has examined further the reports submitted by canners and retail food chains to price increases, and I ask unanimous consent that this further study, together with exhibits attached thereto, be incorporated in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON RECENT INCREASES IN FOOD PRICES

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has examined further the reports submitted by canners and retail food chains relating to price increases for canned vegetables and canned peaches. Comparisons of prices paid growers by canners for the 1949 and 1950 crops with increases in canner's selling prices between May 1950 and January 1951 were reported by this committee 2 weeks ago. This statement extends these comparisons to show increases in prices paid by retail food chains and in their retail selling prices for the same products.

Canned tomatoes: Prices paid to growers by three canning companies averaged slightly lower for the 1950 crop than for the 1949 crop, but the canners' selling price in January 1951 averaged 82 cents per case, or 25 percent higher than in May 1950. Between May of last year and January of this year, two retail food chains reported an advance of nearly 30 percent in the price they paid for canned tomatoes, or 3.2 cents per can, and

Footnote at end of table.

an advance of 18 percent or 2.2 cents per can in their retail price paid by consumers.

Canned snap beans: Three canners reported prices paid to growers averaging about 10 percent less in 1950 than in 1949, and selling prices in January 1951 slightly lower than in May 1950. Three retail chains paid prices averaging 3 to 4 percent higher in January than in last May, with retail prices up 4 to 5 percent.

Canned corn (cream style): Growers received prices averaging 18 percent lower in 1950 than in 1949 from three reporting canners, but canners' selling prices advanced an average of 22 percent between May 1950 and January 1951. During the same period, retailers' purchase prices advanced 32 percent and retail prices rose 23 percent, amounting to 3 cents per can at both levels.

Canned peas: Canners paid growers prices averaging about 3 percent higher in 1950 than in 1949, and sold their products for 7 percent more in January than in last May. Retail chains advanced their retail prices an average of 12 percent or 1.6 cents per can, compared with an average purchase cost increase of 10 percent or 1 cent per can, from May to January.

Canned peaches: Average prices paid to growers by three canners increased by 50 percent or 42 cents per case from the 1949 season to the 1950 season. Canners' selling prices in January of this year were higher than in last May by an average of $1.40, or 32 percent. Cost to retailers reported by three chains averaged 38 percent or 6.5 cents per can higher in January than in May, and their retail prices advanced 42 percent or 9 cents per can.

*Canned peaches and vegetables: Prices paid by canners to growers, canner's selling price, price paid by retailer, and retailers' selling price* [1]

| Item | Paid by canner to grower, dollars per case [2] | | | | Canner's selling price, dollars per case | | | | Price paid by retailers, cents per can | | | Retailer's selling price, cents per can | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Firm No. | | | | Firm No. | | | | Firm No. | | | Firm No. | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Tomatoes (can size) | No. 2 | | No. 2 | No. 2½ | No. 2 | | No. 2 | No. 2½ | No. 2 | 19 oz. | No. 2 | No. 2 | 19 oz. | No. 2 |
| May 1950 | 0.57 | | 0.56 | 0.75 | 2.90 | | 3.70 | 3.14 | 10.8 | 10.9 | 10.4 | 15.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| January 1951 | .60 | | .51 | .74 | 3.70 | | 4.50 | 4.00 | | 15.0 | 12.7 | | 14.5 | 15.0 |
| Actual change | .03 | | −.05 | −.01 | .80 | | .80 | .86 | | 4.1 | 2.3 | | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| Percentage change | 5.3 | | 8.9 | −1.3 | 27.6 | | 21.6 | 27.4 | | 37.6 | 22.1 | | 16.0 | 20.0 |
| Average actual change | | | | −.01 | | | | .82 | | | 3.2 | | | 2.25 |
| Average percentage change | | | | 1.6 | | | | 25.5 | | | 29.9 | | | 18.0 |
| Snapbeans (can size) | No. 2 | No. 2 | No. 2 | No. 2 | No. 2 | No. 2 | No. 2 | No. 2 | No. 2 | 19 oz. | No. 2 | No. 303 | 19 oz. | No. 2 |
| May 1950 | 1.07 | 1.86 | 1.39 | 1.23 | 3.60 | 3.00 | 4.70 | 5.60 | 9.2 | 9.8 | 10.8 | 13.5 | 11.5 | 14.5 |
| January 1951 | .92 | | 1.26 | 1.14 | 3.60 | 2.95 | 4.70 | 5.60 | 9.6 | 10.0 | 11.3 | 13.6 | 12.5 | 15.0 |
| Actual change | −.15 | | −.13 | −.09 | | −.05 | | | .4 | .2 | .5 | .1 | 1.0 | .5 |
| Percentage change | −14.0 | | −9.4 | −7.3 | | −1.7 | | | 4.3 | 2.0 | 4.6 | .7 | 8.7 | 3.4 |
| Average actual change | | | | −.12 | | | | −.05 | | | .4 | | | .5 |
| Average percentage change | | | | −10.2 | | | | −1.7 | | | 3.6 | | | 4.3 |
| Corn—cream style (can size) | 303 | 303 | 303 | 12 oz. | 303 | 303 | 303 | 12 oz. | 303 | 17 oz. | 303 | 303 | 17 oz. | 303 |
| May 1950 | 0.68 | 0.93 | 0.77 | 0.59 | 2.60 | 2.20 | 2.62 | 2.62 | 7.5 | 11.8 | 10.6 | 11.3 | 14.5 | 13.5 |
| January 1951 | .49 | | .73 | .47 | 3.20 | 2.55 | 3.40 | 3.12 | 11.0 | 14.0 | 13.9 | 14.7 | 16.5 | 17.0 |
| Actual change | −.19 | | −.04 | −.12 | .60 | .35 | .78 | .50 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 3.5 |
| Percentage change | 27.9 | | −5.2 | −20.3 | 23.1 | 15.9 | 29.8 | 19.1 | 46.7 | 18.6 | 31.1 | 30.1 | 13.8 | 25.9 |
| Average actual change | | | | −.12 | | | | .56 | | | 3.0 | | | 3.0 |
| Average percentage change | | | | −17.8 | | | | 22.0 | | | 32.1 | | | 23.3 |
| Peas (can size) | 303 | 303 | 303 | 303 | 303 | | 303 | 303 | 303 | 17 oz. | 3 oz. | 303 | 17 oz. | 303 |
| May 1950 | 0.61 | | 0.78 | 0.81 | 3.50 | | 3.30 | 3.72 | 9.6 | 16.4 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 19.0 | 14.5 |
| January 1951 | .72 | | .81 | .70 | 3.80 | | 3.50 | 3.72 | 10.2 | 16.4 | 13.2 | 13.9 | 19.0 | 16.5 |
| Actual change | .11 | | .03 | −.11 | .30 | | .20 | | .6 | | 1.5 | 1.2 | | 2.0 |
| Percentage change | 18.0 | | 3.8 | −13.6 | 8.6 | | 6.1 | | 6.2 | | 12.8 | 9.4 | | 13.8 |
| Average actual change | | | | .01 | | | | .25 | | | 1.0 | | | 1.6 |
| Average percentage change | | | | 2.7 | | | | 7.4 | | | 9.5 | | | 11.6 |
| Peaches (can size) | No. 2½ | | No. 2½ | No. 2½ | No. 2½ | | No. 2½ | No. 2½ | No. 2½ | 29 oz. | No. 2½ | No. 2½ | 29 oz. | No. 2½ |
| May 1950 | 0.87 | | 0.83 | 0.89 | 4.70 | | 4.27 | 4.29 | 14.2 | 18.7 | 19.3 | 20.6 | 23.0 | 20.5 |
| January 1951 | 1.27 | | 1.23 | 1.35 | 5.90 | | 5.74 | 5.82 | 19.6 | 27.2 | 25.2 | 29.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Actual change | .40 | | .40 | .46 | 1.20 | | 1.47 | 1.53 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 5.9 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 10.5 |
| Percentage change | 46.0 | | 48.2 | 51.7 | 25.5 | | 34.4 | 35.7 | 38.0 | 44.4 | 30.6 | 40.8 | 34.8 | 51.2 |
| Average actual change | | | | .42 | | | | 1.40 | | | 6.5 | | | 9.0 |
| Average percentage change | | | | 50.0 | | | | 31.9 | | | 37.7 | | | 42.3 |

[1] Brands and can sizes by retailers are not necessarily the same as reported by canners.

[2] Prices paid to growers in 1949 and 1950 seasons.

*Prices of canned peaches, peas, tomatoes, and corn (cream style), May 1950 and January 1951—Comparison of identical products*

| Item | May 1950 | January 1951 | Actual increase | Percentage increase |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PEACHES, SLICED YELLOW CLING, NO. 2½ CAN | | | | |
| Price paid to grower, per case | Dollars [1] 0.885 | Dollars [2] 1.347 | Dollars 0.462 | Percent 52.2 |
| Canner's selling price, per case | 4.288 | 5.816 | 1.528 | 35.6 |
| Price paid by retailer, per case | 4.98 | 6.55 | 1.57 | 31.5 |
| Price paid by retailer, per can | .208 | .273 | .06 | 31.3 |
| Retailer's selling price, per can | .25 | .33 | .08 | 32.0 |
| PEAS, SIZE 303 (STORE 2, SIZE 17-OUNCE) | | | | |
| Price paid to grower, per case (blended) | [1] .813 | [2] .704 | −.109 | −13.4 |
| Canner's selling price, per case (blended) | 3.722 | 3.722 | 0 | 0 |
| Price paid by retailer: | | | | |
| Per case—store 2 | 3.93 | 3.93 | | |
| Per can—store 2 | .164 | .164 | | |
| Per case—store 3 | 3.92 | 3.91 | −.01 | .3 |
| Per can—store 3 | .163 | .163 | | |
| Retailer's selling price: | | | | |
| Per can, store 2 | .20 | .20 | | |
| Per can, store 3 | .195 | .200 | .005 | 2.6 |

Footnotes at end of table.

*Prices of canned peaches, peas, tomatoes, and corn (cream style), May 1950 and January 1951—Comparison of identical products*—Continued

| Item | May 1950 | January 1951 | Actual increase | Percentage increase |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOMATOES, NO. 2 CAN | | | | |
| Price paid to grower, per case | Dollars [1] 0.569 | Dollars [2] 0.596 | Dollars 0.27 | Percent 4.7 |
| Canner's selling price per case (fancy) | 4.50 | 4.50 | | |
| Price paid by retailer, per case | 4.50 | 4.50 | | |
| Price paid by retailer, per can | .188 | .188 | | |
| Retailer's selling price, per can | .244 | .248 | .004 | 1.6 |
| CORN, CREAM STYLE, YELLOW, SIZE 303 | | | | |
| Price paid to grower, per case | .590 | .471 | −.119 | −20.2 |
| Canner's selling price, per case | 2.62 | 3.12 | .50 | 19.1 |
| Price paid by retailer, per case | 2.84 | 3.35 | .51 | 18.0 |
| Price paid by retailer, per can | .118 | .140 | | |
| Retailers selling price, per can | .145 | .165 | .02 | 13.8 |

[1] 1949 season.
[2] 1950 season.

Further analysis of the reports submitted by canners and retail food chains reported by this committee 2 weeks ago indicate that most of the recent increases in prices for canned vegetables originated at the processors' level and were passed on in whole or in part by the retailers. The following table gives a summary of the relevant data:

*Increases in prices of canned peaches and vegetables, May 1950 to January 1951*

| Item | Paid to grower—change in price per case | Canners' selling price—change per case | Retailers' selling price—change per case [1] | Increase in spread between price paid to grower and retail price |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Canned tomatoes | Dollars −0.01 | Dollars 0.82 | Dollars 0.60 | Percent 22 |
| Snap beans | −.12 | −.05 | .12 | 13 |
| Corn, cream style | −.12 | .56 | .72 | 41 |
| Peas | .01 | .25 | .38 | 8 |
| Peaches | .42 | 1.40 | 2.16 | 40 |

[1] On a per-can basis.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by

the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], on behalf of himself and certain others Senators, is only four lines long; and it has the appearance of being a simple and straightforward proposal.

Appearances are deceiving, for the amendment would accomplish a great deal that is not apparent on its face.

By its terms, the amendment purports to affect only one section of title 18 of the United States Code. Actually, however, it would affect two sections.

By its terms, the amendment would affect section 1114 of title 18. But it would also affect section 111 of that title, because, by the terms of section 111, all persons designated in section 1114 are included within section 111.

Senators are probably familiar with the fact that section 1114, which the amendment purports to affect, provides that whoever kills any individual in certain named categories of officers or employees of the Federal Government, including "any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard," shall be tried on a Federal charge of murder or manslaughter. To come within the prohibition of the code, such killing must be done while the victim is engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties.

On its face, then, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York would simply take a provision of the code which makes it a Federal crime to kill an officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard while engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of the performance of his official duties, and would alter the provision so as to make the definition of the crime embrace the killing of any person of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, under similar circumstances.

If that were all the amendment did, there would still be room for a difference of opinion with respect to the merit of the amendment, because it would involve, even on that basis, a very large increase in Federal criminal jurisdiction. But that is not all the amendment does, by any means.

As I pointed out earlier, the amendment not only affects section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code—the section which by its terms it purports to amend—but also affects section 111 of the same title. Let us look now at section 111.

This section is much broader than section 1114. In section 111 it is provided that—

> Whoever forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any person designated in section 1114 of this title while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.
>
> Whoever, in the commission of any such acts, uses a deadly or dangerous weapon shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

We must recognize, therefore, that if we amend section 1114 so as to include within the persons designated in that section all "persons of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard," we are also changing the scope of section 111, and making it a Federal crime—a felony—forcibly to assault, or resist, or oppose, or impede, or intimidate, or interfere with any person of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

At that point, let me digress long enough to say I am not sure what the words "person of the Army" might mean.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. In my statement I think I deal with the matters which are in the mind of the Senator from Michigan, and I think we will perhaps save time if he will permit me to continue my discussion. However, if the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I shall yield for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask a question as to the meaning of the word "interfere." The word can well apply to the work of a marshal in serving a writ or a subpena. In such a case it would have a significant and certain meaning in the law. But I cannot see how it would apply in the case of a soldier or sailor or officer. I can see how it would apply to a man in the Coast Guard who was operating under the Treasury Department.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no stretch of imagination to which the Senator may not lend himself in using the word "interfere" in this respect. Anything might be construed as being interference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me give the Senator an example. If a soldier was driving along the road and A happened to pull out with his automobile in front of the soldier and stop him for a few minutes, would that be considered to be an interference in such form that the one guily of he inerference could be prosecued?

Mr. McCARRAN. I could be.

Mr. FERGUSON. With a penalty of $5,000 fine and up to 3 years imprisonment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Suppose he was driving at an excessive rate of speed under the terms of the local law, and a traffic officer stopped him. That might be considered to be "interference." We can go into any phase of imagination in the use of the term. That is a matter I wish to draw to the attention of the Senate. I have tried to go into it from every angle. I shall ask to be allowed to continue my remarks, because I think I will deal with the question I know the Senator from Michigan has in mind.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me for the purpose of asking the question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe the construction which would be given necessarily to the words "person of the Army" would involve the assumption that something more than enlisted man and officer was intended; and it might well be that the phrase would be deemed to include civilian personnel. My own opinion is it would be so construed. I mention this only in passing; but whatever the wish of the Senate should be in this regard, I would counsel that it be spelled out rather than left to subsequent interpretation. Certainly, if the Senate does not desire to include civilian personnel of all the Armed Forces within the class of persons who may not be assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with, then the amendment of the Senator from New York should not be approved in its present form.

I have already stated that this proposed amendment is much broader in its actual effect, and much less simple in the issues which it presents, than appears on its face. I have cited one way in which that is true, namely, that while the amendment on its face purports to affect only one section of the code, actually it affects another section as well. Now, let me point out another way in which the amendment appears to involve a simple issue, but in fact involves an issue which is much more complicated.

On its face, the amendment appears simply to broaden a category which now includes men of the Coast Guard—one of the armed services—so as to include persons of other branches of the armed services.

The apparent simplicity of this purpose necessarily involves considering the Coast Guard as one of the armed services. And, of course, the Coast Guard is one of the armed services.

But we must not lose sight of the fact that the Coast Guard is also—and was, for many years, primarily—a civilian agency, even though it has always been a uniformed agency.

Senators reading the categories of persons contained in section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code will note that all these categories of persons are civilians, with the exception of members of the Coast Guard.

Speaking historically, the Coast Guard became a military service, and a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States, by virtue of a statute enacted July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 585; 14 U. S. C., sec. 1). The same statute provides that the historical use of the Coast Guard will continue; that is to say, in time of peace the Coast Guard will operate under the Treasury Department; and will operate as a part of the Navy, subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy, in time of war or when the President shall so direct.

We find, then, speaking historically, that the Coast Guard has had for generations substantially civilian functions, and has operated as one of the enforcement arms of the Government.

It is my conclusion, after a study of the matter, that inclusion of members of the Coast Guard in this criminal code provision was in contemplation of their status—perhaps I should say former status—as civilian or pseudo-civilian employees of the Treasury Department; and I am confident Senators who will make the same study will agree this is a fair conclusion.

Of course, for many, many years the Coast Guard has had commissioned offi-

cers; but that of itself did not make the Coast Guard a military agency. At the present time, the Public Health Service has commissioned officers; but the Public Health Service is not to be considered a military agency.

The Coast Guard, in peacetime, is engaged in many undertakings; among them, the duty of chasing smugglers and rumrunners, the job of dealing with alien crew members of foreign ships, the work of making certain inspections of vessels, and so on.

It is noteworthy that the various categories of Federal employees designated in section 1114 of title 18, United States Code—including the Coast Guard, if we consider the Coast Guard in its capacity as a civilian agency—represent Federal officers and employees engaged in enforcement work of one kind or another. It seems perfectly clear that the intent of the code provisions, particularly in the case of section 111, was to prevent Federal enforcement officials from being hampered in the performance of their duties.

By treating the Coast Guard as a military agency, and adding persons of all other branches of the Armed Forces to the categories of persons designated in this code provision, we shall be getting completely away from this historic purpose of the criminal statute.

One of the sponsors of this amendment stated at the time when the amendment was submitted that it extended "to members of the Armed Forces the protection of Federal law against assault or violence of any kind in the course of performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty."

I shall not say that statement was an intentional oversimplification; but I think it is only fair to the Senate to point out that no clear line of demarcation exists between what constitutes an act performed in, or on account of, an official duty, and what does not constitute such an act. No such line of demarcation has yet been established.

Clearly, as the Court pointed out in the case of *United States* v. *Birdsall* (233 U. S. 223), a case decided in 1913, it is not necessary that a particular act be prescribed by Federal statute in order to be an act which may be performed in line of duty. Clearly, also, as pointed out in the case of *Whipp* v. *The United States* (47 Fed. 2d 496), a case decided in 1931, it is sufficient that the official act be governed by a lawful requirement of the department under whose authority the officer is acting. Such authority might be found in an established usage which constituted the common law of the department, and fixed the duties of those engaged in its activities. In fact, the Court in Birdsall against United States, which I have just cited, suggested that this might be so.

Thus, Mr. President, we see that the extent of the protection which this amendment is supposed to afford is not immediately or readily apparent.

That the sponsors of this amendment themselves anticipate a very broad area of protection is rather clearly indicated by the statement of one of the sponsors, at the time the amendment was submitted, that "there have been reports for instance that members of the Armed Forces were set upon and beaten up, while local police officers stood by abetting the attack. Such incidents would be punished under Federal law under the terms of this amendment."

That statement seems to contemplate, or at least to suggest, that local police officers might be among those who would be subject to prosecution under the language of the amendment. There is, indeed, nothing preposterous about this suggestion, for unquestionably local law-enforcement officers would be subject to prosecution under the language of the amendment. I shall discuss that point more at length as I go along.

As an example of what might be considered to be line of duty, let me call the attention of the Senate to a court-martial order of the Navy Department, in a case which involved the death of a Navy enlisted man from injuries which he suffered as an aggressor in a fight incident to his attempt, without authority, to enforce his conception of a State law.

Senators who are interested in reading this order will find it on page 145 of Court Martial Orders, Navy Department, 1944. The file designation on the entire case is JAG:J:JAL:ac, 7 February 1944.

The enlisted man in this case was the aggressor in a fight with a Negro when he attempte . to enforce the "Jim Crow" law of the State and to compel the Negro to sit in the rear of the conveyance. The enlisted man received stab wounds of the chest and head, and died several hours later. There was no evidence that the enlisted man was intoxicated.

The court found that the facts and circumstances indicated that the enlisted man was the aggressor in the fight, that he had taken it upon himself to enforce a State law, and had attempted to constitute himself a law-enforcement officer. However, the court said, a holding of misconduct may be sustained only when it is shown that the decedent's misconduct was the direct or proximate cause of his death. Even though an act of misconduct by the deceased was a contributing cause, the court said, if an unforeseen and intervening independent criminal act of another caused the injury or death, it cannot be held to have occurred as the result of his own misconduct. The court then went on to find that since the deceased's aggressive act was not the proximate cause of his death, which was caused by the unreasonable, excessive, and unanticipated use of a deadly weapon by another, which force was criminal, as it was not proper self-defense, a holding of misconduct was neither indicated nor justified. Accordingly, it was held that the death of the enlisted man was not due to his own misconduct. In other words, he died in line of duty.

Mr. President, as I am sure most of my colleagues know, a member of the Armed Forces is generally held to be in line of duty when he is performing a function which is a natural outgrowth of his military service. As is stated in an opinion of the Attorney General issued May 17, 1855, while—

> Every person who enters the military service of the country—officer, soldier, sailor, or marine—takes upon himself certain moral and legal engagements of duty, which constitute his official or professional obligations (nevertheless) though a soldier or a sailor, he is not the less a man and a citizen with private rights to exercise and duties to perform; and while attending to these things he is not in the line of his public duty.

The complexity of the many considerations involved in a study of this question is, perhaps, illustrated by the fact that the quotation which I have just read, and which I brought up to illustrate one line of thought, raises another line of thought which, in turn, will involve more questions.

Certainly a member of the Armed Forces is, as the Attorney General of the United States said so long ago, "not the less a man and a citizen with private rights to exercise." To the extent, therefore, that a private citizen may arrest for a felony committed in his presence, a member of the Armed Forces also may arrest for a felony committed in his presence.

The leading case on this point probably is *United States* v. *DiRe* (332 U. S. 589). In that case, at page 591, the Court said:

> We believe, however, that in absence of an applicable Federal statute the law of the State where an arrest without warrant takes place determines its validity. By one of the earliest acts of Congress, the principle of which is still retained, the arrest by judicial process for a Federal offense must be "agreeably to the usual mode of process against offenders in such State." There is no reason to believe that State law is not an equally appropriate standard by which to test arrests without warrant, except in those cases where Congress has enacted a Federal rule. Indeed, the enactment of a Federal rule in some specific cases seems to imply the absence of any Federal law of arrest.

We can now begin to see the legal maze into which approval of this amendment might lead us.

If, on the one hand, the amendment gives the protection which at least one of its sponsors attributes to it, then in any riot in which members of the Armed Forces might engage, civilian participants would be subjected to the strict penalties of this section of the Federal law, whereas the military personnel, if culpable, would only be subjected to the less stringent local laws.

Presumably, if a member of the Armed Forces, having assaulted a state trooper, or local peace officer, or civilian, should be arrested under authority of the State, he would be amendable to trial under State law, whereas if the reverse were true, the assailants would be brought to trial in a Federal jurisdiction under Federal law.

Of course, in any assault case in which a soldier was involved, under the language of this proposed amendment, an assertion that the soldier was attempting to do his duty and was opposed by the party whom he assaulted, conceivably could result in the removal of the case from a State court to a Federal court, even though the soldier was

charged with the crime of murder under State law.

Senators who think that statement is extravagant might be interested in reading the case of *In re Neagle* (136 U. S. 1) a case decided in 1889. In that case, the court quotes with approval the language used in the case of *Martin* v. *Hunter's Lessee* (1 Wheaton 304) where, at page 363, the court said:

> The United States is a Government with authority extending over the whole territory of the Union, acting upon the States and the people of the States. While it is limited in the number of its powers, so far as its sovereignty extends it is supreme. No State government can exclude it from the exercise of any authority conferred upon it by the Constitution; obstruct its authorized officers against its will; or withhold from it, for a moment, the cognizance of any subject which that instrument has committed to it.

Mr. President, I am one of those who oppose the silent supercession of State authority by Federal statutory encroachment. It is my view that no further inroads should be made on the police power of the States under the guise of protecting Federal employees. As a matter of general principle, I am opposed to enlargement of the Federal criminal jurisdiction except in such cases, and within such closely defined and limited areas, as may be fully justified by active Federal interest. The great length to which this proposed amendment would interfere with the States in the exercise of their police power cannot be fully appreciated without a much more exhaustive consideration of the subject than I have had time for; but the fact that this amendment would go to great lengths in its interference with State police powers will be immediately apparent to anyone who will read and study the broad terminology of section 111 of title 18, United States Code.

Even if the Senate should be of a mind to approve in principle this vast broadening of the Federal criminal jurisdiction, it would seem the part of wisdom to defer action until the language of the amendment could be worked out so as to do no more than the Senate intends, whatever that may be.

For instance, even if the Senate should favor the idea of such a wholesale broadening of Federal criminal jurisdiction, even if the Senate should deem it worth the risk of relegating our Federal courts to the status of mere police courts, yet the Senate might consider it wise to include some language to define what shall be deemed an act performed in line of duty, or some word to safeguard an expression of congressional intent that the section or amendment would not apply to a member of the Armed Forces, though in line of duty, while on authorized leave, liberty, or furlough and not in the actual performance of orders relating to a specific mission or task.

Senators, one of the things this amendment would mean, if it should be adopted, would be that in any possible altercation between a military policeman or shore patrolman and a civilian, or even between a military policeman or shore patrolman and a civilian law enforcement officer, the civilian would be wrong in the sight of the Federal law.

As just one example of the type of case which might arise, let me quote, in the language of a Federal judge, the facts of a case which did happen. The case is *Lima* v. *Lawler* (63 F. Supp. 446). The point at issue had nothing to do with the amendment we are discussing; but this is the kind of case which comes up all the time, and Senators will, I am sure, be able to see how a situation of this kind might subject a civilian or a civilian peace officer to prosecution for the Federal crime of assault, if the amendment now under consideration should be adopted.

Here is how the judge recited the facts in the case of Lima against Lawler:

> This is an application for a writ of habeas corpus filed by Albert F. Lima, an enlisted member of the naval forces, seeking his release from the custody of the sergeant of the city of Norfolk, by whom petitioner was held for nonpayment of a fine imposed upon him by the police justice of that city upon a charge of assaulting one A. W. Davis. At the time of the occurrences here related, Davis was night desk clerk at Hotel Martin, on Bank Street, in Norfolk, and petitioner was on duty in the vicinity of the hotel in the capacity of naval shore patrolman, pursuant to assignment by appropriate authority. At the time petitioner was wearing on his arm the distinguishing brassard and carrying a night stick customarily used while so engaged. He had been transferred to the Hampton Roads area only a short while previously.
>
> In the course of his duty the attention of petitioner was attracted to a disturbance on the street near the entrance to the hotel and with another shore patrolman detailed to duty with him, proceeded to the scene. A beer garden next door to the hotel was closing and a considerable number of members of the armed services and civilians were on the street. Upon approaching the place the two shore patrolmen observed a struggle taking place between Davis and a naval enlisted man. Shortly before nearing the participants, the patrolman accompanying petitioner stopped to observe or confront a civilian whose demeanor was threatening, and thus petitioner approached Davis and the sailor alone. At the time Davis was holding the sailor by his skivie shirt and kerchief. Petitioner called upon Davis to release the sailor to his custody. Davis refused, stating that he was holding the sailor until the arrival of the city police, whom he had called, in order that he might prefer charges against him in the police court of the city. Petitioner repeated his demand and Davis continued his refusal. Davis was then warned that unless he released the sailor, petitioner would strike him, and upon continued refusal on the part of Davis, petitioner struck him several times on the forearm with the night stick. Davis testified that he was also struck across the nose. During the course of the argument between petitioner and Davis, the enlisted man (the subject of the controversy) escaped; but his skivie shirt and kerchief were torn from him and retained by Davis. Davis testified that his purpose in holding the enlisted man was to turn him over to the city police, assigning as his reason a belief that the shore patrolman would merely carry him around the corner and free him. He testified to previous trouble with enlisted men who, as this one, had undertaken to visit guests at the hotel, which was out of bounds to members of the Armed Forces. Petitioner testified it was his purpose to obtain custody of the enlisted man in order that he might properly report the incident to the shore patrol in accordance with his orders in such cases.

Mr. President, if the amendment now under consideration should become law, and then a case exactly like that which I have described should occur, the civilian would be guilty of a Federal felony. So, in all probability, would be the civilian peace officer who arrested or attempted to arrest the shore patrolman.

Senators are familiar with the multiplicity of cases in which conflict, usually of a minor nature, arises between civilians and members of the Armed Forces, particularly in wartime, or in times when large numbers of soldiers and sailors are in uniform. Let us remember that we are in such a period now, and shall be in it for a good time to come. Then let us consider whether we want to say, by adopting an amendment such as this, that in any case of such an altercation, the soldier or sailor, who is subject only to the misdemeanor provisions of applicable State law, may be saved even from the operation of those laws by the intervention of military justice, but the civilian will be dealt with under a Federal law which makes his offense a felony.

I do not believe it is possible to overstress the importance of the fact that the penalty which is provided in section 111 of title 18, United States Code, which the proposed amendment would operate to broaden so vastly, is a penalty so severe as to constitute a felony. The effect of this amendment would be to make it a felony, with the accused subject to imprisonment up to 3 years, with a fine up to $5,000, not only for assaulting a member of the Armed Forces, but for resisting him, or for opposing him, or impeding him, or intimidating him, or interfering with him. And if a deadly or dangerous weapon should be used, the penalty could be imprisonment up to 10 years, with a fine up to $10,000. Remember, in that connection, that a shillelagh, or a rock, or a pair of brass knuckles, is a dangerous weapon.

In that connection, and by way of conclusion, let me touch once more upon a point I have already mentioned. The crime defined in section 111 is a felony. The amendment now before the Senate would make the provisions of that section applicable to all persons of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. It is a well-settled proposition of law that an ordinary person witnessing a felony committed in his presence may arrest the felon. That proposition is well stated in the case of *United States* v. *Lindenfeld* (142 Fed. 2d 829), a case decided in 1944. An earlier case, decided in 1940, which states the same proposition, is *Bachum* v. *United States* (112 Fed. 2d 635). Thus, it is not beyond reason to say that under the language of the proposed amendment, if a person loitered on the sidewalk outside an Army base, one who forcibly opposed a sentry's efforts to make that person move on could conceivably be arrested by another sentry witnessing the scene, notwithstanding the fact that the person was legally upon the sidewalk.

I am unalterably opposed to any such extension of the authority of the military.

Because of the many considerations involved in the proposed amendment,

and the many results, which I conceive to be greatly undesirable, which might flow from it, I believe the amendment should be rejected. Even if it be the will of the Senate to extend the Federal criminal jurisdiction and the Federal supercession of state police powers in some such way as this amendment proposes, I do not believe the Senate should adopt any language for that purpose which has not had the mature consideration of a Senate committee. In this particular case, the effects of the amendment would be so broad that I should personally favor having it considered by both the committee on armed services and the committee on the judiciary.

Mr. President, the amendment as it stands constitutes bad legislation, for reasons I have stated, I believe the Senate should reject it on principle. But even if the Senate does not reject the principle involved, the language in which the principle is to be stated should be worked out carefully, in committee, and not hastily, on the floor. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment in line 3, by striking out the word "person" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "uniformed members", so as to make lines 3 and 4, read: "Guard' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'uniformed members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Millikin |
| Anderson | Hennings | Monroney |
| Benton | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Brewster | Hill | Mundt |
| Bricker | Hoey | Murray |
| Bridges | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Md. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Butler, Nebr. | Ives | O'Conor |
| Byrd | Jenner | Pastore |
| Cain | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Capehart | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Case | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kem | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Connally | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Dirksen | Langer | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Lehman | Stennis |
| Duff | Lodge | Taft |
| Dworshak | Long | Thye |
| Ecton | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ellender | McClellan | Watkins |
| Ferguson | McFarland | Welker |
| Frear | McKellar | Wherry |
| Fulbright | McMahon | Wiley |
| George | Magnuson | Williams |
| Gillette | Malone | Young |
| Green | Martin | |
| Hayden | Maybank | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the amendment be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report within 60 days.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to have a minute to reflect on the motion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion was made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not as yet.

Mr. IVES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nevada state his motion again?

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New York for himself and other Senators be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back within 60 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICFR. The motion is not in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the amendment be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to lay on the table the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. IVES, Mr. DOUGLAS, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is this a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a quorum call.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Millikin |
| Anderson | Hennings | Monroney |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Brewster | Hill | Mundt |
| Bricker | Hoey | Murray |
| Bridges | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Md. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Butler, Nebr. | Ives | O'Conor |
| Byrd | Jenner | Pastore |
| Cain | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Capehart | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Case | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kem | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Connally | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Dirksen | Langer | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Lehman | Stennis |
| Duff | Lodge | Taft |
| Dworshak | Long | Thye |
| Ecton | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ellender | McClellan | Watkins |
| Ferguson | McFarland | Welker |
| Frear | McKellar | Wherry |
| Fulbright | McMahon | Wiley |
| George | Magnuson | Williams |
| Gillette | Malone | Young |
| Green | Martin | |
| Hayden | Maybank | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to lay on the table the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and other Senators. On this motion the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY] are unavoidably detained on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS is absent because of illness and is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—57

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bricker | Gillette | Millikin |
| Bridges | Hayden | Monroney |
| Butler, Md. | Hickenlooper | Mundt |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hill | Nixon |
| Byrd | Hoey | Robertson |
| Cain | Holland | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnson, Colo. | Schoeppel |
| Case | Johnson, Tex. | Smathers |
| Chapman | Johnston, S. C. | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Kefauver | Smith, N. C. |
| Connally | Kerr | Sparkman |
| Dirksen | Knowland | Stennis |
| Duff | Long | Taft |
| Dworshak | McCarran | Thye |
| Ecton | McClellan | Tobey |
| Ellender | McKellar | Welker |
| Frear | Malone | Wherry |
| Fulbright | Martin | Williams |
| George | Maybank | Young |

NAYS—30

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Humphrey | Magnuson |
| Anderson | Ives | Morse |
| Benton | Jenner | Murray |
| Capehart | Kem | Neely |
| Cordon | Kilgore | O'Conor |
| Douglas | Langer | Pastore |
| Ferguson | Lehman | Saltonstall |
| Green | Lodge | Smith, N. J. |
| Hendrickson | McFarland | Watkins |
| Hennings | McMahon | Wiley |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Eastland | McCarthy |
| Brewster | Flanders | O'Mahoney |
| Clements | Hunt | Vandenberg |

So the motion to lay Mr. LEHMAN'S amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, various Senators have asked me whether we are going to have a night session, or what the program is.

The Senate has worked hard, and if we could be assured that we could finish this bill tomorrow, I would be willing to have a recess taken until noon tomorrow.

In order to be sure of that, I am going to propound a unanimous-consent agreement, and see whether we can work it

out; and if we can, we shall take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further amendments to be offered to the bill be limited to those which already have been presented and are on the table and all amendments thereto, and that all amendments to the amendments be limited to those which are germane to the amendments; that the debate on the consideration of the amendments and upon the bill be limited as follows: On the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], that debate be limited to 1 hour, to begin at 12 o'clock tomorrow, with the time to be divided equally between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; that the limitation on debate on amendment A offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] be limited to 2 hours, that amendment to be considered immediately after the disposition of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, and that the time be divided equally between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; that the debate on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which is designated as E, be limited to 1½ hours, to be divided equally between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; that the debate on the remainder of the amendments be limited to 30 minutes each, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; that debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the distinguished minority leader or any Senator whom the minority leader may wish to designate and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the question is put on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, let me ask the majority leader to identify the amendments for which more time is requested under the proposed agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought I had done so.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did insofar as the letters identifying the amendments are concerned. However, briefly, is it not a fact that the Cordon amendment has to do with striking out the——

Mr. McFARLAND. The exemption in regard to the 75,000 students.

Mr. WHERRY. The second amendment is the UMT amendment; is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the amendment to strike the UMT provision from the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The third one is the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which has to do with the limitation of the time the bill is to run; is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. Then all the other amendments which have been offered will be considered, and on each of those the time limit will be 30 minutes, with 15 minutes to a side. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; and on amendments thereto, which are germane, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I want to make. If any Senator wants to offer an amendment, will it have to be an amendment to an amendment, or can it be an amendment to the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; an amendment to an amendment, unless it has been previously offered and printed.

Mr. WHERRY. There are one or two Senators on this side of the aisle who, while not intending to offer new amendments, feel that if any amendment is offered to an amendment, and debate is limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, they may not have sufficient time.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator knows we are trying to reach an agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized, reserving the right to object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I realize that the majority leader does not face an easy task, but unfortunately I think he has proposed a unanimous-consent agreement which will keep the Senate in session until 8 or 9 o'clock tomorrow night, and that will put the junior Senator from Virginia in a most embarrassing situation, because for many weeks he has had an engagement to address a gathering in Norfolk, including the Hampton Roads Martime Commission. To the people of that locality it is the most important meeting of the year, and it is too late now for the Senator from Virginia to get a substitute.

Every Senator knows how he is going to vote on the remaining amendments. We have had this bill before us for 10 days. It was debated in committee for weeks and weeks. The newspapers have carried many stories about it; we have been flooded with mail regarding it; we have studied it, we know how we are going to vote, and not a speech which will be made tomorrow will change a single vote.

I ask the distinguished majority leader, under those circumstances, how he can propose 1 hour or 2 hours or longer of debate on certain amendments and 30 minutes on other amendments which may come up, and call it "expediting the business of the Senate"? I ask the question with all due deference.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may answer the distinguished Senator in this way: When we undertake to work out an agreement of this kind, we have to do the best we can. When it comes to accommodating every Senator, if the Senator from Virginia thinks it is an easy job, I should merely like to have him try it, and see whether he can work out anything better.

I regret very much that we cannot accommodate the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I should like to accommodate every Senator, but I know that the Senate has worked hard, and I thought that if we could enter into the unanimous consent agreement as proposed, which is the best we could do, we could complete action on the bill and not have the debate drag on interminably.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield for a moment, he is in the fix of the corporal in World War I, to whom the sergeant said, "Corporal, I heard the chief of staff talking with the general, tonight." The corporal replied, "You did? What did he say?" The sergeant answered, "The general said, 'I will give 10,000 men to take Hill No. 90 tomorrow.'" The corporal said, "Liberal old leader, isn't he?" [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Am I correct in understanding that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement does not prevent any Senator from changing an amendment which is now lying on the table?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, so long as it is germane, an amendment may be offered to any amendment which is now on the table.

Mr. CAPEHART. That does not answer my question. May a Senator change the wording of his amendment, if it is printed and lying on the table?

Mr. McFARLAND. He may so long as it does not change the purpose of the amendment, and as long as the change is germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a good question, and I hope the Vice President will give the Senate his judgment on it. It is a question which has arisen heretofore. If a Senator who has offered an amendment wants to modify the amendment, it is my position, and always has been, that he is not foreclosed from doing so by reason of the unanimous-consent agreement. But I should like to have the view of the distinguished Vice President on the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has, he thinks, commented on it heretofore, and has ruled that a Senator has a right to modify his own amendment, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. There are two questions I should like to ask. In the first place, the Senator has not provided for amendments which may be offered to an amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I included that.

Mr. TAFT. I did not so understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I did. Senators are limited to 30 minutes in such case, just as on original amendments.

Mr. TAFT. The time is limited, just as in the case of original amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, Mr. President, I propose further that any Senator may modify any amendment offered by him, provided it could be amended under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There is nothing in the proposal as to a time for voting on the bill. The Senator simply intends to have vote taken on the bill when the last amendment is disposed of, does he?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The agreement would not prevent the Senator moving a recess or adjournment tomorrow, if we do not get through, I assume.

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. TAFT. In that case we would finish on Thursday or Friday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to get through with the bill tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know whether we can do so.

Mr. TAFT. But there is nothing in the agreement which would necessarily require a vote tomorrow, is there?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. I also desire to amend my unanimous-consent request so as to provide that on any appeal or motion, debate shall be limited to 30 minutes, divided equally between the one making the motion, or the one making the appeal, and the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am not proposing an amendment, but, on principle, if any Senator should want to offer an amendment to this bill, why should he not have the right to do so? Why should he be foreclosed? Why not word the unanimous-consent request in such a way that the time is limited to 15 minutes on a side, and if anyone wants to offer an amendment, he shall be allowed to do so? Once upon a time, by agreeing to a unanimous-consent request, I was euchred out of a chance to amend an agricultural bill involving wheat. I should hate to get into the same position again.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me explain to the Senator why there is a restriction in the proposed agreement. I hope my explanation will be satisfactory to him. A week ago it was suggested that we make a unanimous request such as this. I did not make it at the time, because some of the Senators wanted to know the nature of the amendments before they were willing to agree to a unanimous-consent request. I think every Senator now has that information. We have been debating the bill for a week. Ordinarily I would agree with the Senator from North Dakota 100 percent, but the pending legislation is so important that Senators felt they ought to know the nature of an amendment before agreeing to a limitation of debate, feeling that if they did not know what it was, they would be at a disadvantage. I hope the explanation is satisfactory.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to offer two amendments which I have at my office. I shall get them here in time to file them. I want them included. I am not offering them now, but I want them printed and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall have to wait until the Senator gets them here, so we may see whether we can agree.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I am particularly concerned at the plight of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. He has moved me very much. He desires to deliver his address at Norfolk, and his sense of conscience is so extreme that he is troubled about it. Therefore, in order to give the Senator a good night's rest and to set his conscience at ease, I ask unanimous consent that he be given permission to deliver the address tomorrow night. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask a question as to what the floor situation will be.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, is there a ruling on my request? Does the Chair rule on that unanimous-consent request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can only entertain one unanimous-consent request at a time.

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall get to that later.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to raise a question as to what the floor situation will be after we shall have considered the amendments called for by the unanimous-consent agreement, in regard to motions thereafter. Will motions be subject to the limitations of the agreement?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I included that. I intended to include it. I thought I had done so.

Mr. MORSE. I was afraid he did, because, if we are confronted with the problem of reconsidering any one section of the bill, I want the parliamentary situation to be such that we shall be afforded the opportunity of moving to reconsider many sections of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will have that privilege.

Mr. MORSE. I fear it shall not be sufficiently safeguarded under an arrangement of the kind proposed.

If that situation arises, it may take a very long time. It might take days and days. I do not believe that under those circumstances we could, by this proposal, agree to sacrifice the opportunity of reviewing the entire bill if we should be presented with the problem of reconsidering any one section of it, because the only protection we would have then would be a very thorough review of each and every section of the bill.

I do not believe I can enter into the proposed agreement unless it can be agreed here and now that the motion to reconsider the vote by which the four million ceiling was placed in the bill today, can be brought up so that a motion to table it may be made.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I exclude that provision from the proposal for limitation, would it be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. No, because if that one is excluded, and all the other motions to reconsider are included, in case we got into a parliamentary tussle over any question, such as the rejection of the amendment relating to 18-year-olds and some other sections, I would want to be in a position so that we could review the whole bill, if necessary.

I should be perfectly willing to agree to the request if I could get unanimous consent to be allowed to bring up the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to reconsider the vote by which a ceiling was proposed, so that we could get that out of the way and agreed to, but if we are getting into such a situation that this unanimous-consent agreement could be used as a means of limiting us on a motion to reconsider, and we could not reconsider some other section of the bill, I believe it would be parliamentarily unwise.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I stated before, when we try to get an agreement of the kind we are considering, we have to do the best we can. In order to satisfy the Senator from Oregon, I will exclude the limitation of debate on motions.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. If motions are eliminated from the unanimous-consent agreement, then after all the votes called for by the unanimous-consent agreement are taken on the various amendments, will the Members of the Senate then be in a position to move, if they care to do so, a reconsideration as to any section of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such a motion would have to be made within 2 days of the action of the Senate upon the section affected, and the Senator who made the motion would have to qualify himself by having voted in the majority. Subject to those qualifications, such a motion would be in order.

Mr. MORSE. I accept that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand from the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that he desires to see the amendments to be offered by the Senator from North Dakota before he agrees to a limitation.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that they do not involve any civil rights problems, if

that is the point the Senator has in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not raise that question. I am interested in the bill now pending. If the Senator will permit me to get away from those issues occasionally, I assure him I have enough to keep me busy otherwise. I should like to see any amendment that is proposed.

Mr. LANGER. I have sent for the amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the Church of the Brethren, District of Northern Indiana, dealing with the measure now under consideration in the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN,
DISTRICT OF NORTHERN INDIANA,
*Elkhart, Ind., March 5, 1951.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The joint boards of the Church of the Brethren of the District of Northern Indiana representing a membership of about 9,000 members, meeting in Goshen, Ind., March 3, 1951, felt the need of expressing to you our deep concern regarding the proposed legislation on dealing with the draft question.

Our church fathers came to this country because of the military oppression in Europe, believing that all war is wrong and that all differences can be settled by peaceful means. It appears that we are approaching complete militarism because the leaders of our own country are unwilling to go the second mile in their efforts to establish world peace.

We urge careful consideration of this issue that you may have the courage to vote against the drafting of 18-year-olds and any bill providing for universal military training or service. May we work earnestly and sincerely together to preserve the precious freedom of conscience which is our rightful heritage.

Respectfully yours,
MARTHA HEETER,
*Director of Peace and Temperance.*
GEO. U. HEETER,
*Chairman, Board of Christian Education.*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk the two amendments I wish to offer to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill two new sections, as follows:

SEC. —. (a) Section 12 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the last thirteen lines in the table contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| "Over $22,000 but not over $25,000 | $7,720 plus 56 percent of excess over $22,000 |
| "Over $25,000 | 100 percent of excess over $25,000" |

(b) Section 12 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence therein.

SEC. —. (a) Subsection (a) of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year (in addition to other taxes imposed by this chapter) upon the net income of every corporation accumulating earnings or profits instead of dividing or distributing such earnings or profits, a surtax of 100 percent of the amount of the undistributed section 102 net income."

(b) Subsection (b) and (c) of such section are hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I understand correctly the unanimous-consent agreement which has been proposed, the debate on the amendments would be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment, 15 minutes to each side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood that in the earlier portion of the unanimous-consent agreement it was provided that any amendment or modification of an amendment must be germane to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Arizona for a limitation of debate? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

The agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

*Ordered,* That on the calendar day of Thursday, March 8, 1951, at the hour of 12 o'clock noon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment (lettered "B") intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, by Mr. CORDON, submitted on March 5, 1951; that the time between 12 o'clock and 1 o'clock be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. MORSE and Mr. RUSSELL.

That following the disposition of the foregoing amendment, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment intended to be proposed to the said bill by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), submitted on February 28, 1951, and letered "A"; that debate thereon be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. RUSSELL.

That following the disposition of the foregoing amendment proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment intended to be proposed to the said bill by Mr. TAFT, submitted by him on March 5, 1951, and lettered "E," and that debate thereon be limited to not exceeding 1 hour and 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. TAFT and Mr. RUSSELL.

*Ordered further,* That in the event any amendment shall be offered to either of the foregoing three amendments debate on any such amendment shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the proposer of any such amendment and Mr. RUSSELL: *Provided,* That any amendment proposed to either of said three foregoing amendments must be germane to the subject matter, respectively, thereof.

*Ordered further,* That upon the disposition of the foregoing amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT it shall be in order to proceed to the consideration of amendments intended to be proposed to the said bill, which have heretofore been printed and ordered to lie on the table; that debate upon any such amendment or amendment proposed thereto shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or amendment thereto and Mr. RUSSELL: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received, and no amendment to any amendment shall be received that is not germane to the amendment to which it is proposed.

*Ordered further,* That following the consideration and disposition of all amendments to the said bill, debate shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes on the question of its final passage, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. WHERRY, or some Member of the Senate designated by him.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, to introduce bills and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### SUSPENISON OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### MAUD M. WRIGHT AND MAXINE ROBERTS, FORMERLY MAXINE MILLS, AGAINST UNITED STATES

A lette from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 227, Eightieth Congress, second session, agreed to May 10, 1948, certified copies of the opinion of the Court of Claims in the case of *Maud M. Wright and Maxine Roberts, formerly Maxine Mills* v. *The United States* (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relating to the payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

worsen our relations with the German people by what seems to be simply an act of spite. I refer to the recent action of the Alien Property Custodian in advertising the German Embassy building for sale.

Just a day of two ago, our authorities in Germany announced that the government in Western Germany has been authorized to resume normal diplomatic relations with other nations all over the world. That means that the government there will be sending and receiving ambassadors and ministers to the other nations. For the time being, while we, the British, and the French are in occupation, there will be no ambassador sent here because their diplomatic channel with us is through occupation authorities. However, in the long run, there will certainly be a resumption of diplomatic relations, and the Germans at that time may have need for this building.

There is absolutely no reason why the building must be sold. None of the other foreign embassies or legations has been sold. The Italian Government which has signed a peace treaty with us has reoccupied the Italian Embassy. The Japanese Embassy is now occupied by the Far Eastern Commission under supervision of the State Department, but at least title has never been taken away from the Japanese Government, and there has been no action to sell the building.

We have been particularly tender of those former enemy nations which have turned Communist. The Hungarians have been restored to full possession of their property. The Bulgarians, as I understand, never owned a building, and since we have now broken relations with that Government, they have terminated their lease. At least we did not seize it from them and put it up for sale.

Only in the case of the German Embassy is it proposed to sell it into private hands. The matter may seem trivial, but it has a far-reaching psychological importance to the German people. Their Embassy here is a symbol of their hope to be restored to full partnership with the other nations of western civilization.

If the Alien Property Custodian goes ahead with this sale, it will amount to nothing more nor less than an act of sabotage against our attempt to restore a more friendly relationship with the German Nation. I sincerely hope that the Alien Property Custodian will not now take an action in haste which I feel we will all later have to repent at leisure.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, vice Harold Armstrong Jones, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Ramspeck to be Civil Service Commissioner.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of my long association with Mr. Ramspeck, both in the House of Representatives and in later positions, I cannot let his nomination go by without saying that I believe it to be a fine appointment. I am sure Mr. Ramspeck will do one of the best and most able jobs ever done on the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I wish to concur in all that has been said by the able Senator from Washington in behalf of Mr. Ramspeck, who is an outstanding statesman and one of the most deserving and faithful public servants I have ever known.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, naturally I am gratified to have these very fine sentiments expressed with reference to a fellow Georgian. Former Congressman Ramspeck is highly regarded by all who know him. I am proud to claim him as a personal friend. He is well qualified for the position to which he has been appointed. During his long and useful tenure of office in the House of Representatives he served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He authored much legislation, assuring fairness and equity to employees, as well as protecting the interests of the Government. The people of Georgia are very proud of Robert Ramspeck's career. I predict for him a most successful tenure of office.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it has been my good fortune to know Bob Ramspeck for many years. I know that he is qualified for the position to which he has been nominated. I was very much pleased when his nomination to the position was announced by the President. I also want to state that in the committee every member not only wanted to vote for him but they wanted to say something in behalf of Bob Ramspeck, showing that he must be very well qualified for the position.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to add my voice to what has been said and to identify myself with everything that has been favorably spoken of Mr. Ramspeck. He is peculiarly well qualified for the position because of his long study of civil-service legislation and his long familiarity with it while a Member of the House. His general good character and excellent judgment qualify him unquestionably for appointment to this important position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of Mr. Ramspeck is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of F. Joseph Donohue to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the President will be immediately notified.

## POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared on the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

No hearings were ever held on the veterans bill introduced by Senators RUSSELL, MALONE, and other Senators since a fast switch was made by substituting the Marshall-Rosenberg bill, and hearings were held on the substitute by the Senate Armed Services Committee while the public believed that the hearings were being held upon the Russell-Malone bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE RE S. 1, MARCH 8, 1951

The junior Senator from Nevada has washed his hands of the Marshall-Rosenberg bill which has been substituted for the original S. 1, introduced by the junior Senator from Georgia, the junior Senator from Nevada, and other Senators. The committee hearings have been on the substitute bill and not on the original S. 1. The original S. 1 had the full approval of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations.

The junior Senator from Nevada previously joined in introducing military training legislation. Unfortunately, that legislation was stopped by the administration, the last time late in 1950.

Adoption of universal military training as provided in the original S. 1 is the most effective national security measure obtainable by America at the least possible cost. It is not only necessary for our own security, but as our strongest argument for peace.

Universal military training, as originally provided, is security insurance for our Nation and survival insurance for our young men, as a trained man has the best chance for survival. In World War I and World War II, and in the Korean war, untrained American boys were sent in against trained troops without an even break.

Under the provision of the original UMT bill, there would be no interference with the current war effort and no young men would be called up for such training until the present crisis had passed.

The State Department had Secretary of Defense Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg present to the Armed Services Committee an entirely different bill to take the place of the Russell-Malone bill. This is the same State Department which has made the blunders that brought on our present troubles.

The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute changes the provision of the original bill for a trained civilian army into a provision for a standing professional army and it provides for drafting 18-year-olds and keeping them in continual service two or more years.

This is a far cry from the provisions of the original S. 1 bill, which among other things called for only a 4- to 6-month military training course.

I want everyone to know that I have nothing to do with the monstrosity which they are now calling S. 1.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Senator Malone Washes Hands of UMT Bill," which was published in the Pioche (Nev.) Record, of February 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MALONE WASHES HANDS OF UMT BILL

United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, stated today that he has washed his hands of the bill which had been substituted for his universal military training bill, the original S. 1.

The committee hearings, the Senator said, have been on the substitute bill, and not on the original S. 1, which he and Senator RUSSELL introduced and which had the over-all approval of the American Legion and the veterans and other veterans' organizations.

Senator MALONE said the State Department had Secretary of Defense Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg present to the Armed Services Committee an entirely different bill to take the place of the Russell-Malone bill.

This is the same State Department which has made the blunders that brought on our present troubles.

"The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute on which the hearings have been held at the present gives unlimited authority to send any number of troops to any foreign country at any time for any purpose. It also changes the provision of the Russell-Malone bill for a trained civilian army into a provision for a standing professional army and it provides for drafting 18-year-olds and keeping them in continuous service from 2 to 8 years.

"This is a far cry from the provisions of the Russell-Malone bill which, among other things, called for only a 4 to 6 months' military training course.

"I want everyone to know that I have nothing to do with the monstrosity which they are now calling S. 1."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, my statement before the Armed Services Committee, January 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator MALONE. Universal military training versus universal military service: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, since the hearings are closing today, that I am disturbed by the change in the principle between the original Russell-Malone bill introduced as S. 1 and the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute. Mr. Chairman, since I was one of the sponsors of the universay military training bill, and since the substitute known as the universal military service bill, that has not even a remote resemblance to the original bill, I am compelled to appear in opposition to it.

Changes trained citizens' reserve to a professional army: The substitute completely changes the principle of the proposed military training from a trained citizens' reserve army under the UMT to a professional army under a universal military service bill.

The Defense Department conscription plan changes a civilian Reserve training policy of 4 to 6 months, or whatever the committee may have finally established, providing for alternate educational programs in colleges, academies, or officer-training school, or whatever scientific training might have been chosen or to be selected, to a 27 months' continuous active service followed by 69 months Inactive Reserve duty or a total of 8-years' obligation for the entire service. The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute for the Russell-Malone bill apparently has the blessing of the State Department.

May train army in any nation any place: The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute provides for 27 months' continuous service, and that the President may send them anywhere to any nation outside of the United States for training or fighting at his discretion without consulting Congress further.

Senator JOHNSON. Training in the United States, but service can be anywhere.

Senator MALONE. I understand that nothing in the bill prohibits the President from sending the inducted troops to train or fight anywhere at any time without further approval of Congress.

Destroys civilian training units: Then automatically he enters the Reserve for approximately 6 years, after his 27 months' service. The changes destroy the National Guard and class A Organized Reserve; certainly it would tend to destroy the National Guard. The original bill would have preserved the civilian training units.

No recruits will be available to National Guard and Organized Reserves for 27 months. The civilian components will shrink to almost nothing in that time.

Practically all reserves except Army reserves and one-third the National Guard have already been called to duty.

We will have a regular armed force of 3,500,000 with no Organized Reserves from June 30, 1952, and thereafter. This big professional army will be too small to scare or fight Russia but it will denude our labor market and our colleges and cost billions we do not have.

The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute professional defense force will contain an estimated 1,400,000 ground troops. These cost $5,000 per year per man.

Present cost of National Guard men and class A reserves is $601 per year per man.

The trained civilian army method: If all eligibles are inducted for Army training as proposed by the Defense Department bill and on completion of training one-half are chosen by lot or selection board for duty in the National Guard and Organized Reserves, the following results will obtain:

JUNE 30, 1952

| | Regular Army infantry | Civilian components |
|---|---|---|
| Number | 1,000,000 | 400,000 |
| Cost | $5,000,000,000 | $240,000,000 |

Saving $1,760,000,000 over cost of 1,400,000 regulars.

Four hundred thousand men would have been sent home to families, jobs, and schools and for duty in the Organized Reserves.

This process can be continued until the Reserve force in being is one, two, or three million, whatever Congress thinks the threat requires.

These men will be stationed all over the United States where they will be immediately available in the event of air-borne raid or atom bombing.

Thus, we can build more long-range defensive strength against communism for less money and we can keep a large proportion of young Americans at home, on the job, and in school.

The people confused. The country is entirely confused about the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute while still retaining S. 1. My recent mail indicates the people believe that the substitute upon which the hearings have been held is the original Russell-Malone American Legion or veterans' bill, which serveral of us joined in introducing.

This is the third time I have joined in the introduction of the universal military training bill, but I find now the hearings are not being held on the universal military training bill that was originally introduced at all. The hearings are being held on the substitute universal military service bill which, while retaining the S. 1 designation, changes the entire policy and procedure and character of the Army.

The completely different principle established by the substitute universal military service bill can be changed by this committee following the hearings, and of course they can report the original bill to the Senate floor if they so desire, and I am hopeful that they will do just that.

Senator JOHNSON. The Chair would like to interject that any misapprehension the people have been laboring under is not due to anything the committee did or failed to do. We had 10 days of hearings before we had a hearing on any bill. We had hearings on the general manpower problem. At the end of that 10-day period the Department of Defense finally, at the urging of the chairman of this committee, brought forth a bill, at which time it was announced on the floor of the Senate, and in the committee, that this bill would be introduced by request. We have taken testimony on that bill, introduced by request, since that time.

It is true that the American Legion and the veterans' organizations have come here and testified on this bill, introduced as an amendment by request, and have embraced it and endorsed it, but we have never left the impression or never intended to or never wanted to convey the information to the country that we were holding hearings on the original S. 1.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you, the chairman, had never had any idea of any misrepresentation; but I will call to the attention of the chairman that the Russell-Malone universal military training bill was introduced on the first day bills were accepted on the Senate floor, and was before this committee from the beginning before any hearings were started, but the Marshall-Rosenberg bill was immediately substituted and no hearings were ever held on the Russell-Malone bill.

Not in accord with the substitute: Mr. Chairman, I considered it important to clarify the matter from my own personal standpoint, and to say that I am not in accord with the bill upon which hearings are now being held.

The committee, of course, may, if it so desires, revert to the original Russell-Malone universal military training bill, which the veterans of this Nation have supported in principle for 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, since the principle of S. 1, which I joined in introducing, has been

changed from a trained citizens' reserve army to a professional Army status, and that 18-year-old boys are to be inducted for 27 months' actual service plus 69 months' Reserve status, instead of a 4 to 6 months' training period, and then left at home until actually needed, I felt constrained to appear in opposition to it.

The bill under consideration by the subcommittee is not the Russell-Malone universal military training bill represented in S. 1, but it is the Marshall-Rosenberg bill supported by the State Department.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you a lot, sir.

Senator MALONE. Thank you very much.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express to the distinguished minority leader my appreciation for his good work, cooperation, and help in working out the unanimous-consent agreement on the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the majority leader. He has my cooperation at all times.

## RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

Hon. Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

F. Joseph Donohue, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

### POSTMASTERS

#### CALIFORNIA

Meryl G. Adams, Acton.
Amelia B. Peirsol, Camino.
Margaret I. Higgins, El Granada.
Robert F. Osmann, Escondido.
James B. Michener, Geyserville.
Glen R. Brewington, Los Alamos.
Milton I. Espenshade, Jr., Mather Field.
Ellis C. Allsop, Maywood.
Jeremy A. Gregory, Muroc.
Sidney S. Tucker, Paso Robles.
Nelson F. Smith, Petaluma.
Everett M. Fisher, Rio Linda.
Virgil M. Ringue, South San Francisco.
Fred J. Ishoy, Sunnymead.
Kenneth R. Rudisill, Tulelake.
Odessa M. Love, Tupman.
William D. Thornton, Watsonville.
James V. Breen, Willits.

#### IOWA

Wallace W. Koestner, Centerville.
Thomas G. Clifford, Charlotte.
Vertle DeVerne Lugar, Derby.
Roger E. Klay, Hull.
Richard D. Claus, Plymouth.

#### MINNESOTA

Donald E. Cummings, Spring Valley.
William H. Schaefer, Warren.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Warren E. Horrocks, Blooming Glen.
James H. Taylor, Sr., Canton.
John J. Fox, Ivyland.
Edgar S. Husband, Jr., Lansdowne.
John H. Reuther, Muncy.
Mary R. Vincenti, Plainsville.
John C. Hess, Three Springs.
Thomas G. Wilt, Woolrich.

# House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the counselor and companion of our souls we rejoice that daily we may bring our fears and hopes and longings to Thy listening ear and understanding heart.

Grant that in all our duties we may have Thy help; in all our temptations Thy restraining and conquering power; in all our dangers Thy protection; in all our doubts and uncertainties Thy guiding presence; in all our sorrows and trials Thy sustaining grace; in all our sins Thy forgiveness.

We pray that we may appreciate more fully that Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace and that no blessing wilt Thou withhold from us if we walk uprightly.

Show us how we may strengthen the ties of kinship that make us members of the great family of which Thou art the wise and loving Father. May we always manifest toward one another the mind and mood, the loyalty and devotion, the encouragement and helpfulness of our blessed Lord who went about doing good.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## INFLATION

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, we are all against inflation, but nothing effective is being done about it. Now let us quit kidding ourselves. We have got inflation, and instead of the vigorous use of existing machinery to stop it, we seem to be using that machinery to guarantee continued price increases. We have not frozen prices. We have frozen inflation.

If the people in Economic Stabilization need to have their nerves steeled in order to properly do their job, I suggest that they get out and talk to the people, the housewives who see prices going up, up, up; the wage earners who try week after week to stretch their incomes to cover bare necessities; those in the fixed-income brackets who are falling behind with their bills a little more each month.

Inflation is no toy. It is as deadly as the threat of Russian bullets, perhaps deadlier. We have got to quit playing with the idea of inflation control before it is too late. Economic stability is the key to American security. We are letting it slip away from us.

Congress, whose Members live close to the people, saw this threat and tried earnestly last summer to avoid inflation. The administration refused to adopt the curbs which would at that time have been effective. Curbs then would have hurt a few people, but they would have averted this thing which now hurts everybody. The Government still has the power to stop inflation. It will not be easy, and the present half measures will make it more difficult. But we are facing ruin unless someone accepts the responsibility of clamping down, and clamping down hard.

## IV–F SCANDAL

(Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, is there an IV–F scandal? The current issue of Cosmopolitan magazine tells its reading public that there is such a scandal, in an article which states that less than 25 percent of men between 19 and 26 are able to get into the armed services. What is wrong with the policy of the armed services in recruiting and drafting young men into all branches? If this article is true, then the policy needs a thorough going over by the Congress. I hope that the Armed Services Committee will take cognizance of this before recommending a draft bill.

My attention many times has been called by my constituents to injustices suffered by these young men, particularly those aspiring to the Air Corps. Are these young men's lives to be pawns at the whim of the Defense Department? Let us have this clarified before it is too late. Everyone realizes that we must have an Army and Navy, but let us have a sound policy developing it.

## CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on page 2049 of the RECORD of yesterday, March 6, is recorded the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks and include a speech by Dr. Clarence Decker. Dr. Decker is erroneously identified therein as president of the Kansas City Council on World Affairs. Dr. Decker is in fact the distinguished and able president of the University of Kansas City. Another distinguished citizen of Kansas City, Mr. Edgar Shook, is president of the Kansas City Council on World Affairs, the organization to which Dr. Decker delivered the speech in question. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am informed in connection with the same extension that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and that the cost is estimated to be $266.50. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

## SCHOOL LANDS IN ALASKA

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which, if enacted into law, would prevent use of school lands in Alaska for private as opposed to public interest.

I hope the bill will be acted upon speedily.

Back in 1915 two sections in every township in Alaska were reserved for the support of the common schools of the Territory. Such reservation was effective upon completion of surveys. The law provided that the land could be leased for agricultural and related purposes. In 1939 it was amended and broadened to make possible leasing of these school lands for the timber and minerals they contained. The 1915 act specifically provided that land upon survey found to be mineral in character should not go to the Territory, but this was changed with the 1939 amendment and the mining laws of the United States were extended to such lands.

In the great growth and development of Alaska which has taken place during recent years gravel has become important and valuable. In one school section near Anchorage, the largest community in the Territory, a lease arrangement made for the benefit of the Territorial common school fund has been disturbed by mining claims being staked out on this school section. Whether or not such staking will be sustained in court remains to be seen. If it is, then the gravel which is conservatively valued at $2,000,000 will go to private individuals instead of to the Territorial government, as was intended. Enactment of my bill would prevent any recurrence of that in the future.

Public feeling in Alaska is worked up to a high pitch by what has been done. It is felt that the public good has been endangered by the desire for private gain. I want to suggest to those who have staked this land that the proper thing for them to do is to relinquish their claims without further controversy. Such action would be applauded and is the only right thing to do.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only).

Issued Mar. 12, 1951
For actions of Mar. 9, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 43

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....4
Flood control.....8
Foreign affairs,aid.....3
Forests and forestry.....7
Military training.....1
Natural resources.....7
Poultry.....6
Prices, control.....2
farm.....6
Soil conservation.....7
Transportation.....5

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed military training bill.

SENATE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Passed, 79-5, with amendments S. 1, the military-training selective-service bill (pp. 2235-74). The bill, as passed, was printed in the Record (pp. 2274-7).

2. PRICE CONTROL. Sen. Capehart spoke in favor of stronger price curbs and inserted correspondence and speeches on this subject (pp. 2278-81).

3. INDIA AID. Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution of the Bethel Lutheran Brotherhood of Willmar, Minn., favoring S. 372, to provide for shipment of grain to India (p. 2228).

4. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 12 (p. 2283), when the calendar will be called (p. 2278).

HOUSE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Mon., Mar. 12.

BILL INTRODUCED

5. TRANSPORTATION. S. 1089, by Sen. Magnuson (for himself and Sen. O'Conor), to provide for U. S. flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 2230).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

6. FARM PRICES. Sen. Williams inserted his letter to Michael V. DiSalle discussing price regulations on agricultural commodities with particular reference to the price ceiling on poultry (p. A1328).

7. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Wiley inserted his recent address before the National Wildlife Federation urging conservation of our natural resources and increased programs for soil conservation and forest protection (pp. A1318-9).

8. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Magnuson inserted a Kent (Wash.) News-Journal editorial favoring approval of the Green River flood-control project (p. A1321).

oOo

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS: for Mar. 12: H. Appropriations, defense emergency appropriations (ex.); H. Agriculture, farm-labor supply; S. Banking and Currency, RFC investigation; S. Finance, trade agreements; H. Armed Services, manpower and military training; H. Interior, central Arizona project; H. Expenditures, Government operations (ex.); H. Ways and Means, revenue revision.

oOo

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654, or send to Room 105 Adm.

- oOo -

BOSTON, MASS., *February 5, 1951.*
Senaor JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

As president of the Association of Schools of Public Health, which includes all the schools accredited to give postgraduate training in Public Health in this country, I urge early passage of the Bill S. 337 designed to furnish emergency financial assistance for the education of health personnel. I consider this bill absolutely essential to enable the schools of Public Health to assist the country in training the key personnel required to plan, organize, and operate effective civil and military health programs in the present emergency. This bill is also important to provide emergency assistance to education in medicine and other essential professions. The schools of Public Health are located at the following universities: California, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, Tulane, and Yale.

JAMES STEVENS SIMMONS, M. D.
*Brigadier General, United States Army (Retired), President, Association of Schools of Public Health.*

---

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 27, 1951.*
Senator MURRAY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Strongly urge your support of S. 337, to provide Government assistance to schools trainng doctors, nurses, dentists. Rural areas are desperately short of health services now. Mobilization making situation worse.

JAMES G. PATTON,
*President, National Farmers Union.*

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are meeting early today, if there is no more routine business to be transacted, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into begin to run immediately after the quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated and that further proceedings thereunder be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. The time for debate on this amendment is limited to 1 hour, the time to be divided equally and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. CORDON's amendment proposes to strike out beginning on page 83, line 3, and page 84 down to and including line 19, reading as follows:

(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed 75,000 persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than 10 years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I assure my colleagues that I do not lightly take the floor at this time to present my amendment. I appreciate, as I am sure the other Members of this body do, the sincere, long-continued work of the Armed Services Committee in the preparation of this most important legislation. Having had an opportunity, at least cursorily, to look over the hearings, I realize how voluminous were the data, and how complex their nature. I know that the committee had in mind one thing, and one only: to submit to the Senate the best answer it could achieve to the pressing and emergent necessities of these days.

Mr. President, though I recognize what the committee sought to do and the necessity of something of the sort being done, I feel deep within me that the provision which I seek to strike from the bill contains a discrimination which should not be present in any legislation at all, or, if at all, then only to the extent of absolute necessity for it, and if that be a matter which could be determined, then only if there be determination that the discrimination is workable in its operation. Because I feel that this provision answers none of these necessities, I have offered my amendment to strike.

Mr. President, I think we are all agreed that the highest service any citizen can render his Government is rendered when he offers his body, himself, in the defense of his country. There can be no greater service offered by any human to society. I know that the members of the committee had that thought in mind always while they studied the problem and drafted the bill. I wonder, however, if there was time to do the thing as well as it should be done. I wonder if the necessity which this particular provision in the bill sought to meet is so compelling as to require half-way measures at this moment when full measures might be taken after a more careful consideration of this particular aspect of our problem.

We must all agree, Mr. President, that the ideal we seek, the ideal that should prevail when we call our citizenship to the defense of the country, is that of equal service and equal sacrifice. That the ideal cannot be achieved, of course, we know; but we can at least achieve as much of it as is humanly possible.

The provision which I seek to strike from the bill is that which provides for the equivalent of deferment of a group not in excess of 75,000 persons from the service—not from training, but from service—in order that those constituting this group may pursue studies in the fields of the healing profession, the sciences, and the humanities. The thought, of course, is: Are we now, at the very end of a war, which in itself did unquestionably deplete our trained personnel, in the sciences particularly, again to call men to service and not make provision for exception of a sufficient number of those who otherwise would be called to active military service so that we may have a continuing group of trained minds to carry on the highly specialized and technical necessities of government, war or no war?

Mr. President, no one can question the necessity for providing for that sort of a group. My objection to the provision goes to the proposition that we have no assurance that we can secure such a group by the procedure proposed in the bill. My objection goes to the proposition that when by the words of the law we select the group we eliminate them from any service following the basic training period. The bill provides that thereafter for a period of time they are subject to service; they are further subject thereafter for an additional period of time to direction of the Government in either military or civilian life.

Mr. President, the provision, requiring service after training, is in the bill but that the group will never go into active service in the Armed Forces is a foregone conclusion. If at this moment we need to take 75,000 for medical and scientific training, because we feel that up to 75,000 men are needed for such purpose, how silly it is to say that after we have trained them, we should then waste them on the battlefield, if that be waste. Of course, we will not do that, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CORDON. I wonder if my friend will permit me to finish the general discussion, after which I shall be glad to yield if I have time remaining.

Mr. President, what is really proposed to be done is to establish a board to consider the cases of the 18-year-olds, after they are inducted, during the period of time they are in training, and by competitive examination, and such other procedures as the board may determine to be appropriate, to select up to 75,000 young men to be taken immediately out of the training period—which is of no use to them—and placed in colleges, in institutions of higher learning, to aid in providing, let us say, a backlog of specialists for future use. I think we can forget the other provisions. The legal obligation is there, but the practical aspects of the matter indicate that the legal provisions will never become practical realities.

Mr. President, the point I wish to make above all others is that if we may assume the necessity of taking out this group, this reservoir, for specialized training, we must still face what to me is an incontrovertible fact, namely, that it is beyond human ability to pick that group from 18-year-old young men just finishing high school. The yardsticks for such selection are not available. Of course a competitive examination may indicate the most brilliant mentally in the group; but when we have done that, we have no way of determining how many of them already have reached the very flower of their progress and development. We know by our own experience that many persons develop more rapidly than others do, many persons come to the full fruition of their mental ability more rapidly than do others. We know that many who blossom and appear as prodigies, later on drop back into, let us say, the common herd. We know that there are many others whose development is more gradual, and who may reach middle life before the full value of their minds in their application is known or becomes effective. So we have more to consider than merely what can come from a competitive examination.

The, Mr. President, there are some other factors which need attention. What about character? What about the moral strength that is needed when we educate specialists and prepare them to assume the highest responsibilities of citizenship? We wish to know that they have the basic soundness of character that will keep them fully useful and fully loyal to the United States of America. We cannot know that when they are at age 18.

Mr. President, we also know, and all history has shown, that many and many and many of the greatest minds the world has ever known never could have passed any sort of examination of the type here contemplated for those in the group at age 18.

The other day I picked up the Reader's Digest, and in it I read of a young man by the name of David Marshall Williams, who at the age of 20 was an inmate of a penitentiary, and who prior to that time had lived back in the hills of one of the Carolinas, where he was a moonshiner. Mr. President, had we had this kind of draft and rule, at the age of 18 he would not have been one of those deferred for special training. However, later in his life he became one of the most useful citizens of America. One of his inventions increased the fire power of the doughboy by at least one-third. Today he has 52 inventions in the field of arms. He presented to the American Government the model of an automatic gun, after all the ordnance specialists, those who would have been deferred, the technologists, had failed to do so. All the experts in the arms companies could not do it, but the ex-moonshiner did it.

I realize that perhaps that is an extreme exception, just as is the case of another man, also mentioned in the same edition of the Reader's Digest under the heading "Mister Doctor," a gentleman by the name of Edgar Burchell. At the age of 17, Edgar Burchell was mopping floors in a hospital. Today, Edgar Burchell—who never saw a medical school, so far as training is concerned, and has no degrees except those which come from the university of hard knocks—is a lecturer to the finest specialists in eye and ear diseases in the world. He has no degree; he had no special training at the expense of any government or of anyone else. Let me read what Mr. Burchell has said in recent years. I read now a portion of the article:

> A few years ago at his home in Larchmont, N. Y., Burchell organized a group of delinquent boys into a scout troop and taught them chemistry, hygiene, and first aid. "I'm glad to help those boys," he says. "Maybe one of them will grow up to be a regular M. D. who can give medical advice to patients. That's more than I can do. The only people I can give medical advice to are doctors and students."

Mr. President, those are but two examples. Edison is another. The Rail Splitter himself, is another. We could go on through the list of those whom this kind of an examination could not touch, just as it would not touch any of those who are exempted because of physical disabilities, among whom we probably shall find a greater percentage of good minds than we shall find among the ones who are accepted.

Mr. President, this exemption takes no account of those who are selected under the present Science Foundation Act for scientific study. It takes no consideration whatever of those who may have been selected and given special scholarships by the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is perfectly plain to all of us who have given careful consideration to the matter that there are only remote probabilities that a minor fraction of those who may be exempted from service in the Armed Forces of their their country for the purpose of this training will achieve the type of mental and moral leadership that it is necessary for them to achieve if they are to give our country what it needs in those fields.

I am one of those who believe that no one should ever stand on his feet and indulge in criticism that is wholly destructive; and at this moment one could say that what I have said comes very close to that field. I say to you, Mr. President, that we can take all the 75,000 boys, and give them, first, the training and, next, the service; and they will still be only 20 years of age. There will still be adequate time in which to send them to college. There will be time to follow some such procedure as that which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has suggested, namely, that of putting them into college and then weeding them out, after letting them mature. Even though these boys go into the service, even though they go into active service, certainly we know that all of them will not lie somewhere on a battlefield. The very great majority of them will return. It may well be that not a single boy called under this act for years will ever see real battle. They will have offered themselves; they will be available; they will be trained; they will have undergone the active service which only can make good soldiers. However, I believe that at the end of two more years we shall have a better chance of making a wise selection. Even though the 75,000 may have been depleted in numbers in actual battle, from the remainder of them and from the remainder of those who would not previously have been chosen, but who may have more ability than any of the 75,000, we shall be able to choose, and choose wisely, when the yardsticks are available to us, based on the development of the maturity of the boys.

Mr. President, if we must have this sort of exemption at all, let us use it at a time when we can get the most out of it. At this time let us delete this provision from the bill and then enact the bill, for we need it now.

If any specially equipped geniuses show up, the President may defer them. He may defer them under the terms of the bill as it. We lose nothing, and we gain immeasurably. We gain for the boys who are called into the service, because they will not feel that there are others who have been relieved of service and that they themselves are standing in the front line in lieu of others who might have been there. We shall have gained by letting the 75,000 come out at the end of their terms of service, knowing that they have rendered the full quota of the highest service they could ever render to their country. By eliminating the provision, we achieve these ends. By leaving in the provision, we may defeat them.

Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am going to have to cut my time short. How much time do I have, please?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORDON. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, and I will then yield to the Senator from Texas. I ask Senators, please do not take more time than is necessary.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I desire to introduce into the RECORD two sentences, in connection with his splendid statement. They are from a statement by Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, found at page 46 of the hearings on Senate bill 1. Dr. Dodds said:

To make college a haven of refuge for even the brightest students in these broader fields not immediately pointed to the defense effort would destroy their moral influence and capacities as future leaders of our democracy. To protect a young man from the necessity of national service just because he happens to be bright and scholarly inclined, as some have suggested, would be bad for him and destructive of his leadership possibilities.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRICKER addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Texas want to answer the statement of Dr. Dodds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I wanted to ask the Senator two questions. First, I wanted him to comment on the point raised by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator comment in his own time, since I have but 8 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wanted to point out that Dr. Dodds testified——

Mr. CORDON. The Senator can have what remains of the hour. I have but 8 minutes left.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is a similar amendment. As I understand, they both have the same objective.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I yield the floor. Please let me suggest to my colleague, the Senator from Texas, that he bring up the questions in his own time. I shall be very happy to answer them as well as I can, and I should like to reserve a few minutes of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me 1 minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield the Senator 1 minute.

Mr. CORDON. Had I had the time, I should have been glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has an amendment which I understand has the same objective as the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, except that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio has been perfected to include page numbers and lines. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon would have any objection to inserting that parallel amendment, because, if it should be adopted, it would have the pages and lines numbered correctly.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon called attention to both the pages and the lines in his amendment, which reads:

Strike out all of page 83, and page 84, down to and including line 19.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But the Senator does not renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. CORDON. Oh, that technical matter I am sure the chairman will take care of when the bill is passed. If there should be any difficulty, I shall be glad to cooperate.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a very brief statement?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not have the time now. Had I known the Senator desired to speak, I should have been glad to cut my speech down. If the Senator, representing the committee, will go forward, I shall be glad to confer with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. That is satisfactory.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, while attending the hearings on the pending bill, I was very much impressed with the idea that some provision should be included in the bill which would insure a continuous flow of scientific students. One reason why it impressed me was that I believe we feel now the injurious effects of having failed to follow that course in World War II. But the principal thing which impressed me about the matter was that it is on this very basis that we are expecting to win superiority in the sciences and in technical training. That is our hope. Our reliance is not on manpower alone; it is not on sea power as such, or on any other kind of power, except as that power may be generated by our superior technique, our superior technical knowledge and scientific training and scientific know-how. It seems to me that, at the expense of what we might want to do, we absolutely must provide for a flow of men who have the type of mind that can and will take this training. We cannot create a scientist or make a scientist overnight. It requires a type of mind. It is not a matter of deferment to a college. The provision is not proposed for the sake of any individual or group. If it were, I should be wholeheartedly against it. It is solely to provide for filling the need of having a continuous flow of trained scientific men in the field of industry. Think of the engineers and other scientific men required by our great industrial production. Think of the biologists, of the physicists, and of the chemists.

Mr. President, our entire superiority is based upon the scientific concept and the technical know-how. I was impressed recently with one of the statements made by the mayor of Berlin at a luncheon here, in which he was asked the question, "How many top scientists are left in eastern Germany?" He said, "There aren't any left." He estimated that about 6,000 of the top scientific men have been taken from east Germany to Russia. That emphasizes the need of the Russian leaders and their thinking and their plans for scientific men. It emphasizes that they recognize this need and it emphasizes over and over again wherein our superiority lies.

We may disagree as to methods, but let us not sever the life line which would supply a continuity of the training of men who have had the type of mind required. It makes no difference where they are from, or who they are, or what college they attend, or whether they have served their 2 years. Their time will come. Let us take advantage of men possessing that type of mind, which is the greatest asset I think we have, and let us train them during the period when they are most susceptible to proper training.

There is another thing shown by the evidence, which surprised me. One of the scientists testified that a great deal of top thinking in the development of the atomic bomb was done by men who were under 30 years of age. That indicates that we cannot depend for all the thinking in this work upon men who have attained the age of 40 or 50 years, whom we consider as more mature. It was testified in the hearings that it was when their minds were young that men did some of their top thinking along these lines. We know that it is when men are young and impressionable that they must be trained, because, a few years later, it is too late.

For these reasons I think we would make a great mistake if we did not provide some measure to insure a continuation of the flow of trained scientific men. In addition to the strict scientists, we must have, of course, the medical men, the dental men, the pre-meds, and the pre-dental.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope I shall not consume all of that time. Notwithstanding the painstaking efforts of the committee, and the explanation given by the chairman of the committee, there is much misunderstanding about the section covered by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The purpose of the section of the bill under consideration is to make sure that the United States will maintain its production and scientific superiority. The committee makes no pretense of being the final judge of the best way to accomplish that result, but the committee did attempt to call before it all the outstanding authorities it could get to come to give us their recommendations on this particular point.

We are confronted with this kind of situation: The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered an amendment which would double the number of students deferred under the committee bill. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] offers an amendment which would eliminate the provision entirely.

This is one part of the bill which caused us a great deal of concern, because, as Members of the Senate know, the President now cannot only defer 75,000 but 175,000, or 275,000, or whatever number the President may decide to defer.

Some of the scientists and some of the leaders in production felt that rather than defer persons indiscriminately, without any set of standards, it would be better to set up a board, consisting of perhaps the outstanding medical man in the country, the outstanding dentist,

the outstanding engineer, and the like, have them take a look at our national needs in their fields, and let them determine the standard of selection which should be used, and then let the selections be made on a strictly competitive, nonpolitical basis.

The committee, troubled as it was with the viewpoint of one group that 75,000 was not near the number which should be fixed, and the viewpoint of a very few other people that perhaps we should leave the matter entirely to the President, finally determined that the weight of the evidence dictated the selection of not to exceed 75,000.

I wish to call the attention of Members of the Senate to some statements upon which the committee based its action. Dr. Vannevar Bush testified that—

In the transition period—

That is, the next 3 years—

in order to keep a proper flow of scientific and technical men, I feel we have to compromise and send some men directly without camp training for that purpose. I feel sure—I think 75,000—covers it.

Mr. Dunlap C. Clark, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the members of which we rely on to keep the production lines going, testified as follows:

The President should be authorized to release from active service, after basic training, 75,000 inductees per year to permit them to study or conduct research in medicine, science, engineering, and allied fields.

Dr. Harold W. Dodds, the president of Princeton University, to whom the Senator from Kansas referred, said:

I do endorse heartily the proposals which have been submitted to you. * * * No other proposal that I have seen or been able to dream up myself provides the element of long-term durability which I think is necessary, with a minimum of possible violence to higher education.

Dr. Ralph W. McDonald, of the National Education Association of the United States, said:

We strongly favor the provisions suggested in section 6 (d) (1) that would authorize the selection of at least 75,000 young men annually for college study.

Mr. President, the representatives of the great medical institutions testified that several thousand young men each year must be fed into the medical pipeline if we are to have an adequate supply of doctors. The representatives of the dental association testified that it is necessary to provide an annual reservoir of about 5,000 students from which to select the entering dental class each year.

Dr. Stockton Kimball, chairman of the joint committee on medical education in time of national emergency, said:

To supply the students needed by the medical schools alone will require that at least 10,000 to 12,000 men enter college each year. * * * We understand that last year 50,000 engineers were graduated and were immediately employed.

Mr. President, the problem before the committee was a difficult one. Some wanted the sky to be the limit. Some wanted no provision whatever made. The problem which confronts us is shown by the amendments offered by the Senators representing the State of Oregon. The junior Senator from Oregon seeks to double the 75,000. The senior Senator from Oregon desires to cut out the 75,000 entirely. But the committee, after considering the statements of the doctors, the dentists, the engineers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the outstanding educators of the Nation, finally concluded that it would be dangerous not to make some provision for a constant inflow into the pipeline if we are to maintain production and scientific superiority about which America now boasts.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not the purpose of the committee to select the specific persons to go to specific schools or to study specific courses. It was the purpose of the committee to authorize the setting up of machinery which would provide for the selection of students on a competitive basis, with a nonpolitical board in charge, the members of which would have to be confirmed by the Senate.

The proposal of the committee has not satisfied everyone, but those it has not satisfied are mainly those who wish to increase the 75,000 to 100,000, or 150,000, or some higher figure. The committee feels that, after experience under the plan, we may well have to take a good look at the results, and perhaps we will find that 75,000 is an inadequate figure, that we should readjust it as a result of experience.

I do feel that in order to assure the scientific needs of this great Nation, standards should be set up, not by political leaders, but by professional leaders. Standards should be established for the selection of men to go into the study of the professions.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. With reference to the provision for the deferment of the 75,000, or some figure thereunder, there has been inquiry from some of the junior colleges which have very fine curricula. Will they be excluded from this program merely because they do not give baccalaureate degrees?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that they will not be excluded. I should like to point out that the committee does not provide for the deferment of these men. It merely suspends for a period of time, in the national interest, the utilization of their services.

If the Senate desires to reject the advice of the medical experts, reject the advice of the scientific men, the advice of the labor leaders, and the advice of the production leaders, which has been given to the committee, and upon which the committee acted, and say, "No; we are not going to have any standards, we are not going to have any authorities in the medical field step in and aid in the selection of these people." The Senate certainly has that right. But, if we are to be assured of the necessary inflow into the pipeline of the scientific personnel we need, the doctors, the dentists, the physicists, the engineers, I believe it would be very wise to follow the outstanding doctors, the outstanding industrialists, the outstanding educators, the outstanding engineers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and all those who have had great experience in this field.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected overwhelmingly.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the member of the committee, the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator understands, does he not, that there is no effort on the part of the committee, through the bill, to direct the action of any man? Each man can do as he pleases, can he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, it is not the purpose of the bill to select the specific persons to be deferred, the specific schools to be affected, the specific courses of instruction. The purpose is to let the outstanding men of the United States determine what our national medical needs are, what our national scientific needs are, and to have the students selected on a scientific, nonpolitical, competitive basis. That was almost the unanimous recommendation made to the committee by the outstanding men of this country, and I do not believe the Senate will disregard their recommendations.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator yield for a question for information?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator mentioned the fact that the President now has the power to defer many times more men than are covered by this provision of the bill. If this provision shall be agreed to, and become a part of the law, will the President have that power?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The President will still have it. The purpose of the provision in the bill is to guarantee a sort of necessary cushion for the next 3 years.

Mr. WATKINS. Why did not the committee provide that the President must follow something of that order in his deferments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. WATKINS. Why did not the committee provide that the President in his deferments would have to follow a pattern similar to the one set forth in the committee's provision?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The committee did not feel it was necessary to do so. It felt that the local boards, who knew the situation better, acting under the instructions of Selective Serv-

ice, could work out the problem on a local basis. That might not be true in the case of doctors, because the local boards may not have all the necessary information available on a national basis. Neither would it be true in the case of engineers. Therefore we felt that the plan proposed with respect to doctors, dentists, scientists, and members of certain professions would give better assurance of a workable plan, and that it would be the best plan to put into operation.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask one further question. I am trying to develop some information on this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not doubt that the Senator from Utah is trying to develop some information.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the President now have the power to keep these boys in school?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The President can defer all of them if he wants to do so. The committee's provision would simply guarantee a minimum. It would be limited to 75,000, who would be selected in the manner provided.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator from Texas remember that in his direct examination, Mr. McGrath, the Commissioner of Education, was asked by the chairman of the subcommittee whether he had participated in the preparation of the plan?

At page 557 of the transcript of the testimony the Commissioner of Education responded:

> Yes, sir. We have had discussions for the last 4 or 5 months on this and related matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HUNT. May I ask the distinguished Senator one further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that of the 49 witnesses who testified on this feature of the bill, 36 testified favorably to the bill, and 13 were not in full accord with the bill, but protested only on the ground that they thought perhaps 75,000 was not a sufficient number?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Georgia yield me half a minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield half a minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator from Wyoming made a correct statement. So far as the chairman remembers, the viewpoint now advanced by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] was advanced by no witness who appeared before the committee. The viewpoint of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was advanced to the committee. Most of the witnesses thought 75,000 was too small a number. I cannot at the moment recall that any of the educators or business people advocated that the whole section be eliminated. They never went that far.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask one further question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has 7 minutes remaining. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I submitted a similar amendment to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon. My amendment is at the desk. I paid my respects to this plan at page 2075 of the RECORD, on Tuesday of this week. Mr. President, if any exemption is to be made, I believe it should be made in the community by the local draft boards, who know the needs of the community. I would much rather trust a local draft board than any Presidential board appointed for the purpose of making a uniform or Nation-wide exemption.

The plan as proposed is wholly unworkable. It is impossible for any board or any man to say whether a student, before he enters college or after he has been in college will make a great scientist or a great doctor. It is impossible to tell even after he gets out of college. I for one am not willing to turn our society into a mechanistic or militaristic society, at least at this time. Perhaps at some time in the future it may be necessary to do so for survival. It is not necessary to do so at this hour.

Furthermore, under a program of this kind we might very well be educating Klaus Fuchses or Alger Hisses who after being educated, might turn out to be traitors to their countries, as many of them have for a number of different reasons. The plan might send into service some patriotic boys who might make far better doctors. The program is entirely unworkable. It is unfair. It is unfair to the boys who are sent into service, because they might make just as good doctors, citizens, and scientists as those who are exempted by the board. It is likewise unfair to the boys who are exempted, because they would be given special privileges by the Government which would not be accorded to the other boys.

There is a further provision for the payment of fees. A Presidential board would determine whose fees and expenses shall be borne by the Government and whose expenses shall not be borne by the Government. That leaves the program wide open to favoritism of the very worst kind and character. We have already seen in recent weeks too much of Government favoritism. If it develops in the ranks of the military service it will be destructive of morale both at home and on the battlefield. Therefore I am opposed to the Federal Government encroaching upon our society to this extent.

This is only the first move of the Federal Government into the field of education for militaristic purposes. It is a program which this country has never adopted and would not consider adopting if we had adequate time for debate, and if adequate time could be afforded so that the people of the country could be aroused to the significance of the outreaching of the Federal Government into the field of education in order to control the lives of our boys.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to impress upon my colleagues the fact that the adoption of the amendment would not foreclose the continued selection of every outstanding young man in this country for exemption or deferment. The President would have the power to defer or exempt 5, 10, or all in any category. We spent 2 years in working out a Science Foundation Act, the purpose of which was to do what would be done under this provision of the bill. We have an Atomic Energy Commission doing the same thing, namely, seeking scientific brains and educating them.

Let me say, too, that the adoption of the amendment would not take away the opportunity to utilize the finest brains of the country at the end of 2 years of service. The boys would still be available. Furthermore, we would have a better opportunity to choose them. Our batting record would be immeasurably better. We would get men whose loyalty would be known. In all sincerity, I say that we would not be faced with the same miserable failures with which we have been faced in the past.

Mr. President, if this sort of an act had been on the statute books a few years ago, when some of our bright boys were active—I do not need to give any names, because Senators will remember the kind of persons we had in some of the Government departments, with some of them being convicted for perjury and some of them later standing on their feet and recanting their Communist tendencies—such persons would have been deferred, and we would have found many rotten apples in the barrel of our national security.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, first, I wish to absolve the committee, so far as I can, from any charge that it is attempting to foist 75,000 Alger Hisses on the country.

There is a great deal about this provision which does not appeal to me. Anything which distinguishes in any degree between citizens of the United States is distasteful to most Americans. However, I wish to refute some of the attacks which have been made on this provision. It is offered as a means of assuring a continuity in the supply of doctors, dentists, and highly skilled engineers, who are necessary to take care of the lives of the American people and to assure our superiority in the important field of warfare which is known as technology.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] says that this is the first move toward nationalization of our schools. There is nothing new in the system approved in

this provision. During World War I and World War II the Government of the United States took over great colleges almost entirely. Most of the medical students—if not all of them—were trained not only under the supervision and direction of the Government but at Government expense; and it did not result in socialization.

The period of operation of this provision is limited to 3 years, to enable us to have a continuing flow in the supply. At the end of that time men who have done their 24 months of duty will be coming back and entering the colleges and there will be no interruption in the supply.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon has pointed out two geniuses in their field who, he says, made great accomplishments, though they were not deferred and did not ever go to college. That might be urged as an argument against the need for any college education but certainly it is not an argument for stopping the production of doctors and technologists through the channels from which we are accustomed to get them.

This is not a deferment, despite the frequency with which that term is reiterated. It is a suspension. Every man who goes into the prescribed course must first do his 4 months of basic training and he is responsible to the Government for his term of service after he completes his college work. So it is not a deferment. It is merely an interruption in his service, to permit us to avail ourselves of more of these specialists in our national life. There is a crying need for them.

The question of the poor people has been brought in. This is a protection to the poor boy. It helps him, if he has genius, to attend college. It would also help the poor people who are living in our country, and who would suffer if we were to interrupt the production of doctors and dentists for 3 years. That would produce an even greater scarcity than we have today. What would be the result of that? Undoubtedly the fees and charges of doctors, which in many instances appear high to a layman who does not understand the ramifications of the medical profession, would be even higher.

This system has been attacked with the statement that it is impossible to make any such selections, and that we cannot have any yardstick for selecting the men to be educated.

For the past 5 years we have had a system of taking naval officers in the colleges of this Nation, partly at Federal expense. That system provides for the selection, not of 75,000 young men, but of 7,200 young men each year who may apply for the benefits to be derived from being trained as naval officers under the so-called Holloway plan. It is the intention of the committee that something similar to the Holloway plan be applied on a somewhat larger scale for a period, as I have stated, of only 3 years. We cannot nationalize education in 3 years. This portion of the bill expires at the end of the 3-year period, when we shall be getting back into the colleges men who have served their 24 months. Some of them who have been drafted will be returning within the next 12 months.

So it is nothing new. We have had it in times past. We are doing the same thing each year now, under the Holloway plan as applied to naval officers. Although it is difficult to deal with a problem of this kind in any way, in my judgment the larger national interest demands that the colleges take some steps to see that there will be no interruption in the supply of doctors and dentists, who are necessary to maintain the national health, as well as the supply of technological people who are essential to keep us ahead of our potential enemies by providing superior methods of warfare and the machinery for waging war.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator knows that only yesterday, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in an entirely different connection, one of the foremost experts in America in the field of production of fuels testified that if this country took into the Army all the geologists and gave them engineering commissions, it would be impossible to produce the fuel which the Nation needs to fight a war.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have come to rely so much upon the machine in production that any interruption in the technological training of our engineering experts might well be disastrous to our national economy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not the bill as reported by the committee would in any way interfere with the complete independence of the admission boards of the various institutions of higher learning, governing the admission of students to those particular institutions?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not interfere in the slightest degree, even remotely.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Is it intended by the bill, or by the recommendations of the committee, in any degree to impose supervision upon the activity of any institution of higher learning, either by the military authorities or by the selection board which it is proposed to establish under the terms of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not in the slightest degree. The provision with respect to the 4 months basic training and the responsibility for future service was placed in the bill in order to enable us to get 75,000 boys who would be willing to take such a course. Boys do not like to be pointed at on the campus as having had their service postponed. So we have provided for their preliminary training, and we impose upon them the responsibility for future service, in order that we may be able to obtain as many as 75,000 men for this purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon has 1 minute.

Mr. CORDON. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Millikin |
| Anderson | Hennings | Monroney |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Benton | Hill | Mundt |
| Brewster | Hoey | Murray |
| Bricker | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Md. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Byrd | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Cain | Jenner | Pastore |
| Capehart | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Case | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Clements | Kem | Smathers |
| Connally | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Dirksen | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Douglas | Langer | Sparkman |
| Duff | Lehman | Stennis |
| Dworshak | Lodge | Taft |
| Ecton | Long | Thye |
| Ellender | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Watkins |
| Frear | McFarland | Welker |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Wherry |
| George | McMahon | Wiley |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Williams |
| Green | Martin | Young |
| Hayden | Maybank | |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon to strike out, beginning on line 3, and all of the remainder of page 83, and on page 84, down to and including line 19, and renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness, and, if present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on offi-

cial business, and, if present, they would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—21

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Cordon | Maybank |
| Brewster | Dirksen | Millikin |
| Bricker | Dworshak | Watkins |
| Butler, Md. | Hickenlooper | Welker |
| Butler, Nebr. | Jenner | Wherry |
| Capehart | Kem | Williams |
| Carlson | Martin | Young |

NAYS—68

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Morse |
| Anderson | Holland | Mundt |
| Benton | Humphrey | Murray |
| Byrd | Hunt | Neely |
| Cain | Ives | Nixon |
| Case | Johnson, Colo. | O'Conor |
| Chavez | Johnson, Tex. | O'Mahoney |
| Clements | Johnston, S. C. | Pastore |
| Connally | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Douglas | Kerr | Russell |
| Duff | Kilgore | Saltonstall |
| Ecton | Knowland | Schoeppel |
| Ellender | Langer | Smathers |
| Ferguson | Lehman | Smith, Maine |
| Frear | Lodge | Smith, N. J. |
| Fulbright | Long | Smith, N. C. |
| George | McCarran | Sparkman |
| Gillette | McClellan | Stennis |
| Green | McFarland | Taft |
| Hayden | McKellar | Thye |
| Hendrickson | McMahon | Tobey |
| Hennings | Magnuson | Wiley |
| Hill | Monroney | |

NOT VOTING—6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Flanders | Malone |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Vandenberg |

So Mr. CORDON's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment is that proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will read the second part of the unanimous-consent agreement, and then will read the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That following the disposition of the foregoing amendment—

The amendment just voted on—

the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the amendment intended to be proposed to the said bill by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), submitted on February 28, 1951, and lettered "A"; that debate thereon be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. RUSSELL.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 69, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

On page 71, strike out lines 3 through 10, inclusive.

On page 73, line 11, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

On page 74, line 10, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

On page 76, line 10, beginning with the comma strike out all through and including the word "claimed" in line 3 on page 77.

On page 78, beginning with line 20, strike out all to but not including the period in line 6 on page 80 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "all of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of the second sentence, and the last two sentences of the fourth paragraph, of section 4 (a), sections 4 (b), 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), and 14 shall become inoperative and shall cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such time."

Page 91, line 1, beginning with the word "All" strike out all through line 7.

Page 92, line 17, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour, or he may control the time for 1 hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for 35 minutes, please.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well; the Senator from Colorado is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, the pending measure, Senate bill 1, is really two bills rolled into one. The majority leader has stated over and over again that Senate bill No. 1 is the most important measure that will come before the Eighty-second Congress this year. The majority leader might well have multiplied his statement by two, because this bill contemplates the enactment of two of the most important pieces of legislation with which the Congress will have to deal this year, and perhaps in this entire session. I say that, Mr. President, because these two bills deal with the most precious and most priceless heritage in the United States of America, our youth.

One of these measures provides for extension and expansion of the Selective Service. That is a "must" bill, because our present Selective Service Act expires, as I understand, on July 1, 1951, and must be renewed by the Congress or else we shall face a lapse of that legislation.

Selective service has been adopted by the country as its program for mobilizing manpower in time of war, in time of crisis, or in time of police action. It has been used repeatedly, and it has been found worthy. It has been found practical. It has been found to be the proper system to be used in the handling of a very difficult problem. It is, therefore, well established. There is nothing controversial about selective service. I feel that if that issue were presented on its merits to the Congress and to the Senate, there would not be one vote against it in this body. True, we have had controversies regarding certain details, but the principle of selective service has been accepted by the American people and by their Congress; and so there is no controversy with respect to it. We have found it to be an equitable and democratic manner of mobilizing our manpower, and we are devoted to its principles of fairness and equity.

We come now to the other side of the bill—the bill which provides for peacetime military conscription of the youth of the land. The extension of selective service is a "must" bill. The adoption of peacetime military conscription is a "must not" bill, Mr. President, and it has always been considered to be a "must not" bill by the Congresses of the United States. It has been before the Congress repeatedly. Every year since I have been a Member of this body universal peacetime conscription has been before us, and it has been rejected every time. It is highly controversial.

I recently read a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, placed there by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], in which he called the bill we now have before us a monstrosity; and that is what it is, when it attempts to amalgamate, to tie together in one package, "must" legislation of a highly important nature and "must not" legislation which has been rejected by the Congress and by the Senate whenever it has been proposed.

As I say, we have proved in this country the necessity and the effectiveness of selective service. Universal military conscription in peacetime has been proved also, but not in this country. We must cross the Atlantic in order to see the results of experiments in that direction. Mr. President, I will take you to the birthplace of peacetime conscription—Prussia. That is where it came into existence. What has happened to Prussia? What has happened to the nation of which Prussia is an important part, as it has been for centuries? Go there and see. Look at their proud cities, their beautiful churches, their art museums, their business houses, their factories, their residences. Mr. President, you will find them in utter ruin—masses of twisted steel and piles of rubble. That is what will be found there. That is what peacetime military conscription has done to Germany. Talk to the people of Germany; observe them as they walk down the street. The traveler will not find one smile in a mile, in the moving population of Germany—not one smile. Today they are depressed, they are hopeless, they are defeated. That is what a visitor will see in Germany, where the idea of peacetime military conscription originated. It spread to other parts of the world, to other countries, where one may see its effects also. So far as I know, there is but one major city in all Germany today which has not been more or less devastated by war. It is Heidelberg. I am told that it was not destroyed because of the great university which is located there. Out of respect for the university, Heidelberg was not bombed. That small bit of sentiment, if true—and I think it is true—is in itself a great tribute to the civilization of today. But in Germany we have a great monument, a mute monument to peacetime military conscription. Five years after World War II, German cities are still lying as they were when the war ended.

The present selective service law, as I say, has a date line of July 1, 1951. Under the provisions of this bill, there is no effective date line for peacetime military conscription. The authors of the bill will not contend that there is a date line. It will not become effective, and

it is not proposed to make it effective, for 4 or 5 years. Why, Mr. President, should the two bills have been put together in one package—one, a bill having a date line of July 1, 1951, the other, a proposal which has a date line of 3, 4, or 5 years hence? That is the thing I should like to know. The purpose of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself is to separate the two proposals, which make a contrast. It is impossible to think of two proposals which would present a greater contrast than the two proposals which are dealt with in Senate bill 1.

Mr. President, we have had a fine and illuminating debate on this bill. I do not know when I have listened to debate on a higher level than the debate on Senate bill 1. But all the debate, up to this very hour—yes, up to this very moment, Mr. President—has had to do with the renewal and expansion of selective service, the "must" parts of the bill. Every amendment which has been considered, every note which has been taken to the present time, has been on the selective service aspects of S. 1. Now we are to debate this other great question, for which debate the Senate of the United States has set aside and allocated 2 hours. Two hours has been allocated, Mr. President, to debate on the most important legislative proposal, the most controversial one, as I contend, ever to have been brought before the Congress of the United States. Why have the two subjects been grouped together? I think recently I found the answer. I was visited by Felix Poliano, of Denver, who is one of the officials of the American Legion, Department of Colorado, a lifelong friend, a man to whom I am devoted and have been devoted for many years, a man in whom I have great confidence. When he visited me, he said, "Why did you and Senator BRICKER offer your amendment to separate the component parts of Senate bill 1?" I explained to my friend my views as I am presenting them in the argument I am making here today, I told him the bill was an effort to mix oil and water, that we were not proceeding, as I considered, in an orderly, legislative manner; that the two ideas ought to be separated, that they should be considered separately, and that they should have the attention of the Congress on a separate basis.

He smiled and said, "Well, what you say is probably true, but the American Legion has been trying for years to have the Congress adopt universal military training, and Congress has always turned it down. We are now hoping that by tying it to a bill which we know Congress is going to pass we will get it through."

Mr. President, we have to respect his honesty and candor, even if we do not agree with that way of legislating; and I do not agree with that method.

The people of the country do not know that the Senate today is to pass or reject a provision for peacetime military conscription. They do not know anything about it. The newspapers have not carried the story to the people. I do not blame the newspapers, because the debate has not been on that question at all. We have been talking about the drafting of 18-year-olds. That has caught the fancy of the country, and the newspapers have used that in their headlines. So not one person out of a hundred thousand in America today knows that 2 hours from now we are to decide the most fateful proposal which we have ever considered. They simply do not know it.

Mr. President, that is not the way to legislate on important questions. We should bring these matters up and consider them thoroughly and completely. They should be debated separately. I do not believe this kind of legislating is the proper way to proceed.

Many investigations are being undertaken in the Congress today, and the basic thought underlying those investigations is the integrity of the Government of the United States. That is what we are looking for. I listened to a television broadcast last Sunday, the program known as the American Forum of the Air. General Hershey was on one side. I have a profound respect for General Hershey. I worked with him all the years I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I regard him as a great patriot and a fine man in every way, one who is straightforward and honest in everything he does. I am a great advocate of the things in which he believes. General Hershey was on one side, and Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, whom I hold in high affection and for whom I have great respect, was on the other side. DEWEY SHORT came out of his corner swinging, as he usually does. He was talking about Senate bill 1, and referred to it as a "shotgun marriage." He was objecting to the two proposals which he found in the one package, and called it a "shotgun marriage." Theodore Granik turned to General Hershey and said, "General, what have you to say about that?" General Hershey swallowed a couple of times and replied, "Well, well, I have known about a lot of shotgun marriages, and many of them turned out well."

Mr. President, that emphasizes what I am discussing, the lack of integrity on the part of those who are active in our Government. The reply is, "A shotgun marriage, perfectly legal, sometimes turns out all right, it is all right." That is the only answer we get when we talk about it; there is an effort to laugh it off, to joke about it, not to take it seriously. It seems that integrity does not mean much just so a thing is legal. That was what was said about the RFC investigation, "Everything is legal, so why complain about it?"

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My time is limited, and I am sorry that I cannot yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado, if he thinks we can correct dishonesty in Government by legislation, or whether a good election would not have a better effect?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think we can cure the condition very well by legislation, but I do not believe that legislation should contribute to a lack of integrity. I do not believe we ought to add to what is dragging this great Republic down to the very depths, by promoting the very thing we ought to be preventing.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am unable to yield. I am very sorry.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator advocate that we stop legislating merely because we cannot trust the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; the Senator misses completely the point I am trying to make. I believe legislation should proceed in an orderly way so that we should not attempt to do what we should not do, even though it may be legal, even though we may find excuses, even though expediency might be attractive to us. I think we should go beyond that. I do not believe we should legislate in that way.

What I am complaining about is our lack of feeling about the integrity of legislation. It is not decent to bring in two bills having wholly different purposes and associate them together because one of them is a piece of "must" legislation, and the other one is questionable, so far as approval of it is concerned, amalgamating them, associating them, tying them together, in order to bring the weak sister through. I say that is as wrong as can be.

A few days ago I received a letter, as many of my colleagues did, no doubt, saying a man went into a grocery store to buy a peck of potatoes. The grocer said, "I will sell you a peck of potatoes, but you will have to buy a peck of onions." The customer said, "I don't want the onions." The grocer replied, "That doesn't make any difference. If you want to get the potatoes, you will have to take the onions."

Mr. President, that is what is attempted in this bill: if we want to get the number of troops we must have, we have to take peacetime conscription.

I had a friend who during the war went to a liquor store to buy a case of Scotch, as he told me. He said the liquor store proprietor said, "We will sell you the case of Scotch," and they agreed on the price, and everything was satisfactory. But the liquor dealer said, "You will have to take a case of rum." The customer said, "I don't want the rum. We don't use rum at my house. My friends don't like rum, and we have no use for rum." The dealer said. "The only way you can get your case of Scotch is to buy the case of rum."

Mr. President, that is analagous to what is attempted here. We are asked to take something we do not want, something our friends do not want, something the American people do not want, something the Congress does not want. The attempt is to make us take it in order to get what we must have.

Mr. President, much has been said in the debate about faith in our military leaders. I believe that has been completely answered by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and others, when they have pointed out that

the Senate does have faith in our military leaders in their own sphere of activity, in their own fields of action. But that does not mean that we want the military to move over into Congress and take over the determination of policy, which the Constitution has delegated to us, and the responsibility for which the Constitution has placed in us.

Yes, Mr. President, we have faith in our military leaders. We have opened the money bags of our country to them. We have told them, "There is the Treasury. Go there and take the money with a steam shovel, if a scoop shovel is not big enough. We won't deny you one dollar, one million dollars, or one billion dollars. We will offer no complaint. We will give you all you want."

Mr. President, if that does not indicate faith in the military, what more do they want? We even go beyond that. We say to the military, "Here are our boys, the most precious and most priceless heritage we have. We love them better than our own lives. We are more interested in them than we are in our own careers and in our own lives." We have given them these boys, our most precious and priceless heritage. We have turned them over to the military. Does that not give some indication of the faith which we have in the military? What more do they want? What more can we do? We cannot go beyond that.

The military is not satisfied with that. They are not satisfied with our expression of faith. They want more. We have given them authority and we have given them power. Still they reach out and say, "We must have more power."

I am proud of our military. They have won great wars for us. Our military leaders are second to none in any country in the world. All of us agree, I am sure, that they are all that. I, for one, am extremely proud of what they have been able to do. However, I do not regard them as little tin gods, or little golden gods, or images of any kind. They are not infallible. They are like the rest of us. They are like the rest of humanity. Give them power, and they reach out for more power. They are no different from the Department of State, the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Treasury, or any other department or agency in our Government. No matter how much authority we give them they will always reach out for more authority and for more power. So far as I am concerned, it is all right for them to do it if they are any good.

I do not want a department in our Government that is not ambitious and does not have confidence in its ability to do the things it can do well. I like that kind of spirit. At the same time, Congress must not delegate the power and authority which are given to it by the people of the United States. We have a responsibility to meet, and we must meet it. We cannot meet it by giving our authority to anyone who wants to exercise it. We must exercise it ourselves, with due discretion. I have faith in Congress, in this Congress and in future Congresses. I do not think the Eighty-second Congress is endowed with all the wisdom of the ages. I do not think it is going to be the best Congress the Nation ever had. The Eighty-third Congress may be a better Congress. The Eighty-fourth Congress may be still better. The Eighty-fifth Congress may turn out to be a good Congress, too.

Mr. President, I should like to read what the Evening Star had to say on the subject, although they were not specifically discussing S. 1. This is what they said on the subject of trusting and having faith in future Congresses:

> To assert that this is wise, in view of the national changes that we have witnessed and the changes that are sure to come, calls for a degree of confidence in our ability to foresee the future that is hardly justified by our inability to understand and cope with the problems of the present.

The writer was referring to another piece of legislation, but he expressed the Star's opinion on this important question. Future Congresses must be able to meet the problems which they will have to face.

Mr. President, I say without qualification that the peacetime conscription provision of S. 1 is the most aggravated attempt to delegate powers of Congress to the executive branch of the Government that has ever been witnessed in this Congress or in any other Congress. We have made many delegations of powers. Congress has been accused time after time of delegating its authority and its power to the executive branch of the Government. At no time, and in no measure which we have had before us, have we been asked to take the degrading position which we would assume if we agreed to the peacetime conscription provision of S. 1. Any Senator who doubts that statement should read page 78 of the bill. Not only would the adoption of such a provision be a sloppy and careless way to legislate, but it would give away the Government to the military leaders of the Nation. We ought to stop and think about it.

Mr. President, the powers delegated to the Congress are not our powers. We are only trustees of the powers. They do not belong to us. They are not mine to give away or vote away recklessly to someone else. They belong to the people. I have taken an oath of office to defend all parts of the Constitution. I cannot give away powers that do not belong to me. I must exercise my constitutional rights and my responsibilities.

The peacetime military conscription provision of the bill authorizes and contemplates a peacetime conscription of all youth when they reach the age of 18, whether or not they are intended for military service. What do Senators think of that? I say the bill is a startling measure. It goes far beyond a military measure. I should like to read only a few excerpts from the testimony of Anna Rosenberg before the committee. She said:

> Much of what we are doing in the military field must be reserved for presentation to your committee in executive session, but I should like to give you a broad outline of the way in which we are proceeding, and a few of the things we have accomplished in this urgent task.

I do not know what she told the committee in executive session, but these are some of the hints she dropped for the information of the general public. She was talking about the number of men in the 18-year-old category. She said:

> About 150,000 of the remaining 230,000 could not qualify for military induction, but might be capable of some work. A plan for this group may be announced later by the President.

She gives us another hint along the same line, to the effect that the President may come to Congress with some kind of plan. That aroused the suspicion of members of the committee, as it well might. In subsequent hearings the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] asked Mrs. Rosenberg:

> Under a UMS act, nonmilitary programs would be provided for individuals who are not physically or mentally qualified for military service?
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. That is a program that the military has nothing to do with. That is a program where there are men who are not qualified for military service. The President will have a program.

That is what she said.

> The President will have a program. We will have a program for the limited-service men in the military.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. But, as you testified originally, there will be such a program, although it will not be administered by your Department; is that right?
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. I have been given to understand that the President is contemplating the formulation of such a program. Just when I cannot say. We have nothing to do with it in the military.

There are no exceptions to that program in the universal military peacetime-conscription part of the pending bill.

I should like to read from the report of the committee. The committee listed many of the problems basic to peacetime military conscription. The report lists one problem after another with which the bill does not deal and does not touch at all. I am surprised that the committee would make such a confession, but this is what it says:

> The committee considered including details as to the term of service, salary, and other refinements relating to the commissioners. However, due to the fact that Commission probably will not be appointed for a number of years, due to the further fact that some of the members of the Commission may be retired military personnel subject to the dual-compensation status, and due also to the fact that future salary scales are difficult to predict, the committee felt that these problems should be solved administratively, or by supplementary legislation.

Mr. President, these minimum standards, which should have gone into the bill, are not in the bill at all. The bill provides for the appointment of a Commission, and all power, without any strings attached, is given to the Commission. The Commission can take boys who are not intended for any military use whatever. It is not pretended they will have to be used for that purpose. However, they are placed in the jurisdiction of the Commission.

The President would not come to Congress with a program. He would go to

the Commission with his program. Congress would not have anything to do with it if we passed the pending bill. The President would not have to consult us. He would go to the Commission—the Commission which he himself had appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to propound two or three questions, so I will take another minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have tried conscientiously to trace in the bill the career of a peacetime military conscript after he has been drafted. I have tried without success to find out what becomes of him, where he goes, what his obligations are, and what happens to him. I cannot find out a thing, except that he is likely to be given basic training for from 4 to 6 months, and that the President will determine what his wages shall be after he is drafted. That is all that I can find out on the subject. I do not know what his obligation is to be. I cannot find it in the bill. I should like to ask the committee to clear up these questions. The committee has an hour to make them clear. I should like to find out upon what date peacetime military conscription becomes effective. The report says that it is some years away. I should like to have an answer to my question.

I should like to know something about the salaries which the conscripts are to be paid.

It is said that the bill would promote the National Guard. I am unable to find anything in the bill that would have that result. I think the bill would destroy the National Guard. I believe that the proponents of the bill are engaging in double talk when they tell us that the bill would promote the National Guard, because I cannot find any part of the bill which provides that the conscript is to go into the National Guard. In fact, I find to the contrary. The report of the committee says:

> However, when the program becomes purely one of training, with no obligation for active service after the training—

And I presume that means National Guard service after the training—

> the bill provides that the monthly rate of pay for trainees may be cut to $30.

I believe that that is nothing but fancy double talk. I hope the proponents of the bill will clarify some of these questions, and tell us what standards are established in the bill for the handling of conscripts. I hope that they will answer the questions which I have propounded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in order that the speeches may be interspersed, I now yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, there are many features of the bill with which I am not in full agreement; but this legislation, like most other legislation, must represent a compromise.

I wish to state at the outset that I regret exceedingly that it is necessary for me to support military activity at this time, because so many of the finest people of my State oppose it. But we face a serious crisis. The aggressors of the world have selected America for destruction. I feel that the way for us to keep out of war, and to avoid the necessity of sending our troops overseas, is properly to prepare.

On May 5, 1947, almost 4 years ago, in speaking to the executive committee of the American Legion at Indianapolis, I stated:

> Our national defense must be based upon the ideals of our Republic. That means equal obligation, as well as equal rights for every citizen. In the kind of world we live in today, in which things happen swiftly, equal obligation means to me universal military training. That is the only way to be ready on time when an emergency occurs.
>
> I stand for a highly trained Regular Army, backed by a well-organized, well-trained civilian Reserve. We should have the best and strongest Navy and the best and strongest Air Force we can conceive.
>
> Our fiscal policy must include a balanced budget, reduction of the debt, and equitable distribution of the tax burden. Every expenditure of our Government, whether for use at home or abroad, must be carefully scrutinized.

Mr. President, I feel that that statement was true at that time, and I feel that it is even truer now.

I also stated on that occasion:

> The Congress should provide a plan to train our young men in the fundamentals of protecting themselves under fire. Otherwise they may have to learn under the hellfire of bombs and shells.

Mr. President, many times in my military experience I have had sent to me men who were improperly trained. That is not fair to the soldier himself. It is not fair to his comrades. It is not fair to his country.

The main objection I have to the bill is that to my mind 4 months is not sufficient for basic training. If I had my way there would be 1 year of basic training, although part of such basic training would be unit training. It requires a great deal of time to teach a soldier the fundamentals of military service. He must learn about personal hygiene. He must know how to take care of himself.

I venture the assertion that if this Chamber were attacked by gangsters, among this very intelligent group there would be very few who would know how to protect themselves. We must give such instruction to men in the military service.

We also teach them that a man is his brother's keeper. A good soldier will help his comrades, because that strengthens his organization.

We have never had much of a plan for military training in America. As Senators know, at the close of the Revolution Washington, at the suggestion of the Continental Congress, prepared a plan. He and his generals, including the celebrated Von Steuben, the drillmaster of the Revolution, had a plan. Their plan was based upon the principle that in a republic or democracy wars must be fought by the people. They did not want to depend upon a large professional army, because with such a force there might be danger of dictatorship and tyranny, and they had just finished a war to free themselves from such a burden.

Washington's plan was never put into effect. It was pigeonholed. However, it came out about the beginning of World War I. It was not brought out in time to be used in that war, but after World War I General Pershing set it in motion. All of it was placed in effect except universal military training.

We were to have a powerful navy, a great air force, and the best trained ground force of professional soldiers that we could conceive. Behind them was the great reserve of civilian components. The reserve is what wins wars.

So I am strong for the bill. While there are things about it with which I am not fully in accord, it does provide an opportunity for the civilian components, the National Guard, and the Reserve.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the Senator's opinion is not universal military training a very significant and important part of the bill? Would the bill be complete without it?

Mr. MARTIN. I am fearful that the bill would be almost useless without universal military training. What I want to do is to prevent war. I do not want to see a soldier sent outside the United States unless it is absolutely necessary. War is terrible. War does not settle anything. I have shared in suffering the disappointments of war. They are terrible. They are mental as well as physical. They deprive the individual of a great many things. But so long as we have aggressors in the world, we must be prepared to meet aggression.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Can the Senator name a single country which has had universal military training, and has thereby kept out of war?

Mr. MARTIN. Little Switzerland has been at peace for a hundred years. I feel that if every man in America were trained we could have peace in the world.

I do not favor talking so much about war, as many people are doing. I would talk more of peace. We must make certain preparations in the United States in order to have peace. We must be strong physically. That means that every man must be trained to do his duty as a soldier if necessary.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not have very much time, but I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the Senator if he is aware that Sweden has the most perfect universal military training program in the world. I should also like to make one further suggestion. Does the Senator believe that any nation would have attempted to become an aggressor nation against Hitler when his military establishment, through military

training, was at the point of greatest strength?

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, I am not in accord with what were Hitler's ideals. From a military standpoint he made many mistakes. However, if he had taken the position of a defender rather than an aggressor, his plan of defense would have been in winning plan, just as such a plan has been a winning plan in Switzerland. I do not think that Russia itself will move against America, except perhaps through the satellite countries. I know that Russia will not move against America if we are prepared.

The distinguished senior Senator from Vermont spoke of corruption in government. I say, Mr. President, that as a part of our military training, we must clean up conditions now existing in the United States. We must not only have military preparedness; we must have strong fiscal policies, and then we must live decently under the ideals that are America's ideals. Terrible things have been disclosed as existing at the present time in our country, however. As one distinguished Senator said a moment ago, knowledge of the evil things going on in this country is oozing out through the staves of the barrel. When the barrel is completely opened up, we may really be alarmed.

So, Mr. President, I should like to see provision for strong civilian components. I feel that the bill takes care of that need; a citizen will devote some time to service in the National Guard; or, if he does not want to serve in the guard, he will put in some time in the Reserve.

While I voted with the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the amendment relative to deferment of men for attendance in colleges, I feel that the basic training should come first. I do not care what a man is to do finally; to my mind the training he receives as a soldier gives him some idea of what his flag stands for.

Many people say we should not talk too much about patriotism, but I do not hesitate to say I am proud to be an American. I am proud that I have served on many occasions under the American flag. I believe the red in the flag means that every American has an obligation to it. I believe that the blue in the flag stands for truth and decency. I believe that the white in the flag stands for peace. We can have peace if every American is willing to do his full duty; and no American has done his full duty until he has had some military training.

I should like to close with the statement, Mr. President, that our first objective must be peace in the world. I have been criticized for using the following illustration, but I believe that until the nations of the world disarm, America must move forward with an atomic bomb in one hand, and the cross in the other. The only argument that a country like Russia will heed is the argument of force and power. Until we can teach them otherwise, we must have that force and power.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has been called temporarily from the floor, asked me to state that he yielded 10 minutes to the junior Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator from Washington is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington rises now because of his determination to speak out and against the pending amendment which would strike at and eliminate the universal training program offered in the manpower bill.

I have no desire, sir, to question the sincerity, the honesty, the concern, of those who support the pending amendment. Certainly the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] are among my closest and warmest friends, and for those distinguished gentlemen I have a deep and abiding respect and admiration. On this occasion I merely question their long-range judgment because of my conviction that the amendment will injure the real self-interest of my Nation and of future generations of Americans.

Mr. President, at this moment I speak not as a cosponsor of the manpower bill, and not as a Senator of the United States from the sovereign State of Washington. I speak as a parent, and as the father of a teen-age boy—a boy who, I believe, deserves every reasonable chance to live. I hope I speak, Mr. President, for many of the parents of American young men and for those young men themselves. I can only trust that my plea will be given some consideration.

Mr. President, in my youth I was so fortunate as to have had the opportunity to begin the battles of life early. Because my father was in a position to make it possible, I remained a student in a good military academy during my high-school years. I do not know that I shall be able to offer my son such an advantage. As a result of this opportunity, I was subjected to changing and tough environments, to hard knocks, to life at its best, and to life which, at times, was far from pleasant. Those experiences, sometimes gratifying, sometimes heartbreaking, prepared me well for survival in the bleak and lonely madhouse of war.

By way of contrast, I want to say this: Too often in the frantic, endless hours of waiting, frustration, and blood-letting in the last war, I saw young men who had received too little training, who had seen too little of the hard side of life, lose their senses, and purposely injure themselves in a desperate effort to escape from the tragic reality of war. Too often I have seen these unprepared young men take their own lives in a last futile gesture to escape from the unreality of the cold fact of reality. Too often I have seen men thrown into the grinning and leering teeth of battle with too little training and preparation to give them a fair chance to survive.

Mr. President, if we can help it we ought not to repeat the sad mistakes of the past. Speaking as the father of a boy now 13 years old, I want to do what may be required to give him every chance for survival. In a world in which power-grasping and godless dictators slash wildly about them in an effort to enslave and crucify all civilization, I believe that it would be gross negligence on our part not to give to our young men the training with which to defend themselves. Perhaps it is a fact that I speak for multitudes of parents of young men when I say that as a father I am today worried sick at the prospect of my son not receiving the training he deserves.

From the moment of birth we watch over our children, protect them, prepare them for the life ahead. We teach them to protect themselves in heavy traffic, on the way to school. We rush to the doctor at the slightest sign of sickness. We scrape and save and sacrifice, and live at times beyond our incomes, so that we can give to our sons the best available education. We strive and work to have these sons of ours prepared to meet the challenge of the business and professional world. We do everything in our power to give to our sons the necessary training and knowledge to enable them to meet the problems of life and to conquer them.

Why is it then that we seek to avoid one of the greatest of all our responsibilities, that we continue to fail to meet it? Why is it that we have failed, and perhaps will fail again, to give to our sons the training necessary to enable them to meet the challenge of life and death, should this challenge confront our sons, on the battlefields of freedom.

The reasons we have given in the past for our failure to do this are to my mind fallacious. We have said, "We do not want to train our young men to die on a battlefield," when we should have said, "Let's train our young men so that they can live on a battlefield." The untrained are those who die so needlessly. It takes training to live. We are proposing training for life—not for death.

In the past we have sometimes said, "We do not want this program, for it will make militarists of our sons." Out of my own experience and education I deny the presence of any validity in this position. It overlooks what parents through the years have contributed to the characters of their sons, and it totally underestimates the strength of character which most of our young men possess. No, Mr. President, after receiving 18 years of training in the home, in the church, in the school, and on the athletic field, our young men will not change, through 4 or 6 months of training, into militarists. As a parent I must resist such a charge. Were I my son I would resent such a charge.

Mr. President, such a training program as the Armed Services Committee, speaking after years of considered thought on the subject, has contemplated will give to my son, to our sons, to the sons of all America, the training they deserve and have a right to demand. Young men do not involve their nations in wars. Young men do not go off to wars out of their own choice. Young men are sent off to wars because of the mistakes made by older men and by old men. Our young men stand by and

ready to do their duty, and they ask only for the chance to save themselves if trouble comes. Training will teach them to adjust to changing environments and to bypass and avoid the battle madness brought on by combat. Training will teach our sons to protect themselves in a fire fight so that they will have a better chance to survive, to live out their deserved years of happiness, to use the education and training and advantages which the parents of our Nation have sacrificed to give them.

Mr. President, what the committee and many other thoughtful Americans have recommended in the manpower bill is not training for war, but is training for peace; it is not training for death, but is training for life. As a parent, I pray that my son and all other sons will be given that chance for peace and for life. My son and everybody's son are entitled, in their own names, to that chance.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I deeply regret that I find myself forced to disagree with my distinguished colleague and deskmate, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] on this amendment, for I have a high respect for both these distinguished Senators.

Under the conditions confronting us, Mr. President, I am in favor of universal military training. There may be details of this bill, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has pointed out, which should be changed; but I am for the basic and fundamental principle that under the conditions which now confront the Nation universal military training is an essential part of our preparedness program.

Mr. President, we are facing conditions in a so-called peacetime such as we have never faced before in our entire history. We must be on the war alert for a long time, and we must look forward to a long-range program of military preparedness.

The pending amendment would remove from the bill the long-term provisions for universal military training. In my judgment, these provisions are a vital and essential part of this legislation.

I fully agree with those who contend that the universal military training features will not become operative immediately. I also am in complete agreement with those who state that it is not possible at the moment to predict precisely when the universal military training features actually will begin to operate. However, Mr. President, I insist that this is not a weakness in the legislation, nor is it a reason for postponing or evading a decision in this matter.

In my judgment, the hour of decision is now—not 2, 3, or 4 years from now.

We should examine the problem today, not postpone it on the theory that we can examine it more objectively, more calmly, or more thoroughly at some future time.

Mr. President, this proposition already has been examined with all the thoroughness and objectivity of which the members of the Armed Services Committee are capable.

There is no magic about delay which will in some way make a decision easier or more palatable in the future. To my mind, one most compelling reason, among others, for making the decision now is to prevent the shocking and unforgivable waste in facilities which will be unavoidable if we do not now decide upon our future plan.

All of us are painfully aware of the overnight disintegration and dismantling of our military installations which took place immediately following World War II. We could hardly wait to tear down camps and abandon them or give them away or let them stand idle and deteriorate in the weather.

Today we are paying again for facilities which should never have been abandoned. If we fail now to make our decision regarding universal military training, at some future date we shall be purchasing—for a third time—facilities which are now in use but will be abandoned overnight as soon as the present emergency is over.

Mr. President, as this bill is written, it makes possible an orderly phasing out of the large active-duty force of 3,500,000 troops into the reduced establishment which we hope will at some future time come into being.

By this bill, provision is made for a long-range military defense, at much less cost than the maintenance of huge regular armies over long periods of time.

It permits the planned utilization of existing facilities which insures that camps will not be boarded up, abandoned, or sold, which would be required when a universal military training program takes effect.

Mr. President, this is not my first experience in the consideration either of selective service legislation or military training legislation.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Eightieth Congress, I spent many long hours listening to testimony on universal military training.

I was shocked at that time when the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, informed the committee that to initiate a plan of universal training at that time would cost the Nation $2,000,000,000 more for construction, rehabilitation, and activation of these facilities, as compared to the cost immediately after World War II.

What caused it? It was caused by the fact that when we permitted our Armed Forces to fall apart in 1946 we made no provision for the future. There was no planned cycle whereby the large wartime force would be demobilized and the peacetime establishment brought into being.

In effect, Mr. President, everybody dropped his tools and went home. He simply walked off the job.

Mr. President, this bill attempts, and I fervently hope the attempt will be successful, to save the taxpayers of this country, by making it possible for the Defense Department to plan its operations a little more intelligently.

If they know the UMT program is going into operation as soon as international conditions will permit, then it is possible for them to begin making plans as to which installations they will utilize; what type of construction and methods should now be put into effect at these installations; what type of housing and permanent equipment should be located there.

In this manner, Mr. President, I feel that we can aproach this transition from a large, active-duty force to a UMT program with a degree of sound business procedure rather than with the wasteful lack of procedure which would inevitably follow if we fail to say here and now, today, that we are going to attempt a program of universal military training as soon as it is possible to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From what the Senator has said, it is perfectly clear, is it not, that what is meant is that unless the provision for universal military training were included, this bill would not really be complete?

Mr. BYRD. That is my opinion. It is likely that we shall have to live under the threat of war for many years to come. General Eisenhower has said that the threat of war may last 10, 20, or even 30 years. Let me remind Members of the Senate that the threat of war over a long period may be quite as destructive of our economy as actual war itself.

Under these conditions, normal military peacetime training should be a part of our military program. Unless we become strong and remain strong, we shall be in danger. Only military strength, steady and consistent, will be a deterrent to Communistic aggression.

Mr. President, I desire now to say a few words about the cost of a great standing army. I today received figures on the 1934 military budget of this country, which was $480,000,000. That was the military budget, the entire military expenditure of the country in 1934. In 1939, 2 years before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the military budget was $1,074,000,000. In 1951 the estimated military budget is $20,994,000,000, and for 1952 the estimated military budget on an expenditure basis is $41,421,000,000.

Recently, before the Armed Services Committee, Mr. McNeil, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, stated that in fiscal 1953 the military expenditures will be $48,000,000,000 on an expenditure basis, and will last for a long time to come. He hoped the expenditures would be leveled off at some future time, but that was merely a wish, not in any way a certainty.

Mr. President, if our military expenditures are $48,000,000,000, and the present nondefense budget, as submitted by President Truman, is adopted, we shall then have a total Federal annual expenditure of $80,000,000,000. Added to that will be the local and State taxes and expenditures, to reach a grand total of nearly $100,000,000,000 a year. I ask Members of the Senate, in all sincerity,

to examine their own judgment, to ask themselves whether we can stand a combined expenditure of $100,000,000,000 and still preserve our solvency.

Federal income, Mr. President, under the existing taxation, is $55,000,000,000. Federal expenditures are estimated at $80,000,000,000, assuming that the figures I have given are carried out, namely, that there is no reduction in the nondefense spending. That means a deficit of $25,000,000,000 beginning in the year 1953. If we undertake to increase taxes to the extent of $25,000,000,000 more than we have already increased them, I say to you, Mr. President, that we shall so cripple the economic system of the country that we shall be threatened with collapse, because, as all of us know, there is a limit to which we can pay taxes.

Mr. President, the cost of each soldier in a standing army, with military equipment, is $10,000 a year. It costs $4,000 a year simply for the physical maintenance of a soldier, to pay his compensation, to pay for his living quarters, and so forth; but if we add to that the cost of the military equipment necessary to put the soldier in the field, the cost is $10,000 a year, according to estimates of the Defense Department.

I think it is very obvious that to have a reserve of trained soldiers, such as will be provided by the universal-military-training program, is a much better, a much more economical, and a much more satisfactory operation of defense than to have a great standing army at enormous cost, together with the other disadvantages of a great standing army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one more minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia one more minute.

Mr. BYRD. Therefore, Mr. President, I want to say that, after most careful consideration, in view of the conditions confronting us, I favor universal military training at this time. I say it reluctantly. Under other conditions, perhaps, I would not take this position; but in the past 5 years we have faced a threat to our security such as we have never faced before in the history of America, and that threat we must meet. The only way to meet it is by military preparedness, and the best way to have military preparedness over the long and many years to come is to have as a part of it universal military training. A great standing army over a term of years will bankrupt us.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado will not prevail.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, it is with some timidity that I make reference to polls. However, certainly it is not merely the ex-servicemen of the United States who favor universal military training. It is practically two-thirds or three-fourths of all our people. So I have put together the results of polls taken within the past few years, beginning in 1945, and extending through 1947.

I shall start with the American Institute of Public Opinion. Their last poll, conducted in 1947, shows that 66.5 percent of those interviewed favored UMT, 23.5 percent opposed, 10 percent had no opinion. The results in the various States were as follows: Illinois, 74 percent favorable; Ohio, 75 percent favorable; Indiana, 69 percent favorable; Michigan, 76 percent favorable; Texas, 78 percent favorable; and California, 77 percent favorable.

Mr. President, I do not want to quote merely from that one public opinion poll, but I desire to refer to one with which I am quite familiar—that of the National Opinion and Research Service, conducted by the University of Denver. From this institution I used to receive a poll regularly each month. This poll shows that 79 percent of the people, especially in the Rocky Mountain area, are favorable to UMT, 15 percent are opposed, and 6 percent have no opinion.

There have been a great number of polls. I conclude by saying that, of the 120 polls taken by newspapers throughout the United States, in all the large cities, 109 of the polls were favorable; only 11 were opposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with Senators who have expressed themselves as being in favor of the proposed universal military training program. It seems to me the time has come in this country when we must stop this rather frantic charging up the hill of preparedness in times of emergency, and then coasting rather lackadaisically back to the morass of unpreparedness in times of temporary peace. We have seen ourselves do that twice over the past two decades.

It seems to me that universal military training is the only practical means of getting this Nation prepared, and, more important, of keeping it prepared; for it is the only program which provides for an even flow of young men into the forces, and at the same time out of the forces into active Reserve programs. It is the only proposal which equalizes the burden of service in defense of the country. Because we did not have such a program heretofore, we see that, in the emergency which we are in today, the same men who carried the great burden of World War II are called upon to carry the burden once again. UMT would spread the burden of service so that the load would fall on the many rather than the few. At the same time it is the only program which assures that we shall not incur the danger of creating in this country a great professional army because it is a program which turns over to the citizens, the young men of the Nation, the program and the responsibility of looking after this Nation's defenses.

The Senator from Washington a moment ago made reference to the fact that he had one son whom he wanted to have the benefit of universal military training. I agree wholeheartedly with his remarks. I am the father of two sons, and I certainly hope that my two sons will be afforded the opportunity of having been trained before they are thrown into the maelstrom of battle.

The most tragic single element of the momentously tragic war in Korea is the fact that you men, 17 and 18 years old, with practically no training whatever, have had to move into the front line of the defense of their country. Because many of them had not been taught what to do when under actual battle conditions, with all its confusion and bloodshed, they lost their lives and will never return again. It could well be said that these men, because of lack of training, had no chance.

The national commander of the American Legion, whose name is Earl Cocke, a very able young man from Georgia, a man who served valiantly and well in World War II, said, in a recent speech advocating universal military training, that we need UMT because we find in the excitement and confusion of battle today that "it is the trained men who survive and the untrained who are killed."

I think as a practical matter, as has been so well stated by the able and distinguished Senator from Virginia, for this Nation to economize we need to adopt a universal military training program. Certainly we cannot for very long maintain a military budget of approximately $48,000,000,000 annually. Indeed, it is waste and profligacy of an exaggerated nature for us to spend that many billions to get ready, then when the urgency of the crisis eases off a little bit, to then permit our defenses to deteriorate and our matériel to rust and rot. We need a steady, planned program of preparedness so long as some men seek to capture and enslave others. We have learned that practical preparedness offers the only hope for peace; and, lacking peace, certainly practical preparedness available to us under a universal military training program offers us the only hope of survival.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire as to how much more time remains to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 20 minutes remaining; the Senator from Colorado, 22 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. President, I am somewhat amazed that the old cry should be raised here that the effect of universal military training will be to Prussianize the American people. Over a period of 20 or more years, the great veterans' organizations composed of men who had been called from civilian pursuits into the armed

services and returned to their homes after the period of emergency had passed, organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Association—indeed, all the national veteran organizations of which I have any knowledge—have striven for universal military training. Those men have known what it means to be thrown into battle without adequate training.

It seems to be unpopular here to cite those who have led our armies to success and our Nation to salvation in past wars, but I was impressed by the statement of General Eisenhower, who has seen much of war, that the graves of American boys who died through lack of proper training dotted North Africa and Europe.

Mr. President, I have always been an advocate of universal military training as a method of providing a reserve system of civilian soldiers ready to answer their Nation's call without the delay and avoiding the exaggerated expense we always incur when we have disbanded our forces, destroyed our equipment, and dismantled our cantonments.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is eminently correct in saying that this is a move for economy. I am amazed at the number of those who claim to be the advocates of economy, yet propose to strike down the one system which will, through a period of 20 years of cold war, enable this Nation to escape national bankruptcy. We cannot keep in being, indefinitely, a large standing or professional army of from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 men. We cannot hope to match Russia and China in that respect.

I do not have the figures as to the Chinese Army, but the pay of a private in the Russian Army is $7 a year—not a month, but a year. The pay of the lowest grade in the American Army is $1,080 a year. In view of that disparity, we cannot indefinitely continue to expand our Armed Forces. A brigadier general in the Rusian Army receives pay of $300 a year. A brigadier general in our Army receives pay running up into the thousands of dollars, with other emoluments. So the one road to salvation from the destruction of the economy of America is to inaugurate a reserve program which will enable us to have 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 men on tap, available in reserve, and at the same time avoid the tremendous expense of almost $10,000 a year, the amount we incur in keeping a man on active duty.

The system proposed is one which has proved its worth. For example, the little nation of Switzerland, through a system of universal military training, has built up her reserves. She has had a striking force, so that, though the tide of war has moved about her, though she has been surrounded by nations that were Communist and by nations that were directed by dictators, not one of them has had the temerity to attack her. She has relied upon a system of trained reserves.

The only escape we can possibly have from this staggering military budget of almost $50,000,000,000 a year is to provide this system for building up our reserves.

Mr. President, we have paid a terrific penalty for being so late in inaugurating and adopting such a system. There is no doubt in my mind that had we adopted it some 15 years ago we would probably have avoided World War II. If the nations of the earth had known that America had in being a reserve force which could be quickly summoned to the colors, trained and ready for combat, we might well have seen a change in the entire course of history. The dictators, prepared and armed to the teeth, seeing us absolutely unprepared, with no reserves and with no arms to hand to our citizen soldiers and with no training grounds or camps adapted to the equipment, took the chance that they could accomplish their purpose before America was ready. If there had been a strong reserve force in being, they would have been deterred.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator would agree that a fear which many of us have is that in a future war the enemy might not give us a chance to sit back and prepare for a period of 2 or 3 years, as they have in the past; and that in view of the rapidity of present warfare, particularly in the light of the great importance of air power and atomic warfare, we should be ready to call men to arms immediately, in order to be ready to fight.

Mr. RUSSELL. To enable us to survive we must either maintain a tremendous military establishment, at an enormous cost, or establish a reserve system which would be ready to go into action at any moment a dictator might see fit to strike. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. Two would-be masters of Europe have made the mistake of thinking that America could not be prepared in time. They have seen their hopes vanish in the face of American courage and industrial production. The dictator who today dominates so much of the face of the earth is well aware what American industrial production means when it is given an opportunity to get under way. He is quoted by Mr. Churchill as having said that American industrial production enabled the Allies in World War II to vanquish Hitler and his satellite powers.

If war should come, which God forbid, America would be the first target. Of course, we may undertake to carry the enormous burden of a 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 standing army, costing us approximately $50,000,000,000 a year. On the other hand, we could inaugurate a system of universal military training and organized reserves, which would enable us to defend America perhaps even more effectively and, after the passage of some time, at half the cost we are required to bear today.

Mr. President, the amendment should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall reserve the remainder of my time for use by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield 18 minutes to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the argument for the Johnson-Bricker amendment has been so ably presented by the Senator from Colorado that anything I say will be largely supplemental to what has already been presented to the Senate. However, I wish to speak for the amendment. At the same time I speak for my country. I speak for the people of a Nation which has never unsheathed its sword except in a conflict in which it won the ultimate victory.

Mr. President, I believe in this Nation. I believe that it stands upon a foundation of freedom. When the freedom of the individual is destroyed, the very fiber of a nation is disintegrated.

Reference has been made to three things which Stalin fears. First is the individual initiative, reliance, capability, and resourcefulness of the individual American soldier, sailor, airman, and marine. Such individual reliance and resourcefulness are developed in an atmosphere and in a spirit of freedom, in which they themselves have had to make decisions, and not under a military command or dictatorship.

The second thing Russia fears is the great productive capacity of America. We do not have time to go into that subject this afternoon, but let it be said that our capacity is far greater than that of any other nation in the world. In some respects, it probably is as great as that of all nations combined. The program of universal military training would hinder and curb the great productive capacity of the industry of America, rather than enhance it.

The third thing Russia fears is the atom bomb. By properly emphasizing it, as we are patriotically emphasizing it in Congress, I think it will be the greatest deterrent to Russian aggression and the greatest implement for peace that the world has known.

Mr. President, whenever the power of government is enhanced, human liberty is suppressed. Whenever a great military force is built up, it must be used for some purpose. No nation on the face of the earth is going to attack America with land forces, today, tomorrow, or in the years ahead No nation could successfully invade this country at this time. There may be an air attack. However, the best defense for such an attack would be our own air power and air preparedness. From the arguments which are made on the other side one would be inclined to believe that we have no airplanes, that we would be attacked overnight, and that we would have no means of retaliation. One might judge that we had no Navy, and that an enemy could cross the seas at will and land in force on our shores. The apparent intent of those who oppose this amendment is to assert that all these disasters will result if we do not now adopt this universal-military training program.

Mr. President, the law which is already on the statute books provides adequate authority to build up any army that may be needed in the years immediately

ahead. That that has not been thought through, and that the program has not been critically or completely analyzed and studied by the committee, is shown by the very vagueness of the bill, in which the attempt is made, as was so well pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, to link up universal military service with a selective service bill, in the hope that it would be passed by Congress under the impetus of the moment, accentuated by some of the fears which have been spread over the country by propaganda and otherwise.

Mr. President, it has been said by the proponents of universal military training that it is the heart of the whole bill, and that if we do not adopt the universal military training provision we may as well not have any bill at all. That, I think, brings forcefully to our attention the desires of the military for more and more power. It is in the nature of bureaucracy to build and to grow and to reach out into other fields of service. Power begets power. Greed breeds greed. The strongest bureaucracy in Washington today is in the leadership of our armed forces in the Pentagon and in the office of the Secretary of Defense.

Before proceeding to discuss the bill I should like to pay a little attention to a letter which was received by every Senator this morning from the Secretary of Defense. I shall pass over whether it represents a legitimate use of funds appropriated by the Congress. However, let me say that if we were to follow the arguments contained in the letter our country would start down the road of decadent nations. We could very well start down the road to complete totalitarian government and tyranny, where other nations of the world have been led. The Secretary of Defense says:

> In my opinion, this is not just another amendment—

Referring to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado and myself—

> to be given hasty consideration.

Mr. President, that statement is a reflection upon the integrity, honor, and honesty of the Members of the Senate. I resent the insinuation of the Secretary of Defense that Congress would give hasty consideration to this matter. If he wants to point the finger of hasty consideration let him point to the committee, which reported these controversial sections of this bill without adequate consideration, and without an adequate explanation to the American people of the real meaning and the full scope of this bill.

> Scrapping the universal military training provisions would cut the heart out of the bill.

Mr. President, that shows what the military authorities are after. They are after complete control of the boys of this country, disrupting their education, their business enterprises, and their home life, by taking them into a military force. Mr, President, I do not want this Nation of ours turned into a militaristic and materialistic society. We are headed that way under this bill.

General Marshall continues:

> I have been fearful that a long debate over many details of this legislation would dim the fundamental conception which is the basis of the bill.

Mr. President, if anyone wants to dim the fundamental conception it is the Secretary of Defense. It is the military authorities who do not want the American people to know what is in the bill. It has been so vaguely drafted that Members of the Senate do not know what is in it. We do not know the terms of UMT. We do not know when it would be put into effect. We do not know what kind of commission would administer it. We do not know when the President of the United States would establish it.

The committee declares that it is in the national interest that the personnel serving in the Armed Forces be directed and encouraged in the realization and in the development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental to the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of the American citizenship.

Mr. President, I think the moral fiber of America is the strongest and best of any nation on the face of the earth today. The spirit of the American people is right. We are fundamentally a religious people. We have come to be so after 150 years of guidance of our own destiny, without the dictatorship of the Armed Forces or the generals in command of them, or even the President of the United States or the Secretary of Defense. I do not want the religious instruction of the boys of America to be taken from the homes and turned over to the military authorities. I do not want the spiritual strengthening of the fiber of America to depend upon the commanding officers of the boys in camps who are receiving military training. That is the responsibility of the American home, which has done such a magnificent job. It is the responsibility of the free churches of America. Under our institutions we have builded the finest citizenship in the history of the world. For the military now so say, "We are going to take that over" is going beyond the pale of reason. It is the road toward military tyranny and military dictatorship.

The military authorities do not want this question reviewed in future years, because they know that after the American people know the meaning of this program, and after they see what it does to our society, our economy, and the basic liberties of the people of America, they will resent it and turn against it. The military authorities know, as well as we know, that the American Congress would never pass such a bill in the light of an educated American citizenship.

No; if anyone is trying to dim this bill, it is being dimmed by the military leadership and those who are proposing it in the Congress at this time.

General Marshall continues:

> By the same token, our allies will find it hard to place any confidence in the durability of our support and their will to stand fast against totalitarian pressure will be correspondingly reduced.

Mr. President, today we are contributing one-half the total cost of military development and economic rehabilitation in the countries of Europe. What happened? We tried to obtain an agreement. We tried to get promises. All we have are vague hopes expressed by General Eisenhower in a prayer. It is now the hope that those nations may respond if we take this additional step. Have we not done enough already to bring them into line and revive their patriotism and determination to defend themselves? We cannot do it through universal military training in this country. Do we want to make them more impotent and dependent upon us? It would make them suppliants at our door to a greater extent than they are today, rather than encourage in them a determination to take care of their own responsibilities and protect their own lands.

Universal military training is certainly not needed to defend our shores at this time. We already have in effect a Selectice Service Act. Are we going to send more troops to Europe under the universal military training program? Are we going to prepare them for another such debacle as the President of the United States led us into in Korea, against the advice of all those who should have known the effects of it?

No; the military leaders are trying to becloud the issue. They are not willing that the American people shall look it squarely in the face. What we do here will have no effect upon what Russia does over there, but it may cause the European nations to relax in their diligence.

I read further:

> Because this legislation is designed to meet needs that are so unpredictable, the establishment of a fixed expiration date would wipe out much of its value.

All they want to do is to take complete control out of the hands of the Congress. They want the Congress to subordinate itself to the Executive and the military. Then perhaps they would be willing to let us know at some future time what is going on.

General Marshall continues:

> I am not suggesting that the Congress should adopt this program on a permanent basis and then abandon all concern with its effectiveness or administration. On the contrary, I believe it should be the obligation of the Department of Defense and also of the independent control commission, to be appointed by the President with the advice and approval of the Senate, to render regular reports to the Congress on all aspects of the program.

It is very generous of them to be willing to report to the Congress, which represents the American people and is supposed to determine the policy of the country. It is generous of them to be willing to report to us from time to time what they are doing.

I have not sufficient time to read the remainder of the letter. However, I believe it is a usurpation of authority on the part of the defense chief, outside

his province, when he tries to lobby the Congress of the United States into supporting a program which he and his assistants got through the Armed Services Committee.

My position on this bill is not determined by what the Secretary of Defense says, but by what I honestly and sincerely believe, as a patriotic, liberty-loving American citizen, will be the best thing for the people of my country, not for today and tomorrow, but in the long run. We have builded mightily upon the foundations established by our forefathers. Let us not destroy those foundations by accepting something which we have not studied through, the ultimate effects of which we cannot comprehend.

There are two or three questions which I should like to ask the other side. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] give some attention to them.

The National Security Training Commission is given power to establish policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training, including moral, religious, informational, and educational phases of such training. Does this not provide ultimately for political indoctrination, and possibly for thought control of the people of the country? If we should have a wilful President of the United States, and every American boy were placed in camp at 18 years of age, we would have a perfect Hitlerian picture. If we should have a wilful President who was willing to use the power, and money of his office to propagandize and indoctrinate boys in the camps—and there is some suspicion on my part that that might some day be done—we would have another military dictatorship. It might have been done in the past if there had been an opportunity. Such a thing could destroy the very fundamental principles of liberty in this country and indoctrinate us into totalitarian government.

On page 80 of the bill, lines 2 to 6, it is provided that the commission may designate the Federal departments and agencies to conduct moral, religious, recreational, informational, and education training. Is not that a program which would take over the welfare, the education, and the religious training of the boys of our country for at least the limited period they are in the service? No one knows how long that may ultimately be. It would take such training away from home, the church, the schools and the colleges, under whose guidance, leadership, and training we have developed so mightily.

There appears to be nothing in the bill which would prevent the President from establishing in the United States American youth organizations, similar to those established in Germany by Hitler. Those youth organizations were likewise given moral, religious, informational and educational training, just as is provided by the bill. That was the implement by which Hitler suppressed the people of Germany and led to the greatest debacle in the history of the world.

The military spreads out. The bigger it becomes, the more things it has to do with the American people, over them, and to them.

In the first place, the committee says that the salaries of the National Security Training Commission were not fixed because the members will probably not be appointed for a number of years, and future salaries are difficult to predict. Nevertheless, they did determine what the salaries of the boys would be, what pay they would receive when they were called in. They admit that the program is not going to be used by the President for a number of years—3 or 4 or 5 or 6 years. Why should we abdicate our responsible position in the scheme of Government and give a blank check to the President to place a law in effect when and if he ever feels that it is desirable? No. Let the Congress pass upon that question at some future date, when we can have a clear look at the provisions of the bill, and not pass it as a part of a law extending selective service which is admittedly necessary. It is tacked on because of the propaganda and power of the bureaucracy in Washington, again suppressing the individual rights of the American people.

The bill might make it possible for the President and the Government to supply low-cost, subsidized agricultural or industrial labor. Mr. President, that is the reason why the Grange and the Farm Bureau throughout the country are opposing tacking universal military training on to the selective-service law.

This measure is not a war program, Mr. President. If we have a crisis it will be immediate. We pray and hope that it will not be permanent. It will not be permanent if we do not destroy the liberties of the American people and their individual reliance on the possibility of their continuing to have a voice and a vote in the destinies of their own Government.

This measure would disrupt American life and destroy the liberties upon which we have builded. It would change the entire concept of our social structure. It would give power to the military leaders and to the Government at Washington that they have never had before. The Government could change our whole social fabric, destroy the possibilities of a boy planning his life, planning for a college education. If this program is attached to the society of America it will never be taken off.

This program would result in starting down the road toward totalitarian government and maybe ultimate tyranny. It would lead us down the pathway which every decadent nation has marched to its ultimate destruction and death.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. It is a matter which ought to be thoroughly debated. It is a matter which the American people ought to study. It is a matter on which we ought to have a chance to talk to the people back home. It is a matter respecting which we ought to have the advice of the military leaders as to just what they are going to do with these boys, in order to bring about the peace which they talk and prattle about while all the time war comes closer. We do not have time to talk about the present crisis. But we have before us legislation granting full authority and power to meet the situation as it is today, without attaching to our society ultimately a control program, a bureaucratic program, the most powerful this country has ever had, destroying our liberty, changing the course of history, and, in my opinion, lessening the influence of the United States in world affairs. It is unnecessary for the protection of the liberty of America, unnecessary for the preservation of the peace of the world, and destructive of some of the very fundamental concepts we have held for 150 years, and upon which we have builded our country. We have never been defeated in battle, Mr. President, and in my individual judgment we will not be, so long as the American people remain free, love liberty, and have a voice and vote in the destiny of their own affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, how much time do we have on this side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the time on this side of the Senator from Ohio has been used except one-half minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Bricker-Johnson amendment which, as I understand it, would retain selective service, but abolish the universal military-training features of the pending bill. I think our experience has demonstrated that selective service is not enough. Men are brought into the armed services, but after they have finished their period of service, they are then released, and we do not build up a backlog of trained soldiers who will be available if an emergency develops. As a result of our not having universal military training in past years, we have been compelled to call on approximately 800,000 Reservists, men who have already taken part in fighting one war, and who, because we have not built up a backlog of those who previously have not fought and who are not organized in Reserve divisions, have been compelled to return to the service and fight another war.

The purpose of universal military training is with a short period of basic training, then to send the men back into their home communities, where they will be formed into Reserve companies, regiments, and divisions. Additional training will be given the men at home, and the Reserve units, instead of being skeletons as now, will be firmly organized and inherent groups. Then, if war should develop, we would have not merely the National Guard, but Reserve divisions which could be thrown into the fray, instead of hastily assembling an army, giving the men training, and sending them forth unready.

Mr. President, I believe this feature of the bill will provide greater security for

the Nation, and it will not militarize the youth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much has the other side used up of its time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All except one-half minute.

Does the other side desire to use that remaining time now, that half minute?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, is the other side proposing to yield some part of its remaining time to us?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I understood the other side had a half a minute, or perhaps a minute left.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much time does the opposition have left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eight minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall take one-half minute. Perhaps unanimous consent will be granted that I may speak for a minute.

Mr. President, if we do not change the foreign policy of the United States, if we continue to follow the philosophy we have been following in foreign affairs in recent years, not only will we need all the 18-year-old boys in the country, but we will need all the men who are able to bear arms.

Mr. President, we are attacking the problem from the wrong direction. What we ought to be debating here today is the foreign policy of the United States, which has proved so disastrous over the past many, many, many years.

So, Senators who vote for universal military training are voting to help those who have been responsible for bringing upon the Nation the need for military service. I hope the amendment will prevail and that the provision for universal military training will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time does our side have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood we had 11 minutes at the time I yielded 2 minutes a short while ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact that time passed while Senators discussed the question of how much time remained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield as much time as the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] desires to take.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as part of the debate the very illuminating letter I received this morning from General Marshall. I understand an identical letter was delivered today to every Member of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington March 6, 1951.*

MY DEAR SENATOR BENTON: I am informed that the Senate will be asked to vote on a proposal that all sections relating to universal military training be eliminated from the universal military training and service bill, now under discussion.

In my opinion this is not just another amendment, to be given hasty consideration. Scrapping the universal military training provisions would cut the heart out of the bill. The distinctive contribution the bill makes to our national security would be removed. This single action would be sufficient to cancel the assurance that our defenses would have, for the first time, an enduring base that would guarantee us adequate military strength at a cost we could bear for the years of critical world tension that we now face.

I have been fearful that the long debate over many details of this legislation would dim the fundamental conception which is the basis of the bill. I believe it is important to restate that purpose now so that every Senator may realize exactly what will be the result of voting to remove the universal military training features from this measure.

This bill is intended to enable us to maintain the strength we need to curb aggression and safeguard peace. We must expand our forces in being with all possible speed. At the same time we must assure a dependable flow of trained young manpower into our civilian reserve components so that we can transfer a larger part of the future responsibility for our security to these citizen groups and thus cut down the size of our professional Military Establishment, of the troops on active duty.

No man is wise enough to know how long the present emergency will last. One thing we do know. Unless we give unequivocal proof now of our determination to organize our defenses on a sound, long-range basis, our potential enemies will be encouraged to believe that we will, sooner or later, relax our vigilance and provide them with an opportunity to achieve their goal of world domination.

Our past history is a fever chart of panicky mobilization in periods of crisis, followed by too hasty disarmament when the sense of urgency subsided. So long as our enemies have any ground for believing that we will again weary of the cost of preparedness or that we will wreck our economy by attempting to support a standing military organization of large proportions, we can have little hope that they will abandon their aggressive policies and seek an honest peace at the conference table. By the same token, our allies will find it hard to place any confidence in the durability of our support and their will to stand fast against totalitarian pressure will be correspondingly reduced.

Universal military training is not a step toward militarizing our country. Its effect, in my opinion, is precisely the opposite. By building up the civilian reserve and cutting down the Regular Military Establishment or troops on active duty it offers maximum assurance that we can reduce the number of men who must leave their families, their jobs, and curtail their education to serve in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It would require fewer men under arms, while giving us a vastly greater number of trained men quickly available for duty in a sudden emergency.

It would distribute the obligation for national defense equitably and democratically among all our young men at the time when fulfillment of this obligation would involve minimum hardship for them, for their communities, and for our productive economy. It would permit the maintenance of a strong educational system and prevent any interference with the scientific and technical leadership that is so vital to our total security. It is the common-sense answer to our defense problems in a world situation that may remain tense for a long period of years.

Because this legislation is designed to meet needs that are so unpredictable, the establishment of a fixed expiration date would wipe out much of its value. Any date that was set would represent a marker for those who conspire against us to anchor their hopes that we would revert once again to our old state of vulnerable unpreparedness. Instead of peace, their strategy would be directed toward creating a synthetic atmosphere of calm so that we would strip ourselves of available trained reserves without putting anything in their place.

I am not suggesting that the Congress should adopt this program on a permanent basis and then abandon all concern with its effectiveness or administration. On the contrary, I believe it should be the obligation of the Department of Defense and also of the independent control commission, to be appointed by the President with the advice and approval of the Senate, to render regular reports to the Congress on all aspects of the program.

It is my conviction that any program of such fundamental importance to the American people should have a full review by the Congress at regular intervals to make certain that it is accomplishing the purpose for which it was set up and that it is being administered in a democratic, economical and effective manner. Such a review should go beyond the comprehensive appraisal that every governmental program receives each year in the course of its congressional budget hearings.

My experience in a lifetime of association with the military departments has convinced me that universal military training is an essential element in any genuine program of national security for this country. It is not a new idea. It has been advocated by many thoughtful, peace-loving Americans in all of the years since George Washington first proposed a program of this type 150 years ago.

There are always people who feel that this is not the right time to consider universal military training. In periods of emergency, it is argued that we must concentrate all our attention on building up our immediate strength, not waste energy on long-term plans. In periods of apparent peace, it is argued that we must scale down our strength almost to the last degree.

We have a great national decision to make, a really historic decision. We need universal military training as a fundamental and inseparable part of the bill you are now considering. We cannot draw a line between the problems we must face today and those we may have to face tomorrow. I hope the Senate will not follow the line of evasion or delay. I hope you will vote to approve the basic provisions of this legislation, as reported out by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to myself the remainder of the time.

The Bricker-Johnson amendment strikes at the very essence of this legislation. If the amendment is adopted it will leave our country with nothing more than a limited draft act.

It has been stated that no study had been given the UMT section of the bill. I think I am safe in saying that more study has been given to the subject of universal military training and to the program set out in this legislation during the past 5 years than has been given any other aspect of national defense.

The Postwar Policy Committee of the House of Representatives, under the chairmanship of Representative Woodrum, and that great leader of the other party, Jim Wadsworth, sat for months, and finally recommended the adoption of a universal military training program.

A Commission known as the Compton Commission, because it is headed by the former distinguished president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, filed a report with the President and with the Congress of some 447 pages, recommending the adoption of a UMT program. Last year the Senate Armed Services Committee was ready to report unanimously the universal military training bill when the President requested that that action be delayed so it could be incorporated in one single manpower bill.

In my opening remarks, Mr. President, I stated that "Unpreparedness is an invitation to disaster." The unpreparedness we experienced last summer, the unpreparedness we experienced before two world wars, was basically due to the fact that we did not have the foresight to train large numbers of our young men for the contingency of war.

Mr. President, I should like to give another reason why I think the committee acted wisely when it voted 13 to 0 to include UMT in this bill. The committee adopted the policy of universal training because it believed that we should have long-term legislation. In my judgment, one of the major scandals which has taken place following each period of demobilization has been our inconceivably wasteful policy with regard to surplus property and surplus installations.

There is no point, at this moment, in attempting to fix responsibility for the incredible waste which took place a few years ago. We can anticipate that exactly the same thing will happen in the future if we do not today provide some sort of long-range policy so that the country and the military leaders will have some sort of pattern by which to formulate their future training plans.

The bill as it is written provides for the transition from a major force—a force in the neighborhood of three and one-half million—to a small force. Never before in our history, Mr. President, have we had a blueprint of this kind prepared in advance.

The bill makes it possible for the military progressively to shorten the periods of service, or to increase and modify the period of basic training. It also permits the Congress, by concurrent resolution, to reduce that period of service any time its judgment dictates. This policy, Mr. President, should be decided upon in advance. The committee has presented such a policy. We feel that it will make possible an orderly cut-back in the size of the Armed Forces in such a manner that it will be geared to the building up of the Reserve components concurrently.

Following this demobilization period, the bill provides the mechanism for universal military training to come into operation. With this policy before us, the armed services have no excuse if their planning is faulty; if they dispose of camps today and decide to purchase them back tomorrow; if they give away clothing and equipment this week only to buy it back next week.

There are some who maintain that a program of universal military service will make militarists of our young men. The families of this Nation, above all the young men of this Nation, should feel deeply injured by this fallacious charge. It implies that our young men are so weak in character that they can be changed completely, in a few months, from rugged individualists into heel-clicking militarists.

Look at the veterans of the last war, many of whom are now taking their places as leaders in their communities, many of whom today sit in the United States Senate. How many of them have become militarists?

I just want to say, Mr. President, that I am glad we are going to have a chance to call the roll and decide this issue. Those Members of the Senate who believe that we can continue to maintain a standing army of three or four or five million men, and the consequent expenditures of forty or fifty billion dollars annually, of course, could and should oppose universal military training. But those who think we should start now to plan a universal military training program whereby each youth upon reaching the age of 18 can receive from 4 to 6 months' training and then serve the remainder of his time in the Reserve, should vote to defeat the amendment.

Those Members of the Senate who have long advocated economy, now have a chance to show how they feel about economy.

Those Members of the Senate who feel that we should have a universal military training program are going to be able to vote "yea" today on that program.

This is the day for which men who have fought for preparedness have long been waiting.

Mr. President, I hope the Bricker-Johnson amendment will be defeated overwhelmingly, and that we can proceed with a well planned universal military training program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Under the unanimous consent agreement, all time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Duff | Ives |
| Anderson | Dworshak | Jenner |
| Bennett | Ecton | Johnson, Colo. |
| Benton | Ellender | Johnson, Tex. |
| Brewster | Ferguson | Johnston, S. C. |
| Bricker | Frear | Kefauver |
| Butler, Md. | Fulbright | Kem |
| Butler, Nebr. | George | Kerr |
| Byrd | Gillette | Kilgore |
| Cain | Green | Knowland |
| Capehart | Hayden | Langer |
| Carlson | Hendrickson | Lehman |
| Case | Hennings | Lodge |
| Chavez | Hickenlooper | Long |
| Clements | Hill | McCarran |
| Connally | Hoey | McClellan |
| Cordon | Holland | McFarland |
| Dirksen | Humphrey | McKellar |
| Douglas | Hunt | McMahon |
| Magnuson | Pastore | Taft |
| Martin | Robertson | Thye |
| Maybank | Russell | Tobey |
| Millikin | Saltonstall | Watkins |
| Monroney | Schoeppel | Welker |
| Morse | Smathers | Wherry |
| Mundt | Smith, Maine | Wiley |
| Murray | Smith, N. J. | Williams |
| Nixon | Smith, N. C. | Young |
| O'Conor | Sparkman | |
| O'Mahoney | Stennis | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

On page 69, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

On page 71, to strike out lines 3 through 10, inclusive.

On page 73, line 11, to strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

On page 74, line 10, to strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

On page 76, line 10, beginning with the comma, strike out all through and including the word "claimed" in line 3 on page 77.

On page 78, beginning with line 20, strike out all to but not including the period in line 6 on page 80 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "all of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of the second sentence, and last two sentences of the fourth paragraph, of section 4 (a), sections 4 (b), 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), and 14 shall become inoperative and shall cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such time."

Page 91, line 1, beginning with the word "All" strike out all through line 7.

Page 92, line 17, strike out "Universal Military Training and Service Act" and insert in lieu thereof "Selective Service Act of 1948."

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll on the question of agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is unavoidably detained on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business. If present, each of them would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—20

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Gillette | Taft |
| Bricker | Jenner | Watkins |
| Butler, Nebr. | Johnson, Colo. | Welker |
| Capehart | Kem | Wherry |
| Carlson | Langer | Williams |
| Case | Millikin | Young |
| Dworshak | Schoeppel | |

NAYS—68

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hennings | Martin |
| Anderson | Hickenlooper | Maybank |
| Benton | Hill | Monroney |
| Brewster | Hoey | Morse |
| Butler, Md. | Holland | Mundt |
| Byrd | Humphrey | Murray |
| Cain | Hunt | Nixon |
| Chavez | Ives | O'Conor |
| Clements | Johnson, Tex. | O'Mahoney |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | Pastore |
| Cordon | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Dirksen | Kerr | Russell |
| Douglas | Kilgore | Saltonstall |
| Duff | Knowland | Smathers |
| Ecton | Lehman | Smith, Maine |
| Ellender | Lodge | Smith, N. J. |
| Ferguson | Long | Smith, N. C. |
| Frear | McCarran | Sparkman |
| Fulbright | McClellan | Stennis |
| George | McFarland | Thye |
| Green | McKellar | Tobey |
| Hayden | McMahon | Wiley |
| Hendrickson | Magnuson | |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | McCarthy | Vandenberg |
| Eastland | Malone | |
| Flanders | Neely | |

So the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, for himself and Mr. BRICKER, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] automatically comes up at this time. The debate on this question is limited to 1½ hours, to be divided equally between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 91, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) All of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of the second sentence and the last two sentences of the fourth paragraph of section 4 (a), and except all of sections 4 (b), 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), 14, and 17 (c) shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the fourth anniversary of the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment merely seeks to terminate this entire act 4 years from the date on which it becomes effective. In other words, at that time a renewal of the entire act will be required, if it is to be continued; and that matter must be considered by Congress at that time, under the amendment. The current act, which we are now proposing to amend and extend, contains a similar provision.

Under that act, Mr. President, "all the provisions of this title," except certain portions which I have also excepted from my amendment in order that the actual operation may continue, "will become inoperative and will cease to apply on July 9, 1951, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date."

That section has been omitted from this bill, but it seems to me that very clearly it should be included. After all, Mr. President, the drafting of men for compulsory service or even the drafting of men for compulsory training is a fundamental departure from the entire history of our country. I do not think we have ever had a draft in time of peace, except in 1940 when the fires of war were very clearly, indeed, to be seen; and at that time we had a draft for approximately a year before the war actually took place.

The first law of 1940 had a definite limitation. Under that limitation the law expired. It then was extended for the duration of the war. It terminated with the end of the war.

At the present time there is no war, and thus there is no possibility of using a termination-of-the-war date as the date for the termination of this particular act. Unless we have a termination date for this act, it will remain indefinitely on the statute books. We should take action to provide a termination date.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the situation we face—in other words, the condition of building up a tremendous military state, and in that connection extending our economic capacity to its very limit, and restricting many freedoms of the people—should obviously be regarded as an emergency. We should not get into the frame of mind of thinking of the condition we now face as a permanent one. Perhaps it will continue for 10 years; no one can tell, I agree. Yet it seems to me that we must not permit the people to accept the idea that the United States is a permanent military state or garrison state, with the military features and the cost of the military forces dominating the entire life of the people. We should approach the present condition as being in the nature of an emergency.

Mr. President, we should realize that, as a matter of fact, in considering the Defense Production Act—which, after all, deals with a part of the same program, namely, the construction of a tremendous volume of all kinds of military equipment—we wrote in a very definite limitation. Titles I, II, III, and VII of that act terminate at the close of June 30, 1952; other sections of that act terminate on June 30, 1951; and thereafter we shall have to renew that act if it is to be continued.

So far as I am concerned, I would be in favor of providing a definite termination date for the emergency tax law we now contemplate passing.

We have had a considerable amount of experience with termination dates and with so-called concurrent resolutions terminating war or emergency legislation. I think all Members will admit that we never have found it very practical to use a concurrent resolution as a means for the termination of any emergency or for the repeal of an emergency law. Over and over again we have been forced to a very wise reconsideration of the entire policy, by means of the provision of a dfinite termination date in regard to many of the laws we have enacted. Such a provision in connection with such laws, since they are emergency laws, places on their proponents the very definite burden of showing that the emergency still exists. A termination date automatically ends the law, so that if the emergency is no longer in existence, the law will come to an end of itself, and an affirmative resolution by both Houses of Congress is not required.

The longer one stays in Congress the more he realizes the great importance of the power of veto and obstruction as compared to the power of actually enacting legislation. Gradually the fence against enacting affirmative legislation becomes so strong that it is extremely difficult to enact it. It is much easier to block legislation than it is to enact a new bill. In effect, any separation date puts the burden on those who want to force upon the country an emergency condition to come forward again at the end of a 4-year period to prove their case.

Mr. President, the amendment, as I said, would not have any direct effect on UMT. If peace should come and conditions in the world should be bettered in less than 4 years the President would have the power to put UMT into effect. It is true that if at the end of 4 years we still maintain national compulsory service, or the draft, then before UMT comes into effect we will have to reconsider the whole bill. I cannot see any objection to a 4-year termination date. I voted for the Bricker amendment. I did not vote for it because I was opposed to UMT, but because I did not think we should consider UMT until the time comes to consider it.

I have said to the American Legion and others that I think if we could sit down and work out a UMT program which could be coordinated with the educational system of the country I would be willing to support such a proposal. However, the pending bill merely provides that 5 years from now some commission could be created with power to establish any kind of UMT they want. I certainly do not think any harm would be done by requiring that the whole problem should be reconsidered at the end of 4 years, when we would be closer to the time when UMT would be actually put into effect.

I have been asked why the period should be 4 years. Some Members of the Senate have felt it should be 2 years or 3 years. The House committee seems to be considering a termination date. According to one newspaper report they are considering 3 years, and according to another newspaper report they are considering 2 years. So I hope the managers of the bill will be willing to accept as liberal an extension as 4 years. I cannot see any objection to 4 years or 3 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will be the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senate has just expressed itself on the UMT program by a vote of 68 to 20.

Mr. TAFT. The vote expressed the view of the membership that the UMT

provision should be in possible effect during the next 4 years. It does not necessarily express their views as to what future Congresses may want to do. The vote certainly expressed the opinion of the Senate as to what should be done at this time. There is no question that the law, if enacted would come up for extension presumably 4 years from now. We would be much more likely at that time to have some idea of what kind of UMT we want, based on the experience we would have had with it. We may be able to make peace before then. In that case UMT would be in effect already.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator realizes, does he not, that at any time Congress decides to reduce the term of service it can reduce it from 24 months to 6 months.

Mr. TAFT. It can do so by concurrent resolution. We had that kind of a provision in many bills during the Second World War, but I have never seen Congress adopt such a resolution. I have never seen it done to this day. It is an impracticable proposition. It would put the burden on those who want to repeal the law against the opposition of an administration that does not want to repeal it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator's amendment would do nothing about terminating UMT, because it could be terminated under the pending bill. The Senator's amendment would do nothing to UMT: For the 68 Senators who voted against the Bricker amendment now to vote in favor of the Senator's amendment would be to show some inconsistency.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Texas is admitting that we are now deciding, 5 years in advance, that we will give wide open power to the commission which could set up any kind of UMT they wanted. Within 4 years there may be opportunities to set up a UMT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senate has already decided that question by a vote of 68 to 20.

Mr. TAFT. It has not decided anything of the kind. The Senator never before has said that this could not go into effect for 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has not said that yet.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio if he believes that we should today take action which should be taken by some future Congress. Is it our prerogative and our duty to legislate today for 5 years hence or 4 years hence?

Mr. TAFT. I think we can either pass a permanent law or a temporary law. That is not the question. The question is whether 4 years from now, when the matter comes up, the administration will find there is an emergency again and will want to draft men. The draft provision of the bill goes on forever. It would never end, except by concurrent resolution. I have just pointed out that concurrent resolutions to terminate laws have never been adopted. I do not think they ever will be so long as the administration is opposed to such action. If we had an administration that wanted to end the law—and we have not had such an administration for 20 years—I suppose we could end the law; otherwise we will never end the law by concurrent resolution. The whole question is, Should we not do now, as a matter of principle, what we always did in World War II? Then we invariably fixed a termination date. We said that such and such legislation shall end on a certain termination date or shall terminate at the end of the war. We have no war termination to which we can attach such a provision. We must attach a termination date. Before we went very far in World War II we came to the conclusion that a fixed termination date was a great deal more satisfactory than to say that a given measure should expire with the termination of the war or the termination of hostilities. We never got a termination of the war. All we got was a termination of hostilities, and that brought an end to some laws.

It seems to me that the general principle of enacting a draft law in time of peace without attaching a termination date is completely wrong. I feel very strongly that we should adopt the amendment. We should fix a limitation of either 4 years or 3 years. As to whether 4 years should be the term rather than 3 years, I have no very strong feeling. I would as soon have 3 years as 4 years. My impression is that it should be at least 3 years because the program which we are setting up, including construction, equipment, and war building, call for at least a 3-year period. I was willing to make the term 4 years because some people consider it a 4-year program. I think the military authorities should know—and we want to know—4 years ahead what we are going to face so that we can complete the program that we are setting out to accomplish. It seemed to me that 4 years would give such an opportunity. Furthermore, at the end of 4 years world conditions might improve to the point that perhaps it would not be necessary to extend the law. Perhaps we may feel that it should be extended or amended. At least we would get another look at the entire siuation.

Mr. President, as a matter of principle, I urge that all laws we pass which deal with an emergency, which are not laws which we decide should be permanent, ought to be terminated on a definite date.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator from Georgia stated that I would be permitted to speak for 10 minutes at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the essential point which the Senator from Ohio makes, as he always so ably makes his points, is that this is emergency legislation. In my mind there is very great question whether this is emergency legislation in the full use of that term. Is it not, rather, legislation to make our country strong? Is it not an effort on our part to build up quickly a force which will be sufficient to keep the peace in the world? This would not be a force which would be built up to fight. If it were a force built up to fight we would have to build much more than we plan to build today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator hope that the time may come when we can reduce our military budget from $60,000,000,000 to some reasonable figure, and release our boys from compulsory service in the Armed Forces?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I certainly do. I agree with the Senator completely. I certainly pray that we will be able to cut down the number of boys who will have to go into the Armed Forces. I think it is essential to reduce the amount of money we are putting in the military budget, and expect to put into the military budget over the next few years.

The pending bill was not reported by the committee as an emergency measure. It was reported as a measure which would help America keep the peace of the world. It was reported as a measure that would have, throughout the world, a psychological effect on other nations who might attack us, for they would know that we proposed to be strong and did not intend to be run over.

If I am correct in saying that this is not emergency legislation in the sense that it is something that must be done quickly, and that we hope the time will come very soon when we can terminate it, then the measure in and of itself provides sufficient terminal facilities. I mention one. It is the power of appropriation, which the Senator from Ohio has brought up. Certainly so long as he is in the Senate, and I hope so long as I am in the Senate, we will watch the appropriations of the military as carefully as we can.

I should like to point out one or two things. If the bill is to have the result of building up a strong peacetime army, then we must think of what will happen to its provisions if there is an automatic termination date in 4 years. If we want it to have a strong psychological effect, we must think of what the result will be if we insert an automatic termination date at the end of 4 years. I invite attention to the fact that many of the enlistments—I think most of the enlistments—in the Air Force and Navy today are for 4 or 5 years. The Navy and the Air Force today are made up of volunteers, and most of those enlistments of volunteers are for a 4-year period. If we place in the bill a 4-year terminal date, what is going to happen to the enlistments in the coming 2 years? Naturally, a boy is not going to enlist for 4 years voluntarily if he thinks that the whole situation is going to change in 2 years and that he may be transferred

to another military job. He is going to refuse to volunteer at all, or to reenlist.

Think also what would happen to our Reserve system. The bill specifically requires—and I have heard no objection to that provision in it—2 years of service plus 6 years in the Reserves. If we cut the bill off at 4 years automatically, can we expect a man to enter the service for 2 years and become a part of a Reserve system which will extend beyond the terminal date of the act? It seems to me that it is fundamental that we must cut down the length of the Reserve period if we are going to terminate the act at the end of 4 years.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] mentioned universal military training and the effect it might have on the program. I think we should be perfectly factual. Personally, I do not believe that universal military training as such will be put into effect for 4 years. Every Member of this body hopes that the world is going to be sufficiently peaceful so that we can cut our force back and put our boys in service for a 4 or 5 months' training period and let it go at that. But I do not believe that condition will come to pass. We hope that we shall not have to maintain a force of three and one-half million men, but undoubtedly we shall have to maintain a force greater than 1,000,000 men; and if we do that, we must keep enough men in the service to take care of and maintain the equipment provided for them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts feel that one of the key values of the universal military training section of the bill is its effect on the long-term military policy of building up the Organized Reserves and the National Guard? All of us are very anxious that as soon as the world situation will permit, we may be able to cut down the size of our Regular Establishment. But is it not going to be even more important, as the size of the Regular Establishment is cut down, that the Organized Reserves and National Guard be in a position to be prepared in case the country is ever challenged in the future? Does not that tie in as a long-term policy under the universal military training feature of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from California is absolutely correct. It is one of the fundamentals on which the bill was based—the fundamental of building up the Reserves when the need for a strong armed force is not so immediate as it is now.

It seems to me that if we shall place in the bill a termination date 4 years hence, we will cut down the present strength of our Armed Forces, because it will be difficult to get reenlistments. It will be more difficult to obtain volunteers if we establish a termination date. If we establish a termination date we really eliminate the UMT, which the Senate has just voted overwhelmingly to include in the bill.

I have said before, and I now repeat, that every Member of the Senate knows that there is a method in the bill of cutting down the program by concurrent resolution. The Senator from Ohio says that such a plan has never been put into effect. It seems to me that it would be put into effect very quickly by a Congress which was sensitive to the opinion of the people at home, and sensitive to the knowledge that world conditions no longer required the military strength which is needed at the present time.

The Senator from Ohio agrees that we are building an enormous amount of equipment. We are building airplanes some of which will not be delivered for 2 or 3 years. We are building aircraft carriers, which certainly will require 3 years to construct under ordinary circumstances. We are constructing any number of tanks, and all kinds of equipment for our land forces and our sea and air forces. There is no use in going to that expense if we are not going to get the men to operate them. Such military equipment is valueless if a sufficient number of trained men are not available to operate it. If we establish a terminal date, we shall have fewer skilled men. We shall have fewer men who will reenlist. We shall have fewer men who will be willing to make the armed services a life work. We shall be reducing the morale of the services by that much.

In closing, let me repeat that the fundamental purpose of the bill—and I have listened to practically all the hearings—is to make our country sufficiently strong so that the peace will be kept. There is a psychological value which goes with such strength in the minds of the people throughout the world who might attack us. There is also a psychological value so far as our friends are concerned.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, to my mind the greatest thing that we can do in America is to build up a potential military strength. It requires an enormous amount of money to maintain a Regular Establishment. We figure now that the slice for an infantry division is 60,000 men. To maintain a man in the Regular Army costs $5,000 a year, or $300,000,000 for the slice. Consider just one of the civilian components, the National Guard. It costs $600 to maintain a member of the National Guard, or, for the slice of 60,000 men, $36,000,000 a year, as against $300,000,000. A nation which contemplates aggression against the United States will take into consideration that potential force. If we train 1,000,000 men in America a year, that means, after we get around the wheel, that that number of potential trained soldiers will be added to our potential force each year. Any nation which contemplates fighting America will take that fact into consideration.

If we terminate universal military training, the groups which will be hurt will be the two groups of the civilian components under the American system of defense, namely, the National Guard and the Organized Reserves.

For that reason alone I hope that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and to declare that in my judgment it is absolutely indispensable if we are to carry on the function of Congress which requires assessment and appraisal of the policies which we initiate from time to time.

Either I am thoroughly mistaken with respect to the language of the bill, or my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is mistaken. One or the other of us must be mistaken. I see no particular impact of this provision upon the service features of the bill, for as I read the language on page 79, the universal military training features do not become effective until the President has indicated that the need for active service is over. If that means what I think it means, the Korean incident must first be liquidated. But we shall have to get on a far more stable basis than we are on at the present time before the universal military training features go into effect. So it will be sometime in the future. Consequently we are not going to get a soul under this program who will have any usefulness so far as the emergency is concerned. The universal military training feature is not going to be initiated and placed in effect until the emergency is virtually over.

I wish to say to my friend from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that I see nothing inconsistent with having opposed the Johnson-Bricker amendment, while at the same time insisting upon a time limit. I remember when Secretary Acheson coined the word "reexaminist." I took some pride in it. I think I am a reexaminist, with a capital "R." It is rather tragic, as I look back upon legislative history for the past 20 years, that there has not been more appraisal, that there has not been more careful assessment of the things which we have set in motion in the legislative branch. That is one particular reason why I think there ought to be an automatic time limit. I share the conviction of my friend from Ohio. At the other end of the Capitol I have seen the provision for concurrent resolutions written into legislation for the past 16 years; but I have no recollection that such a provision was ever used as a legislative instrumentality. But let us not be unmindful, Mr. President, that here in pretty general terms is spelled out a permanent military policy. And when we use the word "permanent" it means from today on.

I remember a fellow in my home town who was in jail. The jail stood on the corner, and he could see me as I crossed the street. He called out and I said, "Sam, how long are you in for?" He said, "I am in from now on." And this legislation is going to be in effect from now on.

Mr. President, I have seen what was said to be temporary policy harden into permanent policy. After that has happened, it is difficult to draw it back. That is something which often happens in the case of legislation on which Congress places a time limit. I recall the

trade-agreements program. Oh, how its sponsors argued that the program should be provided for one branch of the Government and they said it was only for 3 years. That was back in 1934. In 1937 it was argued that it would be for only 3 years more. In 1940 it was again said it would be for only 3 years more. There is pending in a Senate committee today a proposal to continue that program which was started in 1934. That is rather eloquent of the fact that there is a way of permanency developing and a rigid pattern being set. If we let such programs continue in force too long, it becomes pretty difficult to undo them.

What is going to be the effect of the proposed policy upon education? I do not know. It is a guess. I doubt whether any proponent of UMT, I doubt whether a member of the subcommittee or the full committee, can give us a real idea of what will be the effect upon the national economy and upon education of a program such as this, under which there will be siphoned at least 800,000 youngsters out of the economic life of the country. Will the boys go back to school? I do not know. I do not have the slightest idea. But I should like to find out, after the program has been initiated, and if it becomes effective, in that 4-year period. I should like to address myself to that point and see what it does to the national economy.

Will it dislocate our manpower situation? What will it do to the educational fabric of the country? No one can tell us. I do not know.

In consequence I think there is real wisdom and real merit in the fact that at some time in the future there is a definite date to which we can repair and say, "At that point at least we can examine the impact of this proposal upon the economic life of the country."

There is something in the bill which escaped me at first and which sounds rather interesting in the light of the averments which have been made. It is in the stump speech in the bill. I think it is a hideous practice in the legislative branch that so many bills have to start out with declarations of policy which become stump speeches. There is no way of spelling out the implications of language. I have seen it happen at least a score of times, when we questioned the administrative action at the other end of the Avenue, that they showed in the stump speech in the bill that here was glossy, vague, obfuscating language which was the basis and the predicate for what they proposed to do.

On page 71 of the pending bill is the statement:

> To this end the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation.

What does that mean? Why have civilians been brought into the purview of this declaration, as much as to say "Sometime we shall cook up some kind of a program for them"? That is permanent language, and when we read it in connection with what is proposed here I think the implication is clear, and that at some future date, not too far in the distance, there ought to be an opportunity to reexamine it, in the light of all the things that have happened, and in a period when history moves by such great acceleration.

This is a thought which occurs to me: Are we finally going to use a preatomic-age approach to the atomic age in the field of warfare? When all is said and done, and when we deal with 800,000 or a million youngsters every year, we are in effect dealing with the old idea of the mass army. In view of the development in the field of air power, in view of the development in the atomic field, are we going to embrace the idea of training so many millions upon millions in the years ahead, when that whole theory may have outlived its usefulness? I do not say it will. I only act in a spirit of inquiry, and say, "At least 4 years hence I want to take a look, because this will be a costly program, and if we intrude ourselves into the future and make these commitments, and cannot undo them, then what?"

I have little faith, of course, in the instrumentality of a concurrent resolution, because I have seen it fail. It is a weak legislative reed on which to lean.

It was said at the outset, when I first took some special interest in the matter, that the program would cost $2,000,000,000 the first year, and the second year it would cost $1,500,000,000. Do Senators think for one moment that as the program develops, and with inflated prices, the program will cost less than $2,000,000,000? At the rate prices are being inflated today, and by virtue of the fact that we have found no effective way to put a brake on inflation as yet, the program is likely to cost $5,000,000,000 a year.

But I find some comfort in the fact that as a full-blown proposal it cannot be put into effect until at least the active service has been liquidated, and then perhaps we can better tell whether we want to charge the economy with such a trifling expenditure.

Let us not be too sure that our domestic house is in good order at the moment. I have grave doubts about it. I must confess publicly a sense of alarm as I read something about 1,500 letters that reach my office every 24 hours, and I find people trying to express a dissident feeling because of the rise in living costs, and hear confessions from persons in high authority that for some time to come it is doubtful whether the measures which have been instituted will adequately meet this particular economic situation.

Under those circumstances should not we be able to review the program, not after we take action by a concurrent resolution, but because there is an automatic terminal date that will make it possible to review it?

Let us not be unmindful of the cost of permanency, and of the possible economic impact of the program upon the educational structure of the country.

Another thing disturbs me about this matter. Why could not the details have been spelled out in some respects? But reliance is had in the main upon rather vague language. Here is provision for the creation of a security training commission composed of five men. They are to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Power is delegated to them to determine the details of policies, the programs, and, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] pointed out, even to deal with the question of spiritual, moral, informational, and recreational training.

I doubt whether in a long time I have seen such a broad delegation of power as that which is carried in this bill. How is it going to be articulated? How is it going to be translated? I should like to have a look at it some time or another. I should like to be able to reexamine what was done within the compass of 4 years, and if it is all right, I am confident it will certainly meet no objection on my part, but I cannot be too sure, in the light of the broad language, of all the implications that are contained therein, that I will approve it. I want to see it again.

Let me remind the Senate that it was not so long ago that Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, made a little statement. What did he suggest in the field of universal military training or matters relating thereto? He said there ought to be UMT for high-school students. Then he made this astonishing observation: He said, "If necessary, the high school period might be made 5 years instead of the present 4 in order to achieve the basic-training goal." The young men could then be kept out of army camps until almost the time they were ready for field service.

Mind you, that is the arch-apostle of socialism in America speaking. He has ideas about changing the high-school structure of the country, possibly inaugurating a 5-year program instead of 4, and then tying it up with universal military training. Is that what is proposed to be done? I do not know. But I do know that if Mr. Ewing, who has been a proponent of free teeth and free wigs and socialized medicine, ever gets his hooks into the program it will peradventure be something with which the Senator from Illinois will not agree. But I will never have another chance, in my judgment, unless there is a terminal date fixed in the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was wondering if the Senator was fearful that possibly Oscar Ewing might be named a member of the Security Training Commission?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In such event, I still will have a chance, I will say to my friend, because in that case his name would come before this body, and I could register an independent vote.

For the same good reason I want another chance to assess and to appraise this thing, whether it is full blown or whether it has been only partially initiated. That is the reason I think there is real merit in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Another thing disturbs me. It is not so long ago that the Wall Street Journal carried an item in which the re-

porter who wrote it quoted a presidential aide as saying, "We are making plans for another Truman policy to police the world right, to keep the peace, and to halt the Russians."

Is this a part of that general fabric of world policy which will require great numbers of young troops to be sent into all the corners of the earth? I agree with what the Senator from Indiana said a little while ago that we have got the cart before the horse.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] yield me 5 minutes more?

Mr. TAFT. I yield five more minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we got the cart before the horse. The idea of fashioning an Army until we know what we are going to do with it, where we are going to send it, what the battle plan is, what the world-wide strategy is.

It seems to me that if a gunsmith started to work fashioning a gun, he would have to know whether the gun was going to be used to shoot elephants or to shoot rabbits before he could determine what the range and bore of the gun should be and how he would design the particular piece.

So we must know something about our objectives before we can fashion a military instrument and do it intelligently.

One of the tragedies about all of this, Mr. President, is that I must confess to a sense of confusion about it. I should like to see a limit of some kind imposed in regard to the number of troops, and I voted accordingly; but I still say I am rather confused. I do not know what is going to be done in the Orient. It seems true that the White House does not take us into its confidence, so we get from persons in high places or authority little asides which are supposed to give us some sense of direction in regard to where our country is going in the field of foreign policy.

Very well, Mr. President; even in that state of confusion, do not discretion and wisdom dictate that 4 years hence, after the second session of the Eighty-second Congress has come to an end, we should embrace not only an opportunity but a responsibility as lawmakers to reappraise this entire matter and see where we are?

Perhaps at that time we shall not wish to charge the country with this kind of an expenditure; or it may be that by that time we shall be able to see more clearly whether it is the better part of valor to take 800,000 or 1,000,000 youngsters out of the social fabric of the country and put them in uniform, send them to camp for 6 months, and then give them 1 of 10 or 11 options as to what they shall do with the last 6 months of that training period.

One other thing, Mr. President: There is a frightful lure, it seems to me, to a mass army. Once that army is trained, once the men in it are put into uniform, there they are, ready to be used, to be disposed to all the corners of the earth. I shall want to take a look before that time comes, because if the Presidential aide was correct when he whispered to a Wall Street Journal reporter that we are on the threshold of a new Truman policy by which we will take the whole wide world to our bosom and will provide chocolate milk for every Hottentot in the world, and will seek to save the destiny and the economy of other countries, even when they are allies of dubious value, if you please, I shall want to look. Mr. President, you can write me down as a reexaminist with a capital "R," not only with respect to this measure but with respect to every other piece of policy legislation which comes along, because I am not going to lend either my voice or my vote to the liquidation of my country.

It is very conceivable that there may be a transition, one day—reluctant as it may be on the part of some—from the welfare state to the garrison state. When the day comes for us to run out of money, I wonder how the language on page 71 will be interpreted then:

> The Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service.

I wonder what sharp brain put that phrase into the stump speech that goes along with this bill. We may hear a good deal more about it before this issue has been resolved.

Mr. President, I think wisdom and discretion dictate that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should be adopted, so that on or before the 31st of June 1955, there will automatically be a chance for us to assess this program and policy once more, and so that that chance will not repose in the discretion or votes of a majority of this body and of another body, which must be obtained, under the provision requiring the adoption of a concurrent resolution, before we would get another opportunity to pass on this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

I make note of the fact that it was only a very few minutes ago that we voted on an amendment which would strike from this bill the provisions which relate to universal military training. That amendment was defeated decisively, with 68 votes cast against it. On that vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] cast his vote for universal military training. Now he asks support for an amendment to kill universal military training.

Mr. President, after listening to the Senator's moving speech, I am somewhat in a quandary to know why one would vote for the universal military training provisions of this bill if there is so much wrong with it, as described by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that my time is limited.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator should yield to me, for he has referred to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I cannot yield, because of the limitation of time.

I agree that the Congress should continuously be alert to what is going on in connection with this sort of legislation; but I cannot see how one can vote for universal military training legislation, in order to satisfy those who are in favor of universal military training, and in another vote, less than an hour later, vote against universal military training before it is ever put into effect.

Mr. President, the decision to support this bill is not an easy one for anyone to make. I concur in the statement that this measure runs contrary to much in our history; but I say that universal military training is necessary, not because we want it, but because of the situation existing in the world.

If the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator can tell me that Joe Stalin will be a peace-loving fellow in 4 years, I will join in support of quick termination of this legislation.

This is legislation which has been made necessary by the kind of world in which we live.

For those in this body who are interested in reexamination—and I repeat that reexamination by the Congress of a policy such as the one outlined in this bill is important—let me say that just as soon as this amendment is defeated, I will offer an amendment which should meet most of the requirements of review and reexamination. It is my intention to offer my amendment so that it can be voted upon on its merits. It is not my intention to offer the amendment now, because I think the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] should be debated and voted upon on its merits.

My amendment reads as follows:

> (aa) Such act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fourth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act and each year thereafter, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such reviews, the committees shall—

Not "may," but "shall," Mr. President—

> report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable."

Mr. President, I submit that that amendment is a sensible proposal. It means that when this body and the House of Representatives are in possession of the facts, the basic policy will be thoroughly reviewed and a full report made to the Congress. My amendment

guarantees reexamination on the basis of facts and experience under the terms of this bill. It affords Congress the chance to revise, alter, or repeal.

So, Mr. President, I ask to have my amendment receive favorable consideration when I bring it to the attention of this body. I believe it to be more practical and realistic than the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is only fair for me to state my position in the RECORD, in view of the fight I have made in recent days in regard to adequate congressional checks upon the executive branch of the Government. I am very frank to say that the arguments of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] give me great logical difficulty, insofar as my own position is concerned, because I think both their speeches this afternoon have been brilliant.

However, I wish the RECORD to show that in the Armed Services Committee it was the junior Senator from Oregon who made the fight or the request—it did not turn out to be very much of a fight, because my colleagues very quickly joined me—for the insertion of a provision calling for a congressional check, by way of a concurrent resolution of both Houses, which does not have to be signed by the President.

I had this problem in mind when I made that fight in the committee. I said then that I thought the Congress should retain a very definite check; and I proposed the provision calling for a concurrent resolution—which provision was adopted by the committee.

So far as procedure is concerned, I certainly felt that placed me under a commitment in regard to standing by the committee bill. However, I do not stand on that ground alone. The bill in its present form contains language providing a check by way of a concurrent resolution. I take note of what the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Ohio say about the difficulties accompanying the adoption of a concurrent resolution. Nevertheless, concurrent resolutions can be passed by a majority vote, they do not require the signature of the President, and provide a very adequate congressional check.

At the same time I wish to say, as I intimated at the opening of my remarks, that there is great merit in the position taken on this matter by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Illinois, so far as the entire problem of the delegation of authority is concerned. I believe, however, that with the checks which we have written into this bill we are adequately protected by the present wording. Therefore I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall try to yield back a portion of that time. I have stated on the floor of the Senate heretofore that this bill has two basic objectives. One is to bring about peace in a troubled world by strengthening the military power of this Nation. The other is to prepare the young men of our country to properly defend themselves in case of war.

If this bill does not meet those objectives, then we should not vote for it. If those are not the purposes of this bill, then we should vote it down rather than attempt to cripple it by amendments. We have just concluded the vote on whether we should adopt the universal military training program; 68 Senators voted in favor of UMT, 20 against.

Mr. President, it has been said in the course of the debate that this is a Truman program. I suppose the inference sought to be conveyed is that anything the President of the United States favors, regardless of what it is, is bad, merely because he favors it. But, Mr. President, it so happens that this program has the unqualified support of many others. It is the program of the veterans of two world wars. After World War I, those men who went overseas and fought the battles in order that we might maintain this as a nation of liberty and justice returned and said to the Congress that we always should be adequately prepared. Did we? No, Mr. President; and a great many of those veterans today believe that by becoming weak in a military way we lost influence with our friends and prestige with those nations which only recognize military might. World War II followed.

After World War II, the men who went overseas and fought, many of whom were wounded, many of whom had seen their buddies die on the battlefield, returned. What did they say? They said again that one of the surest ways to bring about peace in this troubled world was to remain constantly adequately prepared, and that the only way to do that was to adopt universal military training. The pending bill was introduced at their request. It is their program, and I say to my distinguished colleagues, what good is UMT if it lasts but 1, 2, 3, or 4 years? The only object of UMT is to bring about a state of adequate preparedness not for one year but for every year until we can bring about peace in the world.

Senators talk about expense. Let me describe what these start-and-stop programs of 1, 2, 3, and 4 years do. We see training camps and equipment upon which we have spent millions of dollars—yes; billions of dollars—deteriorate, junked, and thrown away. We see property declared surplus or thrown away because of a lack of men even to police it. Today we are starting to spend billions of dollars in order to rebuild and replace what a few short years we had in being. That is why the veterans, the men who have made the sacrifice, have come before the Congress of the United States pleading with us to listen to them, because they have experienced the realities of war. They know what it is.

If we are to have a program, we must have a continuing program. We are compelled to make long-range plans. We must think of the future. We cannot dodge this issue, we cannot throw it out the window merely by saying it is a Harry Truman program. True, Harry Truman is for it, because he fought in World War I. He went overseas, and he learned what it meant to see young men who had not been properly prepared go into the battle line; men, many of whom had not been in the Army more than 6 weeks when they went overseas to fight against trained men. I am proud that the President is for the bill.

What do the young men and women of this country think about this program? These are the people who would receive the training; these are the men for whom some here shed tears. Let me read the result of a recent poll taken at one of our great universities, the University of Nebraska, where more than 1,500 students were asked to express their views on universal military training. Of this group 1,155 were men, 412 were women. Among the men students, 79 percent favored the creation of such a training program and only 21 percent opposed it. Of the women, 73 percent favored it, 27 percent were opposed.

Polls taken in other schools have shown similar results. They show what the young men and women of this country are thinking about in terms of the future—their future and the future of this great Nation. They are willing to make this sacrifice, partly because they believe in continuing a nation of liberty and justice, and partly because they believe in the words they have heard repeated by others who have recently returned from the present conflict, boys who had gone to school with them, who have told about fighting at the side of boys who were not properly prepared. It has been quoted on this floor, and I think it is worth repeating again, that General Eisenhower, when testifying before the committee, stated:

> There are more Americans occupying graves overseas because they were not trained than for almost any other reason; they were not trained to take care of themselves, not trained to know what to do in combat.

Mr. President, are we to deny to the youth of this Nation the opportunity to know how to take care of themselves? Is that to be the decision of the Senate of the United States? Are we to turn a deaf ear to the men and women who have fought in two world wars, when they advocate a program which they say should be adopted in order to bring about peace in the world?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am quite sure it is perfectly clear to everyone who is at all familiar with the bill that this is a flank attack, attempting by indirection to accomplish the identical purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr.

JOHNSON], which was recently defeated. Senators, if they wish, may try to point to their votes on the Johnson amendment and say, "I voted for UMT," and also vote for this amendment. But, Mr. President, if the great service organizations of the Nation, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans Committee, who are interested in this legislation, and who have had the UMT as their primary objective for so many years, are deceived by any such processes of political acrobatics, I shall be very greatly surprised, because it is very evident that this is the time to test whether Senators believe in UMT. The verdict will come with the call of the yeas and nays on the bill.

The eloquent Senator from Illinois read, as only he could read, this language:

> To this end, Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service.

He asks sarcastically, "What sharp mind composed that language?" He had been talking about Oscar Ewing and other people who might not be too popular here, and he implied that it came from them. Mr. President, that language came from the UMT bill which the American Legion has been bringing to the Congress for the past 15 years. I do not know what sharp mind wrote the language, but in my opinion it is a statement of pretty good American principle which was written by the American Legion in their long fight for UMT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the junior Senator from Illinois, on the last vote, voted in favor of UMT. Now he wants to repeal it before it is ever put into effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not question the complete right of the Senator to change his mind within 2 hours, if he wishes to do so. I do not want him to be deceived about the source of the language he read with such vigorous sarcasm.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield briefly, although my time is very short.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know how the junior Senator from Illinois could vote for a limitation unless he first voted for the general principle of UMT. What that has to do with taking another look at the question 4 years hence is another indication of the vague and obscure language contained in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois does better than the Senator from Ohio, because he thinks we will be out of the cold war and have UMT in operation in 4 years. I hope he is right but fear he is wrong. I am surprised to hear the distinguished Senator from Ohio speak so despairingly about the possibility of getting through a concurrent resolution within 4 years. The Senator from Ohio is usually optimistic. Usually he has a great deal of confidence in himself. According to press reports he is being mentioned as the Republican nominee for President. If he has no faith in his ability to get a concurrent resolution through Congress in the next 3 or 4 years, naturally it follows that he does not have the self-confidence about the success of the Republican Party in the next election.

Mr. President, I do not have the time to go into the issue at great length. It has been made clear that all service can be suspended, except the UMT, by concurrent resolution. Congress could do it at any time it may choose to do so. Why should we put a limitation upon UMT, which is designed, after all, to be a permanent plan for the maintenance of our security and the maintenance of world peace? Several years ago we had before us a bill the purpose of which was supposed to be to inaugurate industrial peace in this land of ours. I refer to the Taft-Hartley law. I was in favor of industrial peace, so far as it could be obtained. I was one of the Senators who was assailed for taking that point of view. I supported the distinguished Senator from Ohio in the enactment of a bill whose purpose was to secure industrial peace. No one suggested at that time that we should put a saw-off limitation in the Taft-Hartley law to preserve industrial peace. On that bill we went so far as to pass it over a Presidential veto. The pending bill is designed to preserve the peace of the United States and of the world. I submit it would be much less reasonable to put a saw-off provision in a bill designed to preserve the peace of the entire world than it would have been to put such a provision in the Taft-Hartley bill, designed to preserve the industrial peace in our land.

Mr. President, this amendment is a flank attack. It is designed to accomplish what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] attempted to do by direct frontal assault. They would both accomplish the same purpose. There can be no question about it. The Senator from Ohio is utterly consistent in his vote, because he voted to strike out the UMT provision when the amendment of the Senator from Colorado was pending. I submit that any Senator who has changed his mind on this subject within the last few minutes might take another look before he voted and decide whether or not he wanted to vote for the principle of UMT at 2 o'clock and then vote to stifle it or kill it at 3:15 or 3:20 o'clock. That is all it means. That is what the next vote means.

All of us do not have the eloquence of the Senator from Illinois. It may be difficult to minimize his speech. The statement of Oscar Ewing was made before the vote on the Johnson amendment was taken. The person who made the statement in the Wall Street Journal read by the Senator as to what they were planning made it and had it printed before that vote. If it had any relation to the Taft amendment it affected the Johnson amendment. He did not make that statement between the vote on the Johnson amendment and the vote on the Taft amendment. They are matters that should have gone to the very heart of the vote when the amendment of the Senator from Colorado was pending if they are persuasive as to the pending proposition.

Mr. President, one is either for UMT, or he is against it. The two amendments would have identically the same effect. There can be no question about it. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Committee, and others would like very much to have the matter of UMT settled. They have worked on it arduously for many years. The National Guard, Reserve officers organizations, and Reserve units of enlisted men would like to see the matter settled. They want to set up their own program so as to enable them to inaugurate a real system for the National Guard, for example, which would give it vitality and life and fill its ranks with the men who come out of UMT. The Reserves want to bring reserves into their organizations. The pending amendment would kill the program even before it had a chance to be inaugurated.

I have previously discussed the economy of the plan. I discussed it briefly when we had the other amendment up for consideration. Having a slightly better audience now, I shall repeat some of the things I said before.

If Senators ever hope to get away from a $50,000,000,000 budget during this cold war they had better give some thought to the National Guard and the Reserves. It would be possible to take care of 10 or 12 reservists, who would be ready to move, if we gave our Reserve program a chance to get installed, for what it would cost to maintain one man in the Regular Army. There is no reason on earth why, if this Reserve program is permitted to take effect, that within the next 4 or 5 years, even though tensions remain as critical as they are today, we should not be able to cut our military budget by billions of dollars. We would have reservists on whom we could rely. I would that all Senators could have heard the address of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. Certainly no man has a more consistent record in voting for economy in Government than the senior Senator from Virginia. He said that he had not been in favor of a UMT program. However, after studying the subject closely he was convinced that it was the only way to bring down the cost of maintaining a vast military organization.

The UMT program and the Reserve program are one way of escaping the huge expenditures which threaten national solvency. Let no Senator be deceived. Let us vote down the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

The Senator from Ohio has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAFT. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my old and omniscient friend from Georgia, who seems to have all the answers——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have all the answers, but the answers I am giving are the same answers I gave at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am making the same answer, too, as a matter of fact. However, I do not intend to let any group or organization, through a few national officers, do my thinking for me, even though such officers may represent a substantial portion of the opinion of the organizations. I am not unmindful of the fact that there are thousands of servicemen who were in World War I and World War II—parenthetically, I was a doughboy on the western front in World War I—who still do their own thinking. I wonder how many veterans know that we are considering, not one bill, but two bills; that we are considering a conscription act and a permanent policy on universal military training. I have yet to receive a letter from anyone in the great commonwealth of Illinois who has alluded even once to the fact that we are considering two bills. It is a fair question to ask whether or not the country is fully advised of what is going on. There is a rather substantial segment of opinion today that is thinking seriously about this question of imposing a permanent policy upon the country in an hour of emergency.

My friend from Georgia mentions the fact that there was no terminal date placed in the Taft-Hartley law, as if that were an analogy. The Taft-Hartley Act did not involve billions of dollars in future expenditures and the possible siphoning of millions of young Americans out of the social blood stream. Therefore, I say the analogy is rather thin. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio whether he believes it would be possible to get a concurrent resolution out of the Committee on Armed Services to review the whole subject, so long as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was chairman of the committee and so long as the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee? It would be impossible to get a resolution of that kind on the floor of the Senate unless it was first reported by the committee. From all the evidence, the implication of the language and the argument which has been adduced on the floor of the Senate, it would seem to me that such a resolution would be buried in committee. I do not intend to rely upon such a weak legislative reed. I have had too much experience.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want such a provision written into the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator know that under the rules of the Senate a motion could be made to discharge the committee from further consideration of such a concurrent resolution if it were bottled up in committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Illinois expect the Senator from Georgia to be chairman of this committee after 1952? [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my friend from Vermont that I do not want to seem so lacking in political charity as not to make that assumption for the moment.

Mr. AIKEN. As ranking Member of the minority he might have much influence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois heard the remark of the Senator from Georgia, the able chairman of the committee. However, it is true that under the rules of the Senate a motion could be made to withdraw such a concurrent resolution if it were bottled up in the committee. The able Senator from Illinois and those who felt the same way could move to discharge the committee from further consideration of a concurrent resolution if it were bottled up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TAFT. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my friend from California that I am not insensible of the shadowy prospects and possibilities which go along with joint and concurrent resolutions. What I am talking about is the number of times since I have been in the National Legislature when such provisions have been written into scores of bills. Nevertheless, I have yet to see that instrumentality exercised. I have yet to see such a resolution brought to the floor of either the House or Senate.

So we are dealing with a practical matter. How strange it is that the opponents of the amendment should—shall I say affront the consistency of the junior Senator from Illinois by saying, "Look; he has voted for this principle, and now he wants to engage in a very sharp flank attack to destroy the vitality of this thing."

That is not in the mind of the Senator from Illinois at all; but he believes that he expresses the sentiment of a very substantial portion of America when he says that the people want a "look-see" before it is too late.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 6 minutes, and the Senator from Georgia has 6 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have been accused of a flank attack on universal military training. It seems to me that the committee is using universal military training as a shield behind which to hide in opposing a principle which they admit so far as the emergency section is concerned. They have brought in a permanent bill; but the dominating feature of the bill is not UMT. The dominating feature is the draft of millions of American boys during the next 4 years for 2 years' military service. That is the main factor of the bill. UMT is 4 years distant.

I agree that to reenact it or repeal it represents only a difference of degree 4 years from now. I agree that UMT might be affected. However, the main feature is that we are limiting the freedom of our boys and taking them for 2 years. That program is to continue for many years to come. I say that the right to do that ought to come to an end some time. The mere fact that the committee has chosen to put in a permanent program, not to go into effect until 4 years from now, is no legitimate argument against placing a limitation on the bill itself. There is no effective limitation in the bill. True, by concurrent resolution we can make certain findings, and at least end temporarily the right to draft. But take section 18 of the Selective Service Act. That section contains the right to conscript property, in effect, or it replaces the old right of conscription of property.

That act says that the Government of the United States can make anyone take any order for anything, apparently at any price the Government sees fit to impose. That is an emergency power. That emergency power goes on forever unless we place a limitation in this bill. There is no right in this bill to terminate that power, even by concurrent resolution. There is no right to terminate the property emergency sections of the act unless we place in effect the amendment which we have presented.

I voted against the UMT amendment, not because I am necessarily against UMT. I should like to see the exact program. I am for some kind of universal military training program, but I am not for other kinds of universal military training. So far as the particular kind in this bill is concerned, I do not know what kind it is. I know that President Truman, in referring to this subject, has often left out the word "military." In his official messages he has left out the word "military." I do not know what kind of social welfare or CCC he thinks of as the universal military training program. The bill provides that the National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training, including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training.

What is this UMT to be? Certainly it is not at all clear that it is going to be the kind of UMT which the American Legion is for. It may not be the kind I am for. I only say that this is a permanent program, and there is no particular reason to attach an emergency clause to it. I agree. The reason for the emergency clause relates to the rest of the bill. But mere fact that there is a vague provision for universal military training 4, 5, or 10 years from now is no reason why we should not adopt the principle of putting in an emergency clause to terminate the most drastic law that has ever been enacted to limit the freedom of the American people. I think it is necessary. I believe that it is necessary under present circumstances, and for a short period of time—I hope not too long. But certainly we all recognize

that it is an emergency. It is not a part of the American system. It ought to come to an end, and Congress ought to reexamine the question as to how long the United States Government is going to conscript the freedom of American youth and the freedom of American property.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the committee's time to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Taft amendment, because it would devastate our plans for long-term security. It would convert the pending bill from one of permanent preparedness to one of short-term preparedness. It would make this bill into a small, timid, and halting step in the direction of the goal which we must achieve for the sake of our security.

The Senator from Ohio says that he has never seen a concurrent resolution work. The legislative counsel has just pointed out to me that on October 2, 1945, when the Senator from Ohio was a Member of this body, Congress adopted a concurrent resolution providing for reinstitution of the Federal-aid highway program. It shows that a concurrent resolution can be placed in effect any time there is a majority of votes in favor of it.

It may be possible that the Senator from Ohio, knowing that only 20 Members of this body feel as he does about UMT, realizes that he can never get a majority vote for a concurrent resolution. Hence, the effect of his amendment is to repeal UMT before it is put into effect. One may call that a flank attack, a frontal attack, or any kind of attack he wishes. I do understand the consistency of the position of the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio is against training these men. The Senator from Ohio is against UMT. The Senator from Ohio is frank. He comes here and tells the Senate, "I am not in one breath going to vote against striking out UMT, and in the next breath vote to terminate it." That is an honest, frank, forthright policy.

Twenty Members of the Senate are against UMT. They voted against it. They talked against it. They fought against it. They used every means at their command to destroy UMT.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have only a brief time. Let me finish.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has one more minute.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. TAFT. I only wished to say that I am not against UMT; but I should like to have a hand in working out the kind of UMT which I think we ought to have. I voted against this proposal because it delegates completely to some commission to be established 4 years from now the kind of UMT which we are to have imposed on the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, yes; the Senator would have it worked out according to the Taft plan. The Compton plan is no good. The American Legion plan is no good. The Senate committee plan, adopted by a vote of 13 to 0, is no good. I ask the Senator, has not the time come when we can pass a bill which is not a Taft bill? This committee sat for seven long weeks evolving a program of universal military training. When the time came to vote on that program, endorsed by the American Legion, the Reserve officers, the National Guard, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Labor Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Defense Department, it was adopted. Obviously the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has not read the hearings, because each of those agencies sent representatives before the committee to testify that the program had been coordinated and that they favored it. Yet that does not satisfy the Senator from Ohio. The Compton commission plan, the Senate committee program, and the American Legion program are no good. No; the Senator from Ohio wants the Taft program. He would kill UMT completely, and 19 of his colleagues support him. I admire them and I compliment them for their frankness and honesty. But when a Senator comes along at 2 o'clock and says, "No, I will not go along on the Bricker-Johnson amendment because I want to tell my people I am for UMT," and at 3:30 says, "I will slip under the tent and take my knife and I will terminate it before it goes into effect," that is not the kind of policy that ought to prevail in the United States Senate.

No, Mr. President, we have been putting off UMT too long. If we had followed the wise advice of the first President of the country and put universal military service into effect when he recommended it, I believe we might have avoided many of the troubles that have plagued this Nation. As General Eisenhower so eloquently said before the committee: "The fields of Europe are dotted with little white crosses because Congress has not faced up to a permanent program of training our men." Thousands of young 18-year-old boys were thrown into the Battle of the Bulge. Why? Because we had to have men, and we had to have them at the moment. We had to have them whether they had been trained or not.

Mr. President, the committee has tried to act prudently. The committee sat for 7 weeks. Every Member of the Senate had an opportunity to come before the committee and bring with him his individual program. We would have welcomed the Taft plan if the Senator had not been so busy that he could not come and honor us with his suggestions. We heard him on the subject of troops to Europe, but on the UMT he was as silent as a ghost. Then he comes out on the Senate floor, he dashes forth, and says, "I am for UMT, but not now; not the veterans' plan, not the Legion plan, not the Senate committee plan, not the Compton commission plan, but I am for UMT if you will take the Taft plan."

Mr. President, we are going to have a chance to see whether Senators are for UMT or whether they are not for UMT. I hope the Taft amendment will be overwhelmingly defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hennings | Monroney |
| Anderson | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Bennett | Hill | Mundt |
| Benton | Hoey | Murray |
| Brewster | Holland | Neely |
| Bricker | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Butler, Md. | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Butler, Nebr. | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Byrd | Jenner | Pastore |
| Cain | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Capehart | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Case | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Chavez | Kem | Smathers |
| Clements | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Connally | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, N. C. |
| Dirksen | Langer | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Lehman | Stennis |
| Dworshak | Lodge | Taft |
| Ecton | Long | Thye |
| Ellender | McCarran | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Watkins |
| Frear | McFarland | Welker |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Wherry |
| George | McMahon | Wiley |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Williams |
| Green | Martin | Young |
| Hayden | Maybank | |
| Hendrickson | Millikin | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT was to insert the following, on page 91, between lines 7 and 8:

"(c) All of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of the second sentence and the last two sentences of the fourth paragraph of section 4 (a), and except all of sections 4 (b), 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), 14, and 17 (c) shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the fourth anniversary of the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLAN-

DERS] is absent because of illness, and, if present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business, and, if present, they would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business, and, if present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—30

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Ecton | Mundt |
| Brewster | Ferguson | Schoeppel |
| Bricker | Gillette | Smith, Maine |
| Butler, Md. | Hendrickson | Taft |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hickenlooper | Watkins |
| Capehart | Jenner | Welker |
| Carlson | Johnson, Colo. | Wherry |
| Case | Kem | Wiley |
| Dirksen | Langer | Williams |
| Dworshak | Millikin | Young |

NAYS—58

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Humphrey | Monroney |
| Anderson | Hunt | Morse |
| Benton | Ives | Murray |
| Byrd | Johnson, Tex. | Neely |
| Cain | Johnston, S. C. | Nixon |
| Chavez | Kefauver | O'Conor |
| Clements | Kerr | O'Mahoney |
| Connally | Kilgore | Pastore |
| Cordon | Knowland | Robertson |
| Douglas | Lehman | Russell |
| Ellender | Lodge | Saltonstall |
| Frear | Long | Smathers |
| Fulbright | McCarran | Smith, N. J. |
| George | McClellan | Smith, N. C. |
| Green | McFarland | Sparkman |
| Hayden | McKellar | Stennis |
| Hennings | McMahon | Thye |
| Hill | Magnuson | Tobey |
| Hoey | Martin | |
| Holland | Maybank | |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Flanders | Vandenberg |
| Duff | McCarthy | |
| Eastland | Malone | |

So Mr. TAFT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up for consideration my amendment "C," as modified, dated March 6.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 91, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(aa) Such act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fourth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act and each year thereafter, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such reviews, the committees shall report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota whether the amendment just read by the clerk is the Senator's amendment lettered "C."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it is my amendment lettered "C," as modified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. We have read the amendment very carefully and very thoroughly. It merely provides for study and periodic survey of the legislation now under consideration by the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. Of course, our committee is charged with that duty under the Reorganization Act. Therefore, it is my opinion that the amendment makes a real contribution to the bill, and I have no objection to having it included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement in explanation of my amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The purpose of this amendment is to make clear to the people of the world that this is emergency legislation forced upon us by the continuing threat of Communist aggression against free peoples and the stubborn refusal of the Kremlin representatives in the United Nations to discuss seriously any workable plan for the international control of atomic energy, international disarmament, and the creation of a United Nations police force. The Kremlin is attempting the subjugation of the world by world conflict, by employment of military force, and by the threat of military force for the purposes of aggression. We must be strong—be prepared—to do less would be to betray our Nation.

Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is of extreme importance. Its adoption will make plain to the American people and the people of the entire world that we are seeking an end to military expenditures and aspiring for peace and disarmament. However, the continuing threat of Communist aggression makes it necessary to adopt a plan of universal military training and service and to maintain such a program until peace is restored and firm and unmistakable guaranties of universal disarmament are agreed to by all nations.

By this amendment, we say UMT and UMS are not permanent, irrevocable policy. We have not turned our backs upon the traditions of our people. We do not relish the thought that 8 years of the life of every male youth is going to be earmarked for military service, either active or on reserve.

We accept reluctantly and for no longer than necessary the heavy burden and expense and taxation that such a vast military establishment is going to load upon the backs of the American people, the wage earners, farmers businessmen, investors, those of fixed income—every man and woman in the Nation.

Our military budget is today over forty billion dollars. Let us keep constantly before our eyes and the eyes of the people of the world, the day when that budget will be cut and eventually disappear in a world free from international tension.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the amendment has heretofore been offered, it is not in order, and must lie on the table.

Mr. JENNER. It is an amendment to an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no pending amendment to which an amendment can be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Indiana will withhold his amendment for a short time.

Mr. JENNER. I will.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana withholds his amendment.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call up my two amendments, lettered "B" and "C," and ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together; and I ask that the amendments be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, the amendments will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add new sections, as follows:

SEC. —. (a) Subsection (a) of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year (in addition to other taxes imposed by this chapter) upon the net income of every corporation accumulating earnings or profits instead of dividing or distributing such earnings or profits, a surtax of 100 percent of the amount of the undistributed section 102 net income."

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of such section are hereby repealed.

SEC. —. (a) Section 12 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the last 13 lines in the table contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Over $22,000 but not over $25,000--$7,720 plus 56% of excess over $22,000.
"Over $25,000--100% of excess over $25,000."

(b) Section 12 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence therein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that both amendments may be considered together.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that in my opinion these two amendments are not germane. I do not wish to make the point of order now, if the Senator from North Dakota wishes to make a statement about the amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I do wish to make a statement about them.

Mr. MCFARLAND. However, at the proper time I shall make the point of order, and I do not wish to lose the right to make the point of order later by failing to make it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A point of order may be made at any time; and an

agreement to vote on two amendments together does not require that the point of order be made before such an agreement is entered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am compelled to make the point of order, because this measure is not a revenue bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; I shall withhold the point of order, so that the Senator from North Dakota may make a speech on the amendments. However, I merely wish to state that this bill is not a revenue bill. This bill originates in the Senate. The Senator's amendment is strictly a revenue measure, and, therefore, is subject to a point of order. But I shall withhold the point of order for the present.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Very briefly, the argument in favor of these amendments is that if the United States of America is going to draft the boys covered by the bill and is going to send them anywhere the Government wishes to send them, the Government should conscript the wealth of the country also.

The late President Roosevelt, during World War II, sent to the Congress a message calling upon the Members of Congress to permit no salaries greater than $25,000 net to be made during the war period.

During World War I, 72,000 new millionaires were created by war profits; and, as the late President Roosevelt so well said in his message during World War II:

> I want no new war millionaires to be created in World War II.

So the late President Roosevelt asked for a limitation of $25,000 net on salaries during World War II. At that time President Roosevelt cited the example of two brothers who were earning the same incomes in a business. President Roosevelt said: "The Government is drafting one of them and is paying him $50 a month, or $600 a year. Is it not enough to let the other make $67,500 a year, which would give him a net income of $25,000?" Despite that plea by President Roosevelt, the amendment was defeated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, some of us believe that it is proper for a person to be taxed at the rate of 100 percent on all income over $25,000 net. Some of us believe that a net income of $25,000 a year is enough for any man, when we can draft his brother and can pay him the small sum which those who serve in the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force receive.

So, Mr. President, the senior Senator from North Dakota is offering an amendment which is identical with the one which was embodied in the suggestion of President Roosevelt during World War II. This amendment is word for word identical with that suggestion by President Roosevelt, even though at that time the amendment was defeated. One of these amendments would take all the income of every person above $25,000 a year net.

The second amendment provides that all war profits shall be taxed at the rate of 100 percent. I will vote for selective service, but this measure has so many jokers in it that I cannot support it. It is not a straight, honest war preparation bill. It is not even an honest universal military training bill, Mr. President. I agree substantially with what was said a few days ago in Chicago, at a meeting of what is known as the John Ericcson League. I can repeat substantially what was said at that time and I state it as my own language. It is interesting to take a look at what has happened to nondefense spending in the last 10 years. The Department of Commerce spent $36,900,000 in 1940. It spent $863,000,000 in 1950.

The Department of the Interior spent $210,000,000 in 1940, and $568,000,000 in 1950.

The Department of Labor spent $29,000,000 in 1940, and $257,000,000 in 1950.

The Department of Justice spent $49,000,000 in 1940, and $131,000,000 in 1950.

These costs of Government should be paid as we go—not left to be paid by the GI's when they return, if they do return, from the horrors of war.

Mr. President, listen to this: The Department of State spent $24,000,000 in 1940, and $361,000,000 under Secretary Acheson in 1950.

Finally, the independent offices, including the Executive Office of the President, the Federal Security Agency, the General Services Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, spent $3,800,000,000 in 1940, and $10,700,000,000 in 1950.

These Government departments and agencies have nothing to do with the armed services. They are just symbolic of the sprawling, spendthrift bureaucracy which brings us higher taxes and higher prices, and appeals from the Truman administration to prepare for greater sacrifices still to come, as he issues them on the nice, fine beaches of Florida.

Mr. President, do you suppose American businessmen believe they received $863,000,000 worth of services from the Department of Commerce last year?

Does any American workingman believe that the Department of Labor was worth the $257,000,000 it cost in 1950?

Do American boys fighting in Korea think that the $361,000,000 spent last year by the Department of State contributed substantially to their peace and security?

Mr. President, I also want to say that I agree with another excerpt from a statement made by a very distinguished American:

> The tax program is the second example of unequal burdens.

This is in reality a tax program, Mr. President, because the more men we draft the greater is the expense. I say that if it is possible to draft a boy and to take him away, whether it be now or hereafter under an alleged universal military training program, we ought also to be able to draft the war profits of the country. No person, no corporation should be permitted to become rich on the blood, sacrifices, and suffering of our soldiers—nor on the tears and sweat of their fathers and mothers. Our forefathers left the "old country" to avoid this kind of government by kings, czars, and emperors—by the vote of Senator WILLIAM LANGER it will not be established in the United States.

The excerpt says that, at this time, the Congress is considering tax proposals that will favor the high incomes and bear down on lower incomes, and that, under this tax program, now before the Senate, if one is earning $3,000 or $4,000 a year, he will have to pay the same amount of income tax he paid at the height of World War II. But if his income is $500,000 a year, he will be permitted to pay $40,000 less than in 1944—and will have additional loopholes to save him still more tax money. There is no equality of sacrifice in this type of tax program.

On the other hand, corporation profits have reached an astounding all-time high. Nothing effective is being done to make those superprofits bear their fair share of our national burden. At the same time, while you are carrying the extraordinary burden, a new unfair wage and salary formula has been promulgated by the Government. The net effect of this Government order is to keep wages and salaries down. This combination of heavier expenses and restricted income will cause real hardship among millions of moderate-income families.

Our complaint against the stabilization program is that it is not geared to curb inflation. Rather, in the name of fighting inflation, the program will lower living standards while safeguarding swollen profits.

On the one hand, flabby treatment of the wealthy and gingerly treatment of profiteers; on the other, severe controls over people in the lower- and middle-income levels.

Mr. President, I say that that is the very reverse of fair play. Everyone realizes that war is a national catastrophe, which men are forced into involuntary servitude, without respect to their personal wishes. It is unfair and undemocratic to require a part of our citizens to be forced into the service of their country, without the same and equal conditions being required of all the people—all those who are making half a million dollars a year in salaries, paying $40,000 a year less in taxes than they paid in World War II, under the tax program which has been adopted in this Congress.

Many men and women are required to submit to virtual dictatorship in the service, while those remaining at home are permitted the liberty and comforts of civilian life, with the advantage of amassing wealth due to the conditions arising from the situation for which others are giving their life's blood. All patriotic Americans should share equally in defending the Nation and participate equally in the sacrifices required.

Mr. President, unless these amendments are adopted, and unless we draft wealth at the same time that we draft blood and the lives of our young men, we shall not be carrying out the principles of real, true, honest democracy which we are trying to sell to our allies in Europe and Asia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to renew my point of order. The bill before us is Senate bill 1, a bill which originated in the Senate. It is not a revenue measure. Of course, had it been a revenue measure, it could not have originated in the Senate. I submit that the amendments are not germane, and therefore cannot be considered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit that the point of order is not well taken. If the Senate through this bill can draft the lives of human beings, then I submit that certainly we can at at the same time draft some of the swollen profits which are being taken by corporations and by individuals who are receiving salaries even as high as half a million dollars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, no amendment may be offered, either to the bill or to the amendment, which is not germane to the bill or to the amendment. These two amendments are offered to the text of the bill, which is in the form of a substitute. They are not germane to the text of the bill, and therefore, under the unanimous-consent agreement, they are not in order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment lettered A which I offer for myself and on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the amendment been printed heretofore?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit it is unnecessary to read the amendment, which has been on the table for 10 days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD. The clerk advises the Chair that the amendment is identical with the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], which has been considered and voted upon.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think that is correct, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair himself does not know. The amendment is somewhat different, although the first part of it is identical.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. The amendment offered by the able Senator from Oregon was to eliminate all deferments. This amendment does not in any way eliminate deferments. It simply sets up a different method.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment offered by Mr. CAPEHART was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 83, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 19 on page 84.

On page 84, line 20, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d) (1)."

On page 86, line 10, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

On page 86, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)."

On page 86, line 18, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)."

On page 87, strike out lines 14 through 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction; if—

"(A) he is enrolled as a freshman;

"(B) he is enrolled as a sophomore and ranked in the upper half of his freshman class;

"(C) he is enrolled as a junior and ranked in the upper two-thirds of his sophomore class;

"(D) he is enrolled as a senior and ranked in the upper three-fourths of his junior class; or

"(E) he is pursuing, or has been accepted by an established graduate school to pursue, a course of study leading to a graduate degree and ranked in the uper half of his senior class.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'full-time course of instruction' shall mean a course of instruction which requires the enrollment of a student for a period equivalent to at least 45 weeks out of each calendar year. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the President finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this amendment is being offered by myself and my colleague [Mr. JENNER], in behalf of all the universities and colleges in the State of Indiana, namely:

Anderson College, Ball State Teachers College, Butler University, Cantebury College, DePauw University, Earlham College, Evansville College, Franklin College, Goshen College, Hanover College, Huntington College, Indiana Central College, Indiana State Teachers College, Indiana Technical College, Indiana University, Jordan College of Music, Manchester College, Marian College, Marion College, Oakland City College, Purdue University, Rose Polytechnic Institute, St. Joseph College, St. Mary's College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Taylor University, Tri-State College, University of Notre Dame, Valparaiso University, Vincennes University, and Wabash College.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a printed statement from those 31 colleges.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDIANA PLAN FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF NATIONAL MANPOWER

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

1. The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the present crisis in world affairs and is sensitively aware of the fact that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations.

2. Charged with the responsibility of leadership in American thought and life we must constantly point to the clear and present danger of the short view which would seriously impair our tradition of freedom under God. We must proceed on the commonly accepted assumption that our present situation must be viewed as a long-term phase of our national preparation for any eventuality. Though victorious in our conflict with an alien and vicious ideology we could lose so many cultural and spiritual values that our victory would be empty.

In the light of these considerations we strongly take the position that present proposed legislation should not constitute a permanent national commitment to any program of universal military training and service. Proposed legislation should be enacted for a limited period of time and made subject to review by each succeeding Congress.

3. It is our profound conviction that in any plan of national mobilization we must maintain the values for which American colleges and universities have stood throughout their history as an expression of the heritage of our people. This means that definite and intelligent provisions must be made, even in a time of national emergency, for the uninterrupted training of the leaders of tomorrow. The American college and university must make a continuous contribution to the national welfare in terms of supplying manpower needs in every field of learning during this crisis and beyond it. Thus it is in the national interest that every man pursue his formal education for as long a period as he is willing and able and so long as he can be spared from military service.

STATEMENT OF PLAN

1. Upon the basis of these principles we affirm our conviction that those sections of the present selective service law which provide for registration at age 18 with induction not before age 19 should be retained.

2. The length of military service should be extended from 21 months to 27 months.

3. Standards of induction should be lowered until approximately 78 percent of all young men are taken into the Armed Forces.

4. All freshmen who are attending college and are doing passing work at the time they receive their call should be deferred to the end of the academic year. All students who during their freshman year ranked in the upper half of their class should be deferred to the end of the sophomore year. All students who ranked in the upper two-thirds of their sophomore class should be deferred to the end of their junior year. All students who ranked in the upper three-fourths of their junior class should be deferred to the end of their senior year. Students should be deferred for graduate study if they have graduated in the upper one-half of their senior class, have been accepted by an established graduate school, and continue to maintain satisfactory progress in a program leading toward an advance degree.

5. All students who are deferred to continue in college shall attend college on a round-the-year program consistent with high academic standards.

6. Because continuance in college on a year-round program will impose a significant additional financial burden on the average American family and because participation in this plan should not depend upon the financial circumstance of the student, it is recommended that the Eighty-second Congress pass enabling legislation which will permit any student who is deferred under this program to borrow from the Government up to $100 per month during the period he is attending college.

It is further recommended that interest on this loan shall be at a rate one-half of

1 percent greater than the going rate on long term Government bonds at the time the loan is made, and repayment of the loan shall be made on the basis of annual payments equal to 25 percent of the participant's Federal income tax.

STATEMENT OF MANPOWER SITUATION

The testimony of Mrs. Rosenberg and General Hershey before the House Armed Services Committee established the fact that if the strength of the Armed Forces is raised to 3,500,000 men by June 30, 1951, and if present standards of induction and deferments are maintained, the national pool of acceptable inductees will be reduced to 411,000 by that date.

It was also established by the same testimony that this pool can be increased to 1,218,000 men in the following manner:

| | |
|---|---|
| Number in pool by present standard, June 30, 1951 | 411,000 |
| Addition of college students by graduation and nondeferment | 200,000 |
| Reclaimed by lowering standards of IV–F deferments | 250,000 |
| Reclaimed from deferments by induction of men with one dependent | 220,000 |
| Inducted draftees now in National Guard and Reservist units | 137,000 |
| Total | 1,218,000 |

In an armed force of 3,500,000 it is estimated there will be approximately 1,500,000 career men, and men who serve for more than 27 months. This means that approximately 2,000,000 men will need to be replaced every 27 months or at rate of about 900,000 each year.

Approximately 1,050,000 men reach a given age annually. Of these about 800,000 can be used in the Armed Forces if approximately 100,000 are used on limited service. This leaves a deficit of 100,000 per year which will be subtracted from the pool of 1,218,000. Allowing 600,000 as the minimum safety margin to be kept as a cushion in this pool, it is clear that there is no present need for lowering the induction age below 19 nor to modifying the existing regulations with regard to the deferment of college students.

MEMBERS OF INDIANA CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Anderson College, Ball State Teachers College, Butler University, Canterbury College, DePauw University, Earlham College, Evansville College, Franklin College, Goshen College, Hanover College, Huntington College, Indiana Central College, Indiana State Teachers College, Indiana Technical College, Indiana University, Jordan College of Music, Manchester College, Marian College, Marion College, Oakland City College, Purdue University, Rose Polytechnic Institute, St. Joseph College, St. Mary's College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Taylor University, Tri-State College, University of Notre Dame, Valparaiso University, Vincennes University, and Wabash College.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, to show my interest in training the young men of America so as to enable them properly to defend themselves, about which we have heard so much today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a bill which I prepared as far back as the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide for the defense and security of the Nation, and to assist in the preservation of world peace, by establishing a voluntary system of training of personnel and the furnishing of facilities essential thereto, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Voluntary Training Act."

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide for the defense and security of the Nation and to assist in the preservation of world peace by the establishment of a system of training sufficient to supply personnel and facilities for our armed services and services auxiliary thereto. This system shall include utilization (a) of existing personnel and facilities; (b) of personnel and facilities to be provided from time to time; and (c) of existing and future educational and institutional facilities and personnel and students thereof; all of which are hereby vested with a public interest in the accomplishment of the purposes of this act. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy.

SEC. 3. Definitions as used in this act:

(a) "School" shall mean any educational institution, whether Federal, State, or local.

(b) "Trainee' shall mean any citizen of the United States within the ages herein specified who shall enroll and qualify as a student in the primary training prescribed in this act.

(c) "Advanced trainee" shall mean any trainee who shall enroll and qualify for the secondary training prescribed in this act.

(d) "General reservist" shall mean all citizens who complete the primary training herein provided, but who fail to qualify as an officer, either Reserve or Regular, in the Armed Forces of the United States, or in any branch thereof or auxiliary thereto under the provisions hereof.

(e) Wherever the word "military" is used it shall mean and include all of the armed activities of the United States.

SEC. 4. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, each citizen of the United States of America found to be physically qualified under such regulations, upon obtaining the age of 17 years, or within 4 years thereafter, may elect to attend free of expense within the limitations herein prescribed for a total period of 1 year, the school of their choice from among those schools designated and qualified: Provided each person so electing and enrolling shall comply with and be subject to all the further provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. Each trainee so electing and enrolling shall be required to maintain such scholastic, training, and physical standards as may be prescribed under the regulations promulgated by the President of the United States.

SEC. 6. Each trainee shall be required to attend for a total period of 12 months, inconclusive of time occupied in enrollment and release, the course of training set forth in the rules and regulations promulgated by the President of the United States. This period shall include the customary yearly curriculum of any school as to time and, so far as possible, as to studies and such additional period as may be prescribed and provided for such training under such regulations.

SEC. 7. During the regular school period at least one-half of the prescribed work and instruction shall be of such educational, technical, or vocational training nature as will entitle the recipient to full credit therefor in any accredited school; and there shall be formulated regulations whereby reasonable credit shall be afforded for the remaining part of all training afforded hereunder.

SEC. 8. In the formulation of rules and regulations to be adopted for such training, the basic or primary period is a total of 1 year of training. Under these rules and regulations the entire period of training may be included in 1 year such as the first year of college, or it may be divided between the last year of high school and the first year of college, or between the last year of high school and the first year after graduation from high school if the graduate does not attend any college or vocational school. In any event, approximately 3 months of intensive active field training is to be required as a part of the year's training and at the end thereof.

SEC. 9. During such training, each trainee shall be clothed in such uniform as may be prescribed and provided, supported and maintained in a like manner to that of personnel in the regular military service, and such trainee shall receive an allowance of $—— per month, payable monthly, and also all facilities, supplies and materials necessary for the consummation of such training. Properly qualified training instructors shall be supplied under such arrangements as may be made by the President, or his representatives, with the several schools, and in conformity with the rules and regulations promulgated under the provisions of this act: *Provided,* That, when proper living quarters are not available, such trainees may room and board in places of their own choice selected from a list prepared and approved by school authorities: *And provided further,* That all trainees shall have the privilege within reasonable rules and regulations, to join in the usual fraternal, social, and other activities of the school not inconsistent with the rules and regulations set forth by governmental authority: *And provided still further,* That the total amount expended on behalf of, or paid to any trainee for room and board, and expenses incident thereto shall be fixed by regulation at a sum appropriate to meet the reasonable requirements of each case, but not to exceed a total of $600.

SEC. 10. The training herein provided shall be integrated with the regular curriculum of the schools designated, and shall be given under a combination of military and institutional direction, with military officers in charge only of military training, but with all military courses and classes of instruction selected from a designated or required list compiled under rules and regulations promulgated under the direction of the President.

SEC. 11. The Federal Government shall provide all facilities, equipment, materials, supplies, personnel, and other things necessary to such training either directly or indirectly, by compensating the school for providing the same on such basis as may be provided for under appropriate rules and regulations, or as may be mutually agreed upon thereunder.

SEC. 12. Each trainee, upon the completion of the 1-year period of training as aforesaid, shall be enrolled as a general reservist in the military forces of the United States for a period of 5 years thereafter, but shall not be subject to compulsory military service except in an emergency declared by Congress, and then only under such conditions as the Congress may prescribe: *Provided,* That any trainee who thereafter serves satisfactorily in the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Regular Army for a total period of at least 1 year, or in the National Guard of the United States or the Naval Militia for a total period of at least 2 years, shall be deemed to have completed the 5-year period as a member of the General Reserve, but nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent any such trainee, while in the National Guard of the

United States or the Naval Militia, from being ordered or called to active duty therein by appropriate act of Congress.

SEC. 13. Each trainee who shall enlist in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for a regular term of enlistment therein, shall be given a non-commissioned-officer status or rating commensurable with his qualifications and his efficiency to the extent of completion of his training, provided such enlistment be made within 6 months after the completion of 1 year of such training.

SEC. 14. Of and from each yearly class of trainees, that part thereof with the highest rank scholastically and otherwise, in accordance with the rules and regulations for such rank promulgated under the regulations to be adopted hereunder to the extent therein provided, shall have the privilege and shall be given the opportunity of inquiring for and attending such school as may be duly selected with approval for an additional period of one full calendar year for the purpose of receiving more advanced training. Such continued instruction shall be under like conditions, terms, rules, regulations and provisions in this act set forth as provided for the first year's training: *Provided, however,* That all such advanced trainees, upon completion of such 2 years of training, shall be commissioned as Reserve officers in the Army or Naval Reserve Corps of the United States, and shall retain such commissions, and shall accept and perform such further training, and shall do and perform such other things, as may now or hereafter be legally required of such reserve officers, for a period of at least 7 years thereafter, unless they attain a status of regular or permanent military or naval officers: *And, provided further,* That during such second year of training, such advanced trainee shall have the election of pursuing studies and training leading either to military or naval reserve commissions.

SEC. 15. Such class of advanced trainees as may be prescribed by regulation, based upon scholastic ability, efficiency in training, good conduct and character, and physical condition, upon the completion of such second-year training, shall be afforded the opportunity, competitively, of entrance to the schools provided for the training of officers of our Armed Forces, for the purpose of qualifying for commissions in the regular forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard.

SEC. 16. After the period of reserve enrollment prescribed herein is completed, no man shall be subject to compulsory military service except when the Congress shall have declared a national emergency requiring such service, and then only under such conditions as the Congress may prescribe.

SEC. 17. Any person who violates the provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations hereunder, shall be subject to such reasonable disciplinary action as shall be provided for in rules and regulations duly promulgated with the approval of the President.

SEC. 18. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 19. This act shall become effective upon the approval of the President and shall be placed in operation as soon thereafter as may be practical and possible.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the amendment which I am offering in behalf of all the colleges and universities of the State of Indiana would in no way cripple UMT nor would it in any way cripple the pending bill. Under the bill as now written, the President is to establish a board, which will prescribe rules and regulations whereby some 75,000 college students are exempted or deferred.

Under the Indiana plan—and I call it the Indiana plan because it has been recommended by every university and college in the State—the record of the boy's scholastic standing would be considered. I read from the amendment:

Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction; if—

(A) he is enrolled as a freshman—

Under the bill he would remain during his school year—

(B) he is enrolled as a sophomore and ranked in the upper half of his freshman class;

(C) he is enrolled as a junior and ranked in the upper two-thirds of his sophomore class;

(D) he is enrolled as a senior and ranked in the upper three-fourths of his junior class; or

(E) he is pursuing, or has been accepted by an accepted graduate school to pursue, a course of study leading to a graduate degree and ranked in the upper half of his senior class.

Under such a plan approximately the same number of students would be deferred as would be deferred under the pending bill. The only difference would be that under the plan proposed by my amendment the 1,800 colleges and universities, with some 100,000 instructors or professors, would grade the boys in the same manner they have been graded all along. The same system of grading would be continued. Those who are in the upper half in the freshman class, in the upper two-thirds in the sophomore class, and in the upper three-fourths of the junior class would be automatically deferred. The advantage would be that the boys deferred would not go into training. Therefore there would be that much less expense to be borne by the Government. Secondly, Congress would spell out the plan that would be used, instead of depending upon a board, to be appointed by the President. It would interfere with the colleges and universities much less than would the plan set forth in the bill. In my amendment I have added, beginning at page 2, line 17, the wording which is found in the pending bill.

It seems to me Congress should spell out the yardstick or the standard on which the boys are to be deferred. It seems to me it would be much more democratic to leave the question to the 1,800 universities and colleges and the 100,000 professors than it would be to leave it to a board appointed by the President. We do not know what standards a board would adopt.

Later in my remarks I shall place in the RECORD a letter which I received from General Hershey. While he states he is opposed to the amendment, he admits that mine is the plan which they intend to use. In other words, they intend to use the scholastic standing of the boys. Nevertheless, he is still opposed to the amendment. He admits that is the way they would deal with the problem. However, he does not want Congress to say that that is what must be done.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand and ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, March 7, entitled "Bright Students To Be Deferred."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON BASIS OF MARKS AND EXAMS, BRIGHT STUDENTS TO BE DEFERRED

College students, now facing the draft at the end of this school year, will be deferred through next year provided they are in the upper brackets of their classes, it was learned today. Plans to defer those students, based both on standing in class and a college aptitude test, will shortly be announced by Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey.

General Hershey conferred yesterday afternoon with National Production Authority Manpower Director Arthur B. Flemming, Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna M. Rosenberg, and Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin on the plan for college deferment.

Dr. Flemming has not yet accepted the plan, although General Hershey, Mrs. Rosenberg and Secretary Tobin are said to be in favor of it.

The plan calls for testing more than 1,000,000 college students. Students may stay in college next year if they receive the equivalent of more than 120 on the old armed forces classification test. In addition, this year's freshmen in the upper half of their classes, sophomores in the upper two-thirds, and juniors in the upper three-quarters, regardless of their test score, will be deferred through next year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana why it should be necessary to defer anyone? I voted for the Cordon amendment. I do not know why we should place 75,000 boys in a special class.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator. I also voted for the Cordon amendment, but the Senate rejected it.

I read from the article in the Washington Daily News:

The plan calls for testing more than 1,000,000 college students. Students may stay in college next year if they receive the equivalent of more than 120 on the old Armed Forces classification test. In addition, this year's freshmen in the upper half of their classes, sophomores in the upper two-thirds, and juniors in the upper three-quarters, regardless of their test score, will be deferred through next year.

That is what General Hershey told the newspapers. If that is what they intend to do, that is all right, but unfortunately General Hershey will not be the chairman of the board.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may remind my friend from Indiana that in the last war

we finally had to adopt an amendment to defer farm boys. Are we deferring farm boys in this bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer the question of the Senator. As I say, unfortunately General Hershey would not be on the board. It is intended to follow the plan I have suggested. Evidently General Hershey feels that is the way the matter should be handled. Under my amendment the Congress would say that that is the way it shall be done. I think it would be much safer to do so than to leave it to the board.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether there are any safeguards in the bill against favoritism in the selection of the young men who are to be deferred?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer the question. Under the plan set forth in the bill at the moment the board might well play favoritism, but I cannot conceive how favoritism could be played with 1,800 universities and colleges and 100,000 professors.

Mr. KEM. I am not talking about the Senator's plan. I am talking about section (d) (1) appearing at page 83 of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; there would be a chance for the exercise of some favoritism.

Mr. KEM. Is that not one of the advantages of the Senator's plan?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think it is. It would be very difficult for 1,800 universities and colleges and 100,000 professors to indulge in favoritism. The boys would be graded according to the regular procedure now being followed by the universities and colleges. It is the same procedure which they have been following for many years.

Without doubt the bill which we are considering today is one of the most serious pieces of legislation we shall ever be called upon to consider. I have heard the arguments pro and con. I do not believe we should pass a UMT bill along with an emergency piece of legislation. I have heard the argument made that the UMT provision contained in the bill would reduce expenses. I say it would not. I make the prophecy today that after it has been in effect for 4, 5, or 6 years we will be spending more money on the armed services than we would have spent if we had not adopted the provision.

I have also heard the argument used that in World War I and in World War II—and I guess we are now in world war III, or the Korean phase of it—that boys have died because they had not been properly trained. Mr. President, I am surprised that anyone, particularly anyone on the other side of the aisle, should use that kind of argument, because in all these three wars the Democrats have been in control of the administration. I am surprised that anyone would admit that a government or a general would send a man into battle who was not properly trained. I do not think it is any longer a secret that we have over 2,500,000 men in our Army. I believe the number is 2,500,000. Yet we have probably only 12 or 14 combat divisions available out of the 2,600,000 men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from General Hershey, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
*Washington, D. C., March 5, 1951.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: In keeping with request made in your letter of March 2, 1951, I am pleased to furnish my comments relative to the amendments which you state you intend to propose to S. 1, a bill "To provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes."

As you are aware, I supported the provision in S. 1, which would authorize the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial period of basic training in the Armed Forces, of not to exceed 75,000 persons annually, in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in the various professions and scientific fields. This plan, which represents the combined thinking of the majority of the leading educators in this country, as well as the Department of Defense, the United States Office of Education and all other interested Government agencies, in my opinion assures a balanced flow of students during the immediate 3-year period ensuing before persons who complete their training and service under this bill are released in substantial numbers.

I cannot agree to the elimination of the provision (p. 87, lines 14 through 24) to provide postponement of induction or deferment of students during this pursuance of an academic year. It seems to me that these men who enter a college year before liability for service accrues should be permitted to complete that year as a matter of economics if for no other reason, so long as it is possible to operate in that manner without jeopardizing the national safety.

Your proposal to amend section 6 (d) (2) is in substance the presently contemplated plan of handling educational deferments. I feel, however, that the law contains ample provision for carrying out that plan and I prefer the flexibility possible through regulations to meet changing conditions and needs. This provision would make it mandatory to defer the indicated percentages on scholastic standing alone. It is our contemplated plan to couple scholastic standing with basic intelligence, thus providing an opportunity for the more intelligent young man who has the ability to succeed over the whole of his college career and after, but who, because of lack of all that might be desired in his high school program, would be a little slow in attaining the top of his class in college.

I feel very strongly that the addition of your proposed new section 22 is a definite step in the direction of subsidized education, but I cannot agree to its provisions. I also think that this provision would so swell enrollment that the colleges and universities would be unable to carry the freshman load. Since the succeeding years would attain this size as a percentage of the freshman year, it is difficult indeed to anticipate the numbers of young men who thus would be involved. I am inclined to the feeling that this provision would create a haven and refuge from service. It would also, because of the definition of a "full-time course of instruction," require every college or university in the Nation dependent on male students, to either conduct a full calendar year of school or go out of business.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY, *Director.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I must rise to oppose the amendment. It involves a permanent and far-reaching departure from the scope and purpose of the pending bill. This amendment is completely new in concept. There has not been a single day of hearings on its feasibility. We have received no evidence as to its costs; no facts on which to base our conclusions. The impact of this amendment on our educational system, on the lives of the young men not fortunate enough to go to college, and upon our entire manpower program is so drastic that it would be dangerous to consider it in this hurried manner on the floor of the Senate.

What does the amendment do? First, it provides for a complicated, inflexible, and arbitrary scheme for college deferments. It sets no limit on the numbers involved. It imposes no corresponding military requirement for service of any kind. It deals only with those students in college where the course of instruction runs for a period equivalent to 10½ months each year. It would establish an inflexible method of educational deferments which is far too cumbersome to adjust to our manpower requirements. The amendment moves a long step in the direction of subsidized education for students who attend college, but only those colleges which can offer an accelerated program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think the Senator wants to make a misstatement of fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator has made a misstatement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The amendment would overpopulate the college campuses and involve a heavy outlay of additional Federal funds. At a time when we desperately need manpower, when we desperately need all of our revenues for defense, this program, with its great expense in the form of subsidies, would increase college enrollments to unpredictable heights, and would take a tremendous toll of the manpower we so desperately need for defense. This provision would change our colleges from educational institutions into havens from military service. The colleges themselves would be forced either to adjust their academic year or go out of the business of education.

It is the type of indirect Federal control which the Senate should not approve. With our manpower dangerously low, with our military needs at a dangerous high, we must not permit our re-

serves of manpower to be depleted by any measure concocted on the floor without benefit of hearings.

This amendment has no place in the bill. If it is a worthy amendment it should have been presented to the committee when the committee sat for 7 weeks holding hearings on the bill. If it is to be considered, it should have most careful and diligent study by the proper committees of the Congress, the Nation's educators, the executive departments of the Federal Government, and representatives of junior colleges and vocational schools. All these groups should be consulted before such far-reaching action is taken, because they have a vital interest in it.

Mr. President, there are several amendments on the Vice President's desk. The hour is late. Senators wish to leave. I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 1 minute in reply to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana requests unanimous consent to be heard for 1 minute. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Texas was answering another amendment which I had printed a week ago, and which was lying on the table. He was not answering the amendment which I offered, because the amendment which I offered, from line 17 on page 2 forward, is the exact wording in the bill which we are considering; and if we pass it, everything the Senator had to say about socializing education would relate to the bill itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that shows the danger in bringing forth amendments on the floor of the Senate which have not been considered by the committee. If the Senator wanted his amendment considered he should have proposed it before the committee. We would have given it attention. I am not familiar with all of the Senator's amendment; but the staff has attempted to analyze the amendments filed at the desk.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain that the Senator did not wish intentionally to mislead the Senate. However, he did mislead the Senate.

I also call his attention to the fact that those representing the Indiana colleges and universities did testify. The plan was printed, and had wide distribution. The answer which the Senator gave was not an answer to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the committee's time to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I am addressing myself to the amendment now before the Senate. This amendment, as has been previously stated, was not given any consideration by the committee. I should like to cite to the Senate the names of some of the very competent authorities who appeared before the committee with reference to this particular part of the bill.

There were the usual officers from the military establishments. In addition, the following witnesses testified: Dr. Charles A. Thomas, chairman of the Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee of the National Securities Resources Board, who favors this particular provision of our bill; Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who favors the bill as written by the committee; Dr. James P. Baxter, III, president of Williams College; Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University; Detlev W. Bronk, president of Johns Hopkins University; and Ralph W. McDonald, representing the National Education Association of the United States.

I could go on and name 36 authorities who appeared before the committee in favor of this particular provision of the bill. There were 13 witnesses who gave testimony contrary to this provision of the bill, but only to the effect that the number was not sufficient.

Mr. President, under the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana we would have in the freshmen class exactly the same number of male students we now have, namely, 290,000——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I have only a few minutes. I yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would not this amendment, in effect, defer all college students?

Mr. HUNT. In the first year; yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. How about the second year?

Mr. HUNT. No; I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. The language is:

(B) he is enrolled as a sophomore and ranked in the upper half of his freshman class.

Mr. HUNT. In the upper half of his freshman class.

Mr. McFARLAND. What would it do to the whole program?

Mr. HUNT. It would cut it down to 75,000 in 4 years. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that this amendment would defer college students?

Mr. HUNT. Yes. It would defer a great number of them.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe that any of them should be deferred.

Mr. HUNT. During the committee hearings Commissioner McGrath, of the Office of Education, was asked the question if he participated in the preparation of this particular part of the bill. He stated that he had; that he had been in consultation with the Military Establishment for 4 or 5 months on this particular feature.

Under the amendment as submitted, the entire student body of male students, 290,000, would be admitted in the first or freshman year. That is 215,000 more than the number provided in the administration bill. The committee bill provides for deferring, or rather excusing, 75,000. So in the very first year we would need to dip 215,000 deeper into the 18-year-olds, under this amendment.

Mr. President, one very important feature of the amendment which I must mention is that it does not set out any category whatsoever with respect to the students who are deferred in the freshman year. Under this amendment a student could enter school and take such subjects as music and botany. In my own State we have an extended course in wild-game management. So there is nothing in this amendment which would prevent any male student who did not want to go into the service from going to school and taking any nonessential subjects he wished to take. The ultimate number who would be in school under the two programs would not differ a great deal, for while originally 290,000 students started, under the amendment in the senior year there would be only 75,000 of them left.

There is another very important feature. I am wondering if the Senate feels that we should legislate on the floor of the Senate as to how many months of school the colleges throughout the Nation shall operate next year. This amendment does that. It says to every school in the United States, "You must have 45 weeks of school." When we take out the Christmas vacation, the spring vacation, the other holidays, and the summer vacation, it is clear that the students will be in school approximately 11½ months. I do not think it is proper or that it is the function of the Senate to say to the schools, "Starting next year you shall continue around the clock." During the hearing we specifically asked of Dr. Kimball, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Medical Education, and of Dr. Stone, of Johns Hopkins, if they thought it was proper at this time in partial mobilization to go around the calendar for the school year, and they both said emphatically they did not think it was proper to do so.

Under the amendment, too, the members of the board to be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate will be educators, who will spend their entire time on this particular work and it seems to me that instead of leaving to them the selection of the 75,000 students, we are in effect saying that the President shall select them. If the President selects them it will be, of course, through the military and through selective service. I am inclined to think I would rather have a 5-man board of educators select these students than to leave entirely to the President the decision on this most important matter. So again let me say, we have here a provision, a far-reaching and important provision, that was given long consideration. I do not think we on the floor of the Senate, in a few minutes, should override

the lengthy, detailed studies of the committee, which received the best advice it was possible to obtain in the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to submit a unanimous-consent request at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that he may submit a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the senior and junior Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] and I have an important engagement, made some time ago, in Richmond, Va., this evening, and in order to keep that engagement, which we feel we should not cancel, it is necessary for us to depart from the Senate at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that we may be granted leave to be absent from the Senate for the remainder of the day.

I also wish to announce, Mr. President, that if present, we would oppose any further amendments to the bill, and would also vote in favor of its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none and the request is granted.

The question is on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the amendment being lettered "A" 3-7-51.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when the Senate entered into the unanimous-consent agreement day before yesterday, there was considerable confusion on the floor. The distinguished occupant of the chair will recall, I am sure, that as usual when unanimous-consent agreements are worked out, without having the details in writing, Senators asked questions concerning interpretation of various provisions. During the proceedings the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] came to me and stated that he wanted to know if, in case he agreed to the unanimous-consent request, an amendment to an amendment would be in order, and I told him yes. Possibly I was wrong. Senators can interpret the agreement in any way they want to. I do not want to get into a lengthy discussion of whether I am technically right or generally right, or whether I am technically wrong or generally wrong.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish my statement. At that moment the distinguished majority leader called attention to the fact that if the agreement was to be entered into we would have to have a definite understanding about new amendments which had not been printed. Because of the kindness and consideration of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, he was allowed some few minutes in connection with a couple of amendments he offered, and which he discussed today.

I believe the RECORD shows that when the question of an amendment to an amendment was raised, I asked the majority leader about it, and, whether rightly or wrongly, I informed the distinguished Senator from Indiana that if he proposed an amendment that was an amendment to an amendment—as I considered the committee amendment to be—it would be in order.

There is now some question as to whether my interpretation is correct. Therefore, because of the interpretation of the situation as I presented it to the Senator from Indiana, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana be permitted to offer his amendment. Action upon it will come within the time limit respecting all other amendments, a total of 30 minutes, or 15 minutes on a side.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The object of having amendments submitted in advance was to give members of the committee and other Senators an opportunity to study them, since the proposed legislation is of extreme importance. The committee amendment is really in the nature of a substitute. However, if there is one thing I do not want to occur in connection with unanimous-consent agreements it is a misunderstanding. I would not under any circumstances want to deprive the distinguished Senator from Indiana of the opportunity of offering his amendment. I understand it is germane. I understand it is not objectionable on grounds other amendments might have been subject to objection. I, therefore, join the distinguished minority leader in the unanimous-consent request he has submitted.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the present occupant of the chair be permitted to express his understanding with respect to the unanimous-consent agreement? The unanimous-consent agreement, as adopted, provides that for amendments to the bill to be considered, they must have been printed and ordered to lie on the table prior to the adoption of the unanimous-consent agreement; and that an amendment to such an amendment could be considered provided it was germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer has a perfect right to indulge in that interpretation. I am not going to debate it with the distinguished occupant of the chair. When I asked the question, May a Senator offer an amendment to an amendment? I was answered "Yes." Because of that fact, and because there may have been a misunderstanding, I now ask unanimous consent that regardless of what may be technically the correct interpretation, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana may be permitted to submit an amendment at this time for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire how long consideration of the amendment will delay a final vote on the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Thirty minutes.

Mr. NEELY. I should not like to agree to that much time being given. I must drive 236 miles over the mountains tonight after the final vote on the bill is had. I shall not object to the Senator offering his amendment if it will not take much time to pass upon it. However, if it should occupy 45 minutes——

Mr. WHERRY. No; it will be subject to the provision in the agreement that 15 minutes a side be permitted to be used.

Mr. NEELY. Could we not agree that there be 10 minutes to a side, or 5 minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. There is a way out of this. I do not wish to avail myself of it, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that unanimous consent be given to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to submit an amendment to the bill, notwithstanding the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement?

Is it understood that if exception be made in this case, the amendment to be offered will be subject to the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement with reference to time and with reference to germaneness?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask a question. Does that mean that if half a dozen other amendments are offered under similar circumstances the debate can be continued?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no other request of similar nature to make.

Mr. NEELY. I serve notice that if other amendments are offered, I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. Mr. JENNER, for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. WELKER, Mr. KEM, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. CAPEHART, offers the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment insert the following:

"That (a) the first sentence of section 4 (a) of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen."

"(b) The third sentence of the first paragraph of section 4 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate armed forces.'

"(c) Section 5 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(a)' and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) (A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19 unless there is not within the

jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of 19 to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"'(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as 90 days older, (ii) has not attained the age of 19, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction.'

"(d) Section (6) (c) (2) (A) of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words '6 months' a comma and the following: 'prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction.'

"(e) Sections 17 and 21 of such act, as amended, are amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953.'

"SEC. 2. The act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"'That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2 of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and sections 102 and 202 of the act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"'SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the Reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of 4,000,000 persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this act.'

"SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953.'

"SEC. 4. Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828) is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is recognized for 15 minutes or so much thereof as he wishes to take.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, for weeks we have been debating the so-called universal military training and service bill. Every Member of this body is deeply concerned about providing whatever is necessary for a strong national defense.

But this is not a bill to provide for our national defense. It is not a bill to provide universal military training. It does not set up any national reserve of trained citizens.

Something happened to this measure between the general statement of its purpose and the actual legislative drafting.

What we have here is two bills in one. One of them extends the present draft act to meet an emergency. The other establishes permanent universal service for all youth—men, and probably women—for both civilian and military purposes.

This bill also sets up among our young people an elite corps of those who are to be permitted to study science, engineering, medicine, or even the humanities.

It will give the President of the United States nearly complete control of the population of our colleges and technical schools.

It will subject everyone concerned to the obligation to give, perhaps, 8 years of his life completely over to the direction of the Federal Government.

In these dangerous times, Mr. President, we cannot dwell on the faults of a bill for the Armed Forces without indicating the remedy. We have a simple remedy.

We all know this country is confronted with an emergency—the danger of a sudden or early attack by the U. S. S. R.

My colleagues and I offer a simple solution:

We have a draft act on the statute books at present. That draft act is adequate to meet any emergency. It met all the emergencies of World War II, when we set up an armed force of more than 12,000,000 men who fought in every quarter of the globe.

We propose, Mr. President, a simple extension of the present draft act until 1953.

We propose to include the following provisions which have already passed the Senate—there is nothing new here, Mr. President:

A force of not to exceed 4,000,000 men, to be inducted for 24 months of service.

A draft of the 18-year-olds after the supply of other eligibles in each draft district is exhausted.

We propose to eliminate the provision of the bill which appears to set up universal military training, but really sets up a permanent military and civilian draft of all young people for any project the President wishes.

I know that a great many good and responsible people believe in military training and believe that this bill provides it. We all read, or heard of, the reports of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Training. That report was made by a body of distinguished citizens headed by President Compton, of MIT. Their report was concerned with education and training.

I am afraid, Mr. President, we have here the not unfamiliar situation of a very fine brochure issued by the public relations department of a project which covers a very different reality.

I do not like to say that President Compton and the other members of that Board were picked as "front men" to sell the words "universal military training," while the experts in legal draftsmanship, the semicolon boys who know how to give the administration huge slices of power with a word or a phrase, have done the real work.

Let me read you the words of the committee bill, Mr. President.

The bill says, in the declaration of intent:

Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens—

Not men and boys, Mr. President, but all citizens—

to engage in such training for—

Note this, Mr. President—

civilian and military service as will prepare them for—

Not for defending their country, Mr. President, but for—

the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation.

We have heard again and again that all citizens, men and girls, should be given training, in a service corps in good citizenship as the Government interprets it. That is what we have here.

What a far cry this is, Mr. President, from the military training that our veterans' organizations have urged.

In the declaration of purpose, the bill says further, Mr. President, that the bill is—

To provide a continuing flow—

Not of soldiers or sailors or airmen, but—

of personnel recently trained in modern techniques—

The program is to determine our supply of engineers, scientists, and other experts for civilian life.

To continue reading from the bill, Mr. President—

and assure a vital—

What does that mean, Mr. President?

ready reservoir to fill the military and—

Note this word, Mr. President—

civilian needs of the Nation.

The youth of the Nation, boys and probably girls, are to be drafted, not only for defense against an enemy, but so that the administration can assign them where it thinks they are needed for whatever it decides are "the civilian needs of the Nation."

The first step in that direction is the new elite corps.

Note again, Mr. President, please, that in the committee bill the President is authorized, "under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe," to free from military duty a group of persons selected for study or research in "medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest."

What is left out? Can we think of anything that Mother Hubbard clause does not cover, Mr. President?

Their expenses will, of course, be paid by the Government if they cannot pay without "undue hardship."

We need not worry about whether the numbers are to be 75,000 or 150,000, because ke know how often the administration has asked authorization for a little token program, only to come back year after year with appropriations that increase like the green bay tree.

Who is going to pick these young people who are to make up our educated elite? Of course, there will be competitive examinations, but we know whose sons will prove most eligible. William Boyle will probably decide whose sons are best qualified.

In a few years all the educated young people in the country will have the right political ideas.

Remember, Mr. President, there will not be many students left outside this charmed circle.

There will be officers' training programs in the military colleges whose curriculum is approved by the defense department. Young men in the ROTC will be deferred for further study, if they accept commissions.

Students will be inducted and then assigned to study for the "civilian needs of the Nation." With most of their students in uniform, with most of their funds coming from the Government, what will happen to the independence of our colleges?

After their studies are completed these young doctors and engineers and Latin teachers will still be eligible for military service, and can be assigned to "civilian service in the national interest."

That means that as our young people finish their training, they can be directed by the Government to work in atomic energy plants or in any Government department.

The report of the Armed Services Committee tells us frankly that the new program is universal service, not selective service or universal training.

Everyone in the age group will be taken in, "on a strict universal, impartial basis of age."

Soon there will be no one in the covered ages in civilian life.

Our trade unions and our political parties will not be able to recruit any members until after they have been conditioned by universal service.

After a few years in such a straitjacket, how much will be left of American initiative and enterprise?

Do you remember, Mr. President, how we used to associate that sort of thing with Prussia?

We used to think it could never touch us here at home. Even in Nazi Germany the military leaders did not want a universal draft and a mass army. They wanted a smaller, thoroughly trained, technical army.

But Hitler wanted a universal draft. Why? Because it is the best way to keep all the active young men under political control.

When do we make the transition from the military-training program to universal service, civilian and military? It is not very clear, Mr. President.

Subsection (k) of section 4 provides that the President may, by Executive order, increase the training period to 6 months, change the type of training, decrease the period of active service, or eliminate the requirement of active military service.

This is where the leopard changes his spots.

Whenever the President halts induction into active military service all 18-year-olds not yet in the Armed Forces are liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps.

What is to be in this training program? Apparently anything the President decides is important for the military or civilian needs of the Nation.

Here is the camel's nose of universal peacetime labor service for all youth, the favorite program of all collectivist societies.

How long must they serve? The bill is not clear.

Suppose after the corps is set up the President decides to resume induction into the armed services? Then each young man would be required again to serve the rest of his 24 months, and remain in the Reserves for the rest of 8 years.

Evidently the President alone, is to decide. The report of the committee is curiously silent about this odd provision.

Girls are not yet specifically required to register. But the statement of intent and several other sections refer to "all persons."

We know how easy it would be for this administration to build up a popular "demand" for training 18-year-old girls.

They could be assigned to help in public baby-care stations, while the young men were sent to Afghanistan or Ethiopia to work on the point 4 program.

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that they had better open their eyes, for they are walking their last mile here, today.

It seems as if we could faintly see now, under the soft, innocuous words of the statement of intent of the bill, the real shape of the administration's manpower policy.

What we have here is the beginning of assignment-to-work.

Instead of a free labor market in which physicians and engineers, carpenters and waitresses pick the kind of job they want within their capacities, and walk out of a job they do not like, we have the Government regulating the work of our young people and channeling it in whatever direction it wishes.

This is the ultimate stage in collectivism, the goal of all the laws and regulations for control of money, of trade, of business, of schools. For the young people of this country, from 18 to 26, are under complete Government control when they can be sent from the National Security Training Corps to the Armed Forces, to the Reserves, and back to the Armed Forces whenever they disobey. I ask you, Mr. President, how many of these young people will dare to disagree with the Government? Which of them will join the ranks of the dissenters, the opposition, the free?

The committee bill is not universal military training. It permanently subjects every young man in this country to peacetime service, whose duties are not defined, whose administration is not defined.

The committee bill provides no pool of citizens trained to carry arms. It is something quite different. Whatever else it is, it is not our problem today. Are we facing an emergency or are we not? If we face a crisis in the world today, then our problem in Congress is to met that emergency. We have the means to meet it—that is, through the draft act. All we need to do is to extend the law we now have in effect, with the changes the Senate has already approved—the draft of 18-year-olds, the term of 24 months, the ceiling of four million. It is all so simple.

We must meet this emergency and prevent the recurring emergencies. We must end the terrible confusion which hangs over our young men and their families.

If our purpose is to defend our country against a threatened danger, the extension of the draft will do everything we need. It will bring out all the manpower we need, at whatever rate we need it, for whatever branch of the service we need to build up.

If military training is what Senators want, the committee bill will not give it to them. It will give them universal service, which is neither military nor training.

If national service, a labor draft, is what we want, then we need to spell it out, so the country may look at it. We need a new bill with all the provisions clear.

If we give the President his universal service bill, we are giving him a bigger, more grandiose world WPA, to be paid for by the sweat and blood of the youth of this Nation. He can start a thousand projects in a thousand directions. Congress and the public will never be able to follow what is done with their money, what international crimes are committed in their name.

If we extend the draft as proposed in our amendment, we give the President all the powers he can possibly want or use to meet any threat. We channel all our efforts in that direction. Congress can see what is going on.

We can lay down a military policy, a foreign policy, to protect our country, and insist that the President follow them.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let us remember that when we make this grant of power, greater than has ever before been given to any man in the history of our great Nation, we are trusting our future to those who have betrayed our past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not use all the time available to me. The Senator from Indiana very vehemently expresses his distrust and disapproval of the President of the United States, and his opposition to the grant of any further powers to the President. It is necessary for us to defend this country, without regard to who is President. If we do not defend it, we probably should not have another Presidential election, and none of the distinguished Senators on the other side would have an opportunity to correct all of the mistakes that they think they see at the present time in the Government of the United States.

This bill takes every crippling amendment which the Senate has heretofore rejected, and incorporates all of them in one amendment. It would make a bill under which we could not possibly reach the objectives which have been allowed by the Senate up until now and generally proved, of 3,462,000 men in the armed services.

It takes the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, striking out all of the UMT provisions of the bill. It adopts the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, after poisoning that amendment considerably by reducing the time from 4 years to 2. It likewise cuts back the term of service which is allowed to 21 months, thereby making it impossible to reach the objectives of the Armed Forces without dipping below the 18½-year limit when it comes to the drafting of men.

It will cripple the entire military program, and we must hope that it will be rejected overwhelmingly. Making it impossible to defend the United States is a very disastrous way to strike at the President of the United States or to express lack of confidence in him. As I have stated, it merely takes all the crippling amendments which have been offered heretofore and incorporates them in one poison dose which would destroy the defense of this Nation and make it impossible for us to reach even the objectives which almost every Senator has said were not unreasonable, particularly in having 3,400,000 men in the Armed Forces. I hope it will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

Mr. JENNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hennings | Monroney |
| Anderson | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Bennett | Hill | Mundt |
| Benton | Hoey | Murray |
| Bricker | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Md. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Cain | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Capehart | Jenner | Pastore |
| Carlson | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Case | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Smathers |
| Clements | Kem | Smith, Maine |
| Connally | Kerr | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Smith, N. C. |
| Dirksen | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Langer | Stennis |
| Dworshak | Lehman | Taft |
| Ecton | Lodge | Thye |
| Ellender | Long | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McCarran | Watkins |
| Frear | McFarland | Welker |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Wherry |
| George | McMahon | Wiley |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Williams |
| Green | Martin | Young |
| Hayden | Maybank | |
| Hendrickson | Millikin | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is unavoidably detained on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness, and, if present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business, and, if present, they would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business, and, if present, they would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—18

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Dworshak | Schoeppel |
| Bricker | Jenner | Taft |
| Butler, Nebr. | Johnson, Colo. | Watkins |
| Capehart | Kem | Welker |
| Case | Langer | Wherry |
| Dirksen | Millikin | Young |

NAYS—64

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Monroney |
| Anderson | Hill | Morse |
| Benton | Hoey | Mundt |
| Butler, Md. | Holland | Murray |
| Cain | Humphrey | Neely |
| Carlson | Hunt | Nixon |
| Chavez | Ives | O'Conor |
| Clements | Johnson, Tex. | O'Mahoney |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | Pastore |
| Cordon | Kerr | Russell |
| Douglas | Kilgore | Smathers |
| Ecton | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Ellender | Lehman | Smith, N. J. |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Smith, N. C. |
| Frear | Long | Sparkman |
| Fulbright | McCarran | Stennis |
| George | McFarland | Thye |
| Gillette | McKellar | Tobey |
| Green | McMahon | Wiley |
| Hayden | Magnuson | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Martin | |
| Hennings | Maybank | |

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brewster | Flanders | Robertson |
| Bridges | Kefauver | Saltonstall |
| Byrd | McCarthy | Vandenberg |
| Duff | McClellan | |
| Eastland | Malone | |

So Mr. JENNER's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, debate on the bill is limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, and the time is equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or some Member of the Senate designated by him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when the distinguished majority leader wrote out the unanimous-consent agreement he assigned to me the task of controlling the time of the opponents of the bill. I said that I would not oppose the bill, and would rather not control the time of the opponents. On the other hand, I said, if no one else should be willing to control the time, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. President, early in the debate I stated that I wanted to support a selective service act. The present act will expire in a few days. Certainly we are as much interested in the bill as anyone who has spoken in favor of the Selective Service Act. It is a democratic way of bringing the boys into the service. I think the bill contains many features which should not have been included. Many of its features should have been the subject of separate legislation. I objected to some of the provisions, and I voted against them. My record is plain. I shall continue to fight the objectionable features of the bill. However, we find ourselves in the position today of deciding whether we want a Selective Service Act or do not want a Selective Service Act. This is the only opportunity we shall have to act on it. Therefore I shall vote for the bill, because I am in favor of extending the selective-service features of it. If some of the objectionable provisions are stricken out by the House, that will be agreeable to me. I want the Senate to know that I shall continue to try to have the objectionable features removed from the proposed legislation. I think they should stand on their own bottom. I do not think they should have been placed in the bill in the first place. They have no relation to the selective-service features of the bill which most of us want to have enacted.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill although I do not like some of its provisions. This will be the only opportunity of getting a selective-service-law extension which is a must in view of our present dangerous international situation. For that reason I have balanced the necessity of having the life of the present act extended and having a Selective Service Act upon the books, as against the disadvantage of having some features in the bill which I think are unwise. There is only one answer to the needs of our present situation. We must have a Selective Service Act. That is why I shall vote for the bill.

I do not like the 18-year-old provision. I voted for 18½ years. In the

substitute which was presented by the Senator from Indiana in my behalf as well as his own we included a provision for drafting 18-year-olds. The Senate had already expressed its views on that subject, and for that reason I was willing to go along, although I think it is a bad thing to draft the 18-year-olds of this country under the conditions in which they will likely be surrounded in training camps.

In my opinion, this bill grants entirely too much power over our youths to the President of the United States and the commission which is to be appointed to actually take the place of Congress in setting up a military-training program. If it were not for the fact that we must have a draft extension to meet the dangerous condition we are in and the great threats against us, I would vote against the entire measure. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am willing to accept the universal military training provisions because of that great danger and the need of a draft act of some kind. It was either take this bill or nothing.

I am voting for this bill in the hope that at some time in the future we may get another look at the military manpower situation and may be able to write the provisions of a military-training bill which will fit the defense needs of the country, and at the same time preserve the liberties of the people.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise at this time to urge the final passage of this bill. The hearings on this bill have been long and exhaustive. The discussions of the Armed Services Committee were based on evidence. Their decision was prudent.

For many days now in the Senate we have debated this measure, devoting long hours to this bill which may well prove to be the salvation of our country. At times our debate has become bitter, our tempers short. But through it all, I believe that the Senators assembled here have acted with the best interests of our country and our way of life at heart.

There may be those who see this matter differently from the way I see it, but I am sure that all have honest beliefs based on what they think is best for the welfare of this Nation. I know that in this fateful moment when we must cast our vote, we will forget all past argument all past recriminations, and act for God and country.

Sometimes in the heat of debate and in the long, tiring hours of our work, we forget the world around us—the black headlines scorched in anguish across the front pages of our leading newspapers.

Mr. President, I think it might be well at this time to recall a few of the tragic events that have brought us to this moment in history—this moment when we must once more consider legislation such as this. Mr. President, for well over 5 years this Nation and all of the free world have been the victims of a savage war, cold and hot, waged by the cruel masters of the Kremlin. This so-called world revolution has now reached a dramatic climax in the blizzard-swept mountains of Korea.

I think it may well be in vain if we indulge any fond hopes of peace and reconciliation when the facts are against us. That is how we have arrived at this hour of decision. We will gather no strength by irresolution and inaction, by lying flat on our backs, believing in the cruel phantom of hope. The graveyards of the centuries are filled with the wreckage of civilizations which failed to meet the challenge of the times, which failed to meet the issue, which hoped for the best when the worst was bound to happen, which hoped for survival in spite of weakness and indecision.

In the 170 years of our history, this Nation has had repeated instruction in the lessons of unpreparedness. Too often we have been poor pupils. We have not applied what we have learned. We have acted too late, too often. We have had to do hastily in time of war that which we had failed to do reasonably in time of peace. We have had to train inadequately the men we have refused to train thoroughly.

The tragic result of this is written in blood on battlefields all over the world. It is sickening to think of the thousands of graves filled by young Americans who simply did not have the necessary training to prepare them for the worst.

Within the last year we have seen thousands of veteran reservists of the last war called back to active duty because we had no trained Reserves of young men wso had not served before. There are now 800,000 reservists on duty. I believe it is the right of every young American to receive the training which may mean life or death to him on a future battlefield of freedom.

In our past history we have bounced along from crisis to crisis, always hoping that each crisis would be the last one. Too often we were wrong. Men with foresight should always prepare for the worst rather than hope for the best.

At this time in our history we must have something more than a timid tiptoe toward preparedness.

I know of no change in the international situation which would justify inaction here. What has there been in the conduct of the Kremlin since last July to justify any hope that this bill is not needed? True, we have an occasional peace offensive, as is now being waged on the battlefield of Paris, but how do these peace offenses balance against the warlike preparations which cover Europe and Asia and darken the world? Are fleets and armies in the hands of the aggressor the instruments of peace? I say that in the hands of aggressors they are the implements of war and slavery—the last arguments to which dictators resort.

Talk and argument and indignation do not balance well against tanks and artillery and the trained men who use them. Let us not make brave assertions based only on what we would like to be the facts. We must not handcuff, hamstring, and hamper ourselves at this dangerous time in our history.

Mr. President, we must not continue to go up the hill of optimism and down the hill of pessimism as threats to our security increase and decrease. Just because we receive a pleasant little note from Stalin today does not mean that he will not blackjack us tomorrow. Just because our troops are advancing in Korea today does not mean that we can relax our efforts.

Too many of us are for all-out preparedness when we are retreating and for half-hearted preparedness when we are advancing. That makes little difference to the man on the lonely battlefield who is cut down as our armies advance. Men and machines are lost both ways.

We must tell our allies today, by the passage of this bill, that a strong and ready America will rise up as a symbol of peace and justice in this world. We must give them that inspiration. We must tell our young men who are today struggling through the bleak blizzards of Korea that we are not going to forget them—that we are going to build our strength for the inevitable victory—that we are going to have the strength to relieve the lonely, heartsick men in Korea—that we are going to help them in their struggle.

Thousands of white crosses from two world wars and one Korea war are the most persuasive arguments I know for adopting this program—for adopting this program which will tell the aggressors that we are ready.

We might well ponder a message written for us by a man who died on a distant battlefield of freedom in the First World War. This message from the thousands of men who have died while holding high the torch of freedom in the past—this message to us, the living, who must protect those freedoms today—should be remembered by us all in this fateful hour:

To you from failing hands, we throw the torch;
Be yours to lift it high.
If you break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with expressions of profound regret that some of our colleagues find some of the provisions of the bill so distasteful, but in the belief we have an excellent bill the committee yields back the remainder of its time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the

Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business, and, if present, they would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness. He is at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—79

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Millikin |
| Anderson | Hennings | Monroney |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Benton | Hill | Mundt |
| Bricker | Hoey | Murray |
| Butler, Md. | Holland | Neely |
| Butler, Nebr. | Humphrey | Nixon |
| Cain | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Capehart | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Carlson | Johnson, Colo. | Pastore |
| Case | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Smathers |
| Clements | Kefauver | Smith, Maine |
| Connally | Kem | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Kerr | Smith, N. C. |
| Douglas | Kilgore | Sparkman |
| Duff | Knowland | Stennis |
| Dworshak | Lehman | Taft |
| Ecton | Lodge | Thye |
| Ellender | Long | Tobey |
| Ferguson | McCarran | Watkins |
| Frear | McFarland | Wherry |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Wiley |
| George | McMahon | Williams |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Young |
| Green | Martin | |
| Hayden | Maybank | |

NAYS—5

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dirksen | Langer | Welker |
| Jenner | Schoeppel | |

NOT VOTING—11

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brewster | Flanders | Robertson |
| Bridges | McCarthy | Saltonstall |
| Byrd | McClellan | Vandenberg |
| Eastland | Malone | |

So the bill (S. 1) was passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'.

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

"(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

"(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command."

(b) Section 2 of such act is repealed.

(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen."

(d) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate Armed Forces."

(e) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects (including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard)."

(f) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least 4 months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of 24 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title."

(h) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such act is repealed.

(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter," where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act," and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of 8 years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve com-

ponent of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(j) The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E-1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(k) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.

(l) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-four."

(m) Section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed 6 months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of 4 months but not in excess of 6 months which may be designated in such resolution;

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 24 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than 4 months.

"(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

(n) Section 5 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19 unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of 19 to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as 90 days older, (ii) has not attained the age of 19, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the following: "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer-procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed 75,000 persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than 10 years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research

under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended (1) by inserting in clause (1) of the second sentence after the word "persons", where it appears the second time, the following: "(other than wives alone)", and (2) by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof the words "wives or".

(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Subsection (j) of section 6 of such act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction," and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction."

(u) Section 7 of such act is repealed.

(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board."

(x) Section 16 of such act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(j) the terms 'active training and service' shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of 4 months (or not to exceed 6 months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(y) Section 17 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by Departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated Departments and agencies."

(z) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "21" and inserting in lieu thereof "24."

(aa) Such act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fourth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act and each year thereafter, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such reviews, the committees shall report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is hereby amended by striking out "July 9, 1951," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act."

(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953."

SEC. 3. The act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2 of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the Reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the selective-service system, shall not exceed a total of 4,000,000 persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this act."

SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

TITLE II

SEC. 21. (a) The first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army," approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out the words "until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than 5 years of not to exceed 2,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than 5 years of not to exceed 25,000."

(b) Section 3 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as amended and passed by the Senate be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if it would not be proper to have the statement made now for the RECORD that it would have been most gratifying to the late Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], who belonged to the Armed Services Committee, could he have been here today and voted on the measure just passed. He was a member of the Armed Services Committee and it would have been indeed of much satisfaction to him could he have been present and seen the final passage of the bill, and taken part in passing it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know it would have pleased Senator Chapman very much had he been present and taken part in the final passage of the bill. He labored very hard on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of the current debate on Senate bill 1, an article entitled, "Reversing a 'Drift' From the Constitution," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of Friday, March 9, 1951. The article deals specifically with the action of the Senate in placing a limit on the size of the military establishment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVERSING A DRIFT FROM THE CONSTITUTION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The Senate's action in placing a limit on the size of the Military Establishment was taken because the advocates made a constitutional point which was unusual in that it could be fully supported. This was that, when the Congress exclusively assigned the power "to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy and make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces," the purpose was to reserve to Congress the discretion to fix and alter these limits.

In this debate there was no twilight zone of conflicting powers, as there was in the dispute over whether and how Congress should associate itself with the dispatch of additional troops to Europe, now being resolved in favor of the view that Congress should impose conditions. When Senators MORSE, GEORGE, BRICKER, and others had stated the constitutional issue, a majority stood ready to enforce the principle despite the impressive protests from the Pentagon.

SENATOR MORSE'S VIEW

Mr. MORSE, who wanted to fix the ceiling at three and a half millions, led off. He said:

"I do not believe that we should ignore the importance of the Congress giving orders to the Military Establishment as to what its manpower ceiling should be. * * * The check for which some Members * * * argue is the check on appropriations. * * * I do not believe we should turn the Appropriations Committee into a legislative policy committee. * * * I believe that now is the time to determine the manpower ceiling."

The Senator from Oregon then rejected what he called an emotional argument, conveyed by the question whether Senators did not have enough confidence in the generals and admirals to let them impose and change the limits. "I have confidence in them as military men, to execute legislative policies determined by the Congress," he said. "But I do not have sufficient confidence in their judgment on legislative questions to make them an extension of the Congress * * * and delegate to them legislative power."

A HISTORICAL PARALLEL

This brought to his feet Senator GEORGE, who is much respected as an analyst of the Constitution. He said that in the last 15 years there had been a "notable drift toward the delegation of authority by the Congress to the Executive and to other branches of the Government." And touching the proposal to leave the size of the Armed Forces to the military command, he quoted Gibbon as relating that "the Roman Senate, with absolute complacency, voted the power to raise additional legions without any limitations or restrictions upon it," leading to the bankruptcy and downfall of Rome.

Mr. BRICKER, reading the pertinent sections of the Constitution, remarked he did not "see how it could more clearly have fixed responsibility as to the number, as to the rules and regulations, and as to the use and utilization of the Armed Forces than it did in section 8. * * * I think we would be recreant to our trust and would violate our oath if we refused to assume our responsibility in determining the size and kind of Army we shall have in this country."

THE TWO ROLL CALLS

Furthermore, Mr. MORSE enforced the position by the statement that when the military authorities could show they needed more men, "You will get a prompt hearing, and, as in this instance, when you have proved your case you will get your men." The Senate then provided a fair majority to limit, but larger than the largest figure from the Pentagon.

The two roll calls which were taken do not indicate precisely which Senators were chiefly concerned with assuring a high limit and which with the constitutional point. Both showed a division of 49 to 41, but there were many shifts. On the first roll call the question was whether to make the limit three and a half millions or four millions; on the second the question was whether to incorporate the four millions limit in the draft bill.

ONE ISSUE SETTLED

Senators BYRD, FREAR, JOHNSON of Colorado, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, MCCLELLAN, MCMAHON, O'CONOR, O'MAHONEY, ROBERTSON, and SMITH of North Carolina (Democrats), and CAPEHART, CASE, IVES, SMITH of New Jersey, THYE and TOBEY (Republicans) were the only Members who voted in favor of both resolutions. Democratic Senator GEORGE, who apparently thought the four millions limit too high, voted against the first amendment to that effect and in favor of the second as the best limit obtainable, and many others followed the same procedure. Republican Senators DUFF, LODGE, and NIXON, supported the first resolution and opposed the second. A complicated variety of reasons, some of which were stated on the floor and some not, account for the curiosity of the divisions.

But the debate settled one issue clearly—that Congress is becoming increasingly aware of the notable drift mentioned by Mr GEORGE and intends to reverse it. But the way back will be hard in times like these when it is obvious that the Executive must not be too technically hampered in the exercise of his duties as Commander in Chief.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, now that the bill has passed, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] for his splendid handling of this measure. He and the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and, in fact, all the members of the Armed Services Committee, are deserving of our warmest commendation. We know that the committee has worked diligently for many weeks and reported a fine bill. Its members are deserving of a good word for their hard work.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is also my desire to thank Members of the Senate for their friendly cooperation in bringing the bill to a final vote today.

Mr. President, Senators have inquired whether we are to have a session tomorrow. I do not believe that that would meet with the approval of the minority leader. He has cooperated with me, so I will yield to him and agree that the Senate go over until Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills and other measures to which there is no objection. I may say that immediately following completion of the call of the calendar, we hope to consider S. 728, the McCarran amendment to the Subversives Activities Control Act, and such other noncontroversial bills as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, where will the call start?

Mr. McFARLAND. At the point where the previous call left off.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are only two bills on the calendar up to that point.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; we shall include those two.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to a complete call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a speech which Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, delivered last evening over radio networks. I shall quote two sentences from that speech:

Not a single critical statement has been voiced by such inveterate enemies of real price control as Senators TAFT, CAPEHART, BYRD, and WHERRY. Their silence is an eloquent testimonial to the fact that the public is getting price control in name only.

Mr. Green went on in his speech, of course, severely to criticize the administration and those responsible for the lack of price control, as he puts it.

Mr. President, I am dispatching tonight a letter to the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green, which reads as follows:

MARCH 9, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN,
*President, American Federation of Labor,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. GREEN: I have before me a copy of your radio address of March 8, and am of the opinion that you choose to ignore the record or that you sought to inject political misrepresentations in your purported report to the American people on the domestic economy problems of the day.

Had you been inclined to stick to the record in your address, you would have had no need to charge me with being a party to the failure of the administration to properly meet the inflationary spiral.

It is ironical that you should choose to charge me with not raising a voice of protest against the failure of the Truman administration to control prices. Let's look at the record:

You remember, of course, that Mr. Truman submitted the original defense production bill to the Congress in July 1950 and that his bill carried no provision for price controls. That fact, sir, was widely publicized and available to any person, even those who would not take the time to read the bill.

You are also familiar with the fact that public hearings were held on that bill on July 24, 25, and 26, 1950, and wide publicity was given to the testimony of many witnesses that the bill did not provide for price controls.

It is a matter of record, Mr. Green, that neither you nor your organization sought to testify at those hearings, and the file of letters and telegrams received by the committee does not show any correspondence from you or from the organization you represent voicing a protest against the failure of Mr. Truman to ask the Congress for the power to control prices.

During those public hearings I constantly questioned witnesses about the need for price control legislation and mentioned that I thought price ceilings should be frozen as of the date we entered the Korean War.

Further, Mr. Green, I issued a press release on August 1, 1950, during the executive sessions of the Banking and Currency Committee on the defense production bill, in which I stated that I would offer an amendment on that day calling for the freezing of price ceilings as of June 30, 1950.

I am enclosing with this letter a copy of that press release.

The amendment was not accepted by the committee because of the contention by administration leaders that it could not be enforced although the same enforcement agencies now assisting in the enforcement of price regulations existed at that time.

I received no support at that time from either you or from the organization for which you spoke to the Nation by radio on last Thursday night.

Let's proceed further with the record which you ignored when you mentioned my name in that broadcast:

On December 15, 1950, I sent a letter to President Truman in which I offered a recommendation for the control of meat prices. I received a reply of acknowledgment of receipt of the letter, but no further consideration.

That letter was also released to the press, and I enclose a copy of it. However, I received no support from you, nor from the organization which you represent.

It probably will also interest you to read the enclosed copy of a release on an address I made on February 13, of this year, in Marion, Ohio, in which I said that if the Truman administration had accepted my recommendations to freeze price ceilings as of June 30, 1950, the American consumers would have saved nearly $10,000,000,000 in living costs up to that time.

That is only a small portion of my record on behalf of price controls in connection with the Defense Production Act of 1950. As you know, I am also a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, the so-called "watchdog committee," and in the sessions of that committee, the record will show, I have constantly urged the administrators of the act to give the American people the protection against inflation that was intended and provided by the act.

I also wish to call your attention, Mr. Green, to the fact that my record for price controls to block inflation did not begin with the Defense Production Act of 1950.

I enclose a copy of an address I made on the Senate floor on December 15, 1947, on the matter of control of prices. You recall, Mr. Green, that at the time of this address the Congress was in special session at the behest of Mr. Truman for the primary purpose of meeting a critical inflationary trend. Much more could be said, Mr. Green, in support of my contention that you either chose to ignore the record, or you sought to inject political intrigue in your address on last Thursday night, but I believe the material hereby submitted is sufficient to establish my position as being wrongfully represented by you.

It is a great pleasure that I have this opportunity to furnish you with this material.

Sincerely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks the release I made on August 1, 1950, the release I made on December 15, 1950, the release I made on February 14, 1951, and the release I made on December 15, 1947, as well as a copy of Mr. Green's speech over the radio, delivered on March 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART will introduce in the executive session of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee this afternoon an amendment to S. 3936, the Defense Production Act of 1950, to freeze the price ceilings of all commodities and materials as of June 30, 1950.

Under Senator CAPEHART's amendment the frozen ceilings would be continued until January 30, 1951, or until that portion of the act is terminated by Presidential order in the event that order precedes the termination date of the amendment.

The amendment, Senator CAPEHART explained, would not prevent the sale of commodities or materials at lower prices than existed on June 30.

In introducing the amendment, Senator CAPEHART said:

"This amendment is designed to give the people immediate relief from the increasing upward spiral of prices while the long-range proposals to meet the situation are being prepared for actual operation.

"Credit restrictions and other methods of curtailing inflation will take time before their effect is felt by the people. The same will be true in the event Congress should enact price-control measures, either for immediate action or for stand-by use. It would take the President several months to get price-control machinery into operation.

"The people are in need of protection against what is becoming an alarming condition of inflation while the Congress and Government have an opportunity to give the over-all problem greater study."

---

DECEMBER 15, 1950.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the event it is your intention to enforce the powers of the Defense Production Act of 1950, which was enacted into law by the Congress several months ago, to control the prices of commodities, I should like to offer a suggestion which I believe would eliminate many inequities and discriminations and hardships that normally follow such actions.

As you know, Mr. President, I am a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which drafted the Defense Production Act of 1950.

My efforts to attain an equitable solution to the obvious problem of prices and their control did not terminate with the passage of the act. I have since been actively engaged in a grass-roots study of the over-all picture as it applies to the producer and the consumer.

I believe that this study has brought about that solution, and I am writing you only in an attitude of helpfulness to you, to the producer, to the consumer, and to the national defense program.

A fair and unbiased study of the economic situation we face today reveals rather clearly that the critical disturbance to our economy did not occur until the international situation indicated the necessity for all-out mobilization.

That being an accepted fact, and I am confident it is accepted as a fact by every economist, it is necessary that we use to the best

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 12, 1951

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# AN ACT

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'.

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

"(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

"(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect

the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is repealed.

(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen".

(d) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate Armed Forces."

(e) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects (including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard)."

(f) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least four months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary

of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.

(h) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such Act is repealed.

(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and

shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(j) The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an

allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(k) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.

(l) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-four".

(m) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed six months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of four months but not in excess of six months which may be designated in such resolution;

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security

Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than four months.

"(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall, subject to the direc-

tion of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

(n) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons

who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board

who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the following: "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons

temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement

programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training.

There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting in clause (1) of the second sentence after the word "persons", where it appears the second time, the following: "(other than wives alone)", and (2) by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof the words "wives or".

(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Subsection (j) of section 6 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction", and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction".

(u) Section 7 of such Act is repealed.

(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall

upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(x) Section 16 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(j) the terms 'active training and service' shall be

deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(y) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by Departments and agencies designated by the

Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated Departments and agencies."

(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four".

(aa) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fourth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act and each year thereafter, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such reviews, the committees shall report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is hereby amended by striking out "July 9,

1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828); is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".

SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed

a total of four million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this Act."

SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".

## TITLE II

SEC. 21. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out the words "until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed two thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in

the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed twenty-five thousand".

(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955".

Passed the Senate March 9, 1951.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

*Secretary.*

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

## AN ACT

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

MARCH 12, 1951
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

ment, and to refute Communist propaganda to the effect that America is scheming to attack the Soviet Union.

A splendid beginning along these lines has been made by the Voice of America Russian-language broadcast programs. The best tribute to their effectiveness its the all-out scale of the Soviet jamming effort. Before the jamming, we had many direct indications that the programs commanded a wide and eager audience.

Even today, what filters through the wall of interference is a far more powerful weapon than the atom bomb—a weapon for peace, that reaches men's minds and creates instead of destroying.
special

Malcolm Johnson, INS writer, from a special series of articles published in December 1950:

The American programs, giving the facts about American life and American policy, are penetrating the iron curtain countries and even winning some converts from Communism.

The Russians evidently are greatly worried over the increasing effectiveness of Voice of American broadcasts to overseas' listeners, including millions in the Iron Curtain countries.

Ray Zeman, Los Angeles Times, tells of interviewing Joseph Vladimir Polodna, who for 16 years was a Czech diplomat in Amsterdam, Singapore, Lima and Washington:

"The Voice of America at the present time," Polodna says, "is the biggest and most effective weapon combating the very effective and very skillful Kremlin propaganda in every satellite country, especially Czechoslovakia."

Amerika Magyarsag—The American Hungarian—Bridgeport weekly publication, August 25, 1950:

We have mentioned it on two previous occasions that our editor, an interview with whom has been broadcast over the Voice of America radio a few weeks ago, has been receiving letters not only from Hungary, but from all over the world, from Hungarians who have heard the interview. These letters are evidence of the significance of the Voice of America, and of its world-wide success.

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include additional matter.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARDIE SCOTT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. CLEMENTE) for today, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered at the time of presentation of the First Silver Quill award of National Business Publications.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article of February 27.

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permisison to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the New York Post.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today.

Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the South Carolina Farmer.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from Marine Progress for February.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the head of the New York State Civil Defense Commission.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances.

Mr. BROWNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement adopted by the board of directors of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include copy of a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject India's Emergency Assistance Act of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by the mayor of Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Local No. 295 of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks and also a clipping from the Detroit Free Press.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PRESTON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a magazine article.

Mr. ELLIOTT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend

his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1. An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

275. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

276. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1950, also a list of all cases heard by the Board during the period July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, and a list of cases in which the Board rendered decisions for the same period, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

277. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Vasil Bliznakoff or Bill Valos, file No. A–5554927 CR 28972, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

278. A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

279. A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGRATH: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 195. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 3164. A bill to provide an equitable method for fixing rents charged by the Atomic Energy Commission for housing accommodations at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3165. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 3166. A bill to amend the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 3167. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to add to the free list articles temporarily imported for display at shows, fairs, expositions, and similar events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3168. A bill to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 3169. A bill to amend section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3170. A bill to provide free postage for certain mail matter of the fourth class sent to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3171. A bill to permit Chinese students to remain in the United States for a period of 3 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3172. A bill to provide for the termination of the powers and succession to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3173. A bill to extend pension benefits payable under the veterans' regulations to persons who served with the United States military occupation forces in Germany during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3174. A bill to provide for the issuance, without cost, of patents for certain public land which have been held under claim or color of title, and on which taxes have been paid, for more than 20 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE (by request):

H. R. 3175. A bill to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, relating to State taxation of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3176. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington," approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3177. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3178. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3179. A bill to extend the Federal franking privilege to nonpolitical activities of the New York Civil Defense Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 3180. A bill to establish an independent Federal Education Agency in the Federal Government and to define its organization, power, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3181. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1952, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 196 Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 161. Resolution providing for an increase in the salary of an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 162. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Elsie Clancy, widow of John F. Clancy, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 163. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 99; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relating to Senate enrolled concurrent resolution No. 6, concerning the confidential nature of public records of recipients of public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, protesting the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relating to Assembly joint resolution No. 6, relative to ratifying a pro-

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

**OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE**
**Division of Legislative Reports**
**(For Department staff only)**

**Issued** Mar. 16, 1951
**For actions of** Mar. 15, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 47

**CONTENTS**

Adjournment.....14
Agricultural investigations.....5
Appropriations.....6
Civil defense.....21
Commodity exchanges.....9
Cotton.....3
Electrification.....25
Expenditures.....1,26
Flood damage.....20
Food and drugs.....17,18
Foreign affairs, aid.....24
Grain.....7,18
Health.....1
Labor, farm.....16,22
Livestock and meat....1,11
Military training.....4
Organization executive.....10,15,19
Peanuts.....2
Personnel.....15
Prices.....3
control.....3
food.....9
Rent control.....8
R.F.C.....19
Taxation.....23
Transportation.....7,13,25
Water utilization.....12

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported military-training bill. Sens. McClellan, Aiken, et al introduced bills to carry out Hoover Commission recommendations for USDA and other agencies. House approved measure providing $50,000 for Agriculture Committee investigations. Sen. Dirksen spoke in favor of economy in Government expenditures.

## SENATE

1. HEALTH. Debated S. 445, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units. Sen. Dirksen criticized the bill and spoke in favor of economy in Government expenditures. Sen. Langer spoke of the need for health units in rural areas and said more attention is paid to animal diseases by the Government than to human health. (pp. 2547-56, 2564-5.)

2. PEANUTS. On behalf of Sen. Hoey, Majority Leader McFarland asked for immediate consideration of H. R. 2615, to modify the acreage-allotments and marketing-quota provisions regarding peanuts. After a brief discussion, Sen. Dirksen objected. (p. 2565.)

3. PRICE CONTROL. Received a Ga. Legislature resolution criticizing the recent cotton-price order (p. 2516).

## HOUSE

4. MILITARY TRAINING. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment S. 1, the universal military training and selective service bill (H. Rept. 271) (p. 2597). As reported the bill contains the language of H. R. 2811, which was inserted as a substitute amendment. The bill would lower the present draft age from 19 to 18½ years and extend the length of service from 21 to 26 months.

5. AGRICULTURAL INVESTIGATIONS. Agreed without amendment to H. Res. 163, to provide $50,000 for investigations of agricultural mobilization and other farm matters by the Agriculture Committee (p. 2571). The measure was reported by the Administration Committee (H. Rept. 267) (p. 2597).

6. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee was given unanimous consent to have

until midnight, Fri., Mar. 16, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation bill (p. 2571).

7. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Andresen, Minn., urged that prompt action be taken to make boxcars available to move midwest grain before it spoils (p. 2571).
Rep. Mansfield, Mont., urged that boxcars be made available to ship grain from Mont. elevators, and inserted letters from Mont. mills and elevators on the subject (p. 2572).

8. RENT CONTROL. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 196, to continue rent controls until June 30, 1951 (H. Rept. 268) (p. 2597).

9. FOOD PRICES. Reps. Bolton, Ohio, Harden, Ind., Church, Ill., Thompson, Mich., and St. George, N. Y., discussed food price increases over the past 30 years and urged steps to control inflation (pp. 2577-8).
Rep. McKinnon, Calif., claimed that price increases on foods have resulted
10. in part from failure to authorize control of commodity speculation, and discussed the matter with Rep. McCormack, and Rep. Keating (pp. 2591-3).

10. REORGANIZATION. Rep. Busbey, Ill., criticized the proposed "amalgamation of the State Department and the Foreign Service without first submitting the plan to Congress" (pp. 2574-5).

11. FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE. Received a S. Dak. Legislature memorial urging continuation of the foot-and-mouth disease campaign in Mexico (p. 2598).

12. WATER UTILIZATION. Received a S. Dak. Legislature memorial favoring the sealing of artesian wells in areas to be flooded by Missouri River dams in S. Dak. (p. 2598).

13. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Received a Md. Legislature memorial opposing appropriations for this project (p. 2598).

14. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 19 (p. 2597). Majority Leader McCormack announced the program for next week as follows: Mon., Consent Calendar and rent control extension; Tues., Private Calendar and Treasury-Post Office Appropriation bill and Wed. and Thurs. undetermined (pp. 2576-7).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

15. REORGANIZATION. S. 1149, by Sen. Aiken (for himself and Sens. O'Conor, McCarthy, Taft, Ferguson, Smith (N.J.), Lodge, Douglas, Benton, Duff, Dirksen, Saltonstall, and Ives), to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee (pp. 2518, 2545). Remarks of Sen. Aiken (pp. 2544-5).
Sen. McClellan introduced (for himself and various other Senators), the following bills to carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission: S. 1134, relating to principles and policies on management; S. 1135, relating to a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service (to Post Office and Civil Service Committee); S. 1136, to give GSA responsibility for certain miscellaneous activities in D. C.; S. 1137, relating to separation of subsidy from air-mail pay (to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee); S. 1138, to create a Veterans' Insurance Corporation (to Finance Committee); S. 1139, relating to regulatory agencies; and S. 1140, to establish and consolidate Government health and medical facilities. Bills were referred to Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee unless otherwise indicated. (pp. 2543-4).

82D CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
*1st Session* } { No. 271

# 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

MARCH 15, 1951.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany S. 1]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'."

(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of eighteen years and six months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of eighteen years and six months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of eighteen years and six months. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other

than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereafter provided (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act."

(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six in January 1945."

(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the six-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone)."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-six consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"(3) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of eighteen, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.

"(4) Any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for

induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"(5) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."

(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of six years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(i) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six."

(k) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-six months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under section 4 of this title who on that date have not attained the

nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of six months: *Provided*, That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of nineteen years during the period of such deferment.

"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians; of the remaining two members one shall be an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, the other shall be a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a reserve component. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

"(4) The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be two years. The term of office of the remaining three members of the Commission shall be for three, four, and five years, respectively. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member, shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. Members of the Commission, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. Subject to the direction of the President, and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies, standards, and directives of the Commission.

"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"(7) The Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a plan or plans for—

"(i) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, which program shall include the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(ii) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(iii) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;

"(iiii) such other policies and standards as may be established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection, and

"(iiiii) recommendations with respect to disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

"(1) the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress and referred to the Committees on Armed Services, during which sixty-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses of the Congress, by the

affirmative vote of a majority of either House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such plan: *Provided*, That the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses to which the plan is referred shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of forty-five calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress, report a resolution to their respective Houses approving or disapproving the plan submitted by the Commission, and its recommendations thereon, and such resolution shall be privileged and may be called up by any Member of either House; and

"(2) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(9) Following the adoption of a plan submitted by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (8), the Commission may, if changes to the plan are deemed desirable by the Commission, submit such changes to the Congress in accordance with the procedure prescribed in paragraph (8), and such changes shall be acted upon as prescribed in paragraph (8).

"(10) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding six months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission, and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding six months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

"(11) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: *Provided, however*, That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"(12) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(l) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferrable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that

such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."

(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided*, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(v) Section 10 of said Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal Judicial District in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof as may be prescribed by the President.", and (2) by adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"(g) the Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."

(w) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than six months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954."

(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of ninety days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of twelve or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session) is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1952" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".

SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act, except members of the reserve components.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided*, That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written preference to discharge their obligation for training in the National Security Training Corps or training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race, which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training or training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit."

SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to accomplish two highly important objectives:

1. It will enable the armed services to immediately raise and *maintain* an armed force of sufficient size, as determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to meet our minimum security requirements; and

2. It will establish a universal military training program.

## REDUCING THE PRESENT DRAFT AGE FROM 19 YEARS TO 18 YEARS AND 6 MONTHS

The Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, requires the registration of every male citizen of the United States and, with certain exceptions, every other male person residing in the United States between the ages of 18 through 25. It also authorizes the induction of registrants who are between the ages of 19 through 25.

As of October 31, 1950, there were 7,957,157 registrants between the ages 19 through 25. The following chart shows the breakdown of persons registered under the present law:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total number of registrants, ages 19 to 26 | | 7, 957, 157 |
| Members of the Armed Forces, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, and registrants inducted under the Selective Service Act of 1948 who were subsequently discharged or transferred to a Reserve component | | 460, 502 |
| Veterans liable for registration but exempted from service by law | | 2, 862, 969 |
| Registrants already examined and found physically, mentally, or morally unfit for service: | | |
| Men found unfit for obvious physical defects | 388, 195 | |
| Men found unfit by Armed Forces at pre-induction exam for following reasons: | | |
| Administrative reasons | 10, 156 | |
| Failing mental test only | 167, 783 | |
| Neuropsychiatric | 23, 157 | |
| Physical only | 158, 033 | |
| Mental test and physical | 47, 126 | |
| Men found unfit by Armed Forces at final induction exam | 5, 063 | |
| Total number of men found physically, mentally, or morally unfit by Armed Forces | | 799, 513 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Conscientious objectors opposed to both combatant and noncombatant service | | 13, 583 | |
| Ministers and divinity students exempted by law | | 48, 918 | |
| Aliens exempt from service but required to register under the Selective Service Act | | 8, 541 | |
| Government officials deferred by law | | 20 | |
| Men with dependents, deferred by regulation: | | | |
| Nonfathers | 533, 202 | | |
| Fathers | 651, 691 | | |
| Total number dependency deferments | | 1, 184, 893 | |
| Registrants deferred because of agricultural occupation | | 129, 341 | |
| Registrants deferred because occupation is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: | | | |
| Industrial deferments | 63, 713 | | |
| Students of the healing arts | 16, 000 | | |
| Other students, in upper half of their class (including ROTC) | 554, 000 | | |
| Total number occupational deferments | | 633, 713 | |
| Members of reserve components or students taking military training: | | | |
| Members of National Guard and active Reserve units | 137, 186 | | |
| Students in senior division ROTC | 45, 729 | | |
| Total reservists and ROTC students deferred upon whom services have issued NME 44 (get them in sophomore year) | | 182, 915 | |
| Total number deferred from service by law and/or regulations | | | 6, 324, 908 |
| Number of men not yet examined | | | 1, 632, 249 |
| Number of men who will probably be found physically, mentally, or morally unfit for service under present standards (37 percent), and who will be reclassified and deferred (13 percent) | | | 816, 124 |
| Total expected number out of manpower pool who may be inducted into Armed Forces, including conscientious objectors not opposed to noncombatant service | | | 816, 124 |

The most startling revelation from this analysis is the fact that under existing practices nearly 800,000 young men between the ages of 19 and 26 are now classified as IV–F, and are thus unavailable for induction. In addition to this however, is the equally shocking disclosure that of the 1,632,000 men now classified as I–A pending physical examination, at least 37 percent are expected to be rejected as being mentally, morally, or physically unfit for induction. Thus, almost 1,400,000 young men in this Nation cannot be inducted under the present physical and mental standards of acceptability.

The proposed bill goes far toward remedying this situation by reducing the mental and physical standards to those prevailing in January of 1945. By requiring those standards, it is anticipated that 326,000 men now classified IV–F will, on reexamination, be made liable for induction. In addition, it is anticipated that an additional 164,000 men in the I–A unexamined group will be qualified for service under the proposed standards. These men would otherwise have been classified as IV–F after examination, under current standards.

The next large heretofore untapped source of manpower is found in the group of nonfathers, who at present are, generally speaking, in a deferred class. The proposed bill removes the authority of the President to defer men whose only dependent is a wife (except in cases of

extreme hardship). Unless such persons are otherwise deferrable for other reasons, registered nonfathers will hereafter be subject to induction. It is anticipated that this will increase the manpower pool by approximately 283,000 men.

In addition, approximately 55,000 men who have or will attain the age of 19 during this fiscal year will be liable for induction under the proposed lowered mental and physical standards.

Thus, the proposed bill, by reducing mental and physical standards and by eliminating the deferment of nonveterans who have a wife only as a dependent, increases the immediate manpower pool by approximately 828,000 men.

The testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Defense indicated that under present physical and mental standards, and without drafting nonfathers, there will be available, on June 30, 1951, a manpower pool of only 411,000 men. This number, according to the Director of Selective Service, is not sufficient to maintain an adequate safety margin, since it does not permit any possible rapid expansion in our Armed Forces, nor does it provide sufficient leeway for the myriad of reasons for temporary deferments and postponements that inevitably result when heavy draft calls are passed on to the local boards. It must be remembered that we are dealing with people, not just statistics. Potential inductees become ill, need time to dispose of businesses, need time to harvest crops, need time to adjust hardship conditions at home, and need time to rearrange previously made plans and careers of all conceivable types and descriptions. The circumstances to be encountered by each of the more than 3,700 draft boards throughout the country can never be accurately predetermined. There must, therefore, be an adequate manpower cushion to assimilate unanticipated temporary shortages here and there throughout the Nation.

Under the present law and under the present standards of physical and mental acceptability, therefore, we can anticipate a net pool of only 411,000 available men on June 30, 1951. Under the provisions of the proposed bill heretofore described this pool will be augmented by 828,000 men, raising the net pool of available men to 1,239,000 men.

What, then, is the necessity for reducing the draft age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months? To properly present the facts substantiating such a reduction requires an examination of the present and proposed strength of our Armed Forces.

By July 1, 1951, or shortly thereafter, the armed services are expected to reach a planned strength of 3,462,000 men.

As of October 1, 1950, there were 2,100,000 men on active duty in our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, including 487,000 men from the National Guard and Reserves. Between October 1, 1950, and July 1, 1951, the armed services must obtain approximately 1,400,000 men. Of this amount, an additional 380,000 men will be furnished by the National Guard and the Reserve components; 862,000 will come from inductions and enlistments of men between the ages of 19 through 25; 120,000 will come from enlistments of 17- and 18-year-olds; 40,000 veterans will enlist; and it is anticipated that 127,000 men will reenlist.

It appears, therefore, that the rapid expansion during the present fiscal year will take 862,000 men out of the 19–26 age groups. Under present law, and under the prevailing standards of acceptability, there

will only remain a net pool available on 30 June 1951 of 411,000 men. The proposed bill, as previously indicated, raises the net pool to 1,239,000 men, without reducing the present draft age. Of this number, however, at least 608,000 will be men who would otherwise be classified as IV–F except for the proposed lowered standards of acceptability.

Obviously, the increased number liable for induction, because of the reduced physical and mental standards, cannot be absorbed by the services in any large number during a short period of time, and particularly during a phase of rapid expansion. Such men must, of necessity, be inducted over an extended period, since we cannot expect to maintain the efficiency of our Armed Forces, and particularly the Army which is the recipient of the greatest number of inductees, with men who, for all intents and purposes, may be considered as substandard.

Let there be no misunderstanding with regard to the proposed lowered standards. The January 1945 level of acceptability can properly be called the barrel-scraping period. The armed services cannot be expected to assume a disproportionate number of substandard men, and still be held responsible for the security of the Nation.

Thus what appears to be an excess pool of men 19 through 25 potentially available on July 1, 1951, under the provisions of the proposed legislation, must necessarily be analyzed in terms of net availability over a protracted period of time. The pool of 19-to-26 men who meet present standards is only 411,000. The net increase to the pool by inducting men who are nonveterans and have wives only to support is 220,000, under present standards of acceptability. From this group greater delays in reporting for induction can be anticipated because of hardship. Thus the anticipated net pool of available men who can meet present standards of acceptability, as of July 1, 1951, will be only 631,000, just slightly in excess of the number the Director of Selective Service considers must always be in the manpower pool to provide the necessary safety margin.

To maintain an armed strength of 3,500,000 men, from July 1, 1951 to July 1, 1952, will require, under the present Selective Service Act, an input of 641,000 men. However, by extending the period of service from 21 to 26 months, and by authorizing the involuntary extension of present voluntary enlistments for 1 year, as provided in the House amendment, this required input will be reduced, in fiscal 1952, to 428,000 men. However, this figure is based on the assumption that 135,000 men now in service will reenlist, and that 240,000 men will voluntarily enlist from outside the present group liable for induction.

Thus by—

1. Lowering physical and mental standards,
2. Extending the period of service to 26 months,
3. Inducting married nonveterans who are nonfathers, and
4. By involuntarily extending *enlistments* for 1 year,

there will be a sufficient pool of available men, without regard to physical and mental quality, between the ages of 19 through 25 to support an armed force of 3,500,000 men probably until the end of fiscal 1953.

However, as has already been pointed out, the induction of men under the proposed barrel-scraping standards must be extended over a protracted period of time.

But, of even greater significance is the fact that the contemplated input of men in fiscal 1952 (641,000 under the present law; 428,000 under the House bill) *does not* take into consideration the release of the more than 800,000 National Guardmen and reservists who will be on active duty by July 1, 1951, most of whom are veterans of World War II.

If these veterans of World War II are to be released, and the committee believes they are entitled to the earliest consideration consistent with national security, then the available pool of men who meet *present* standards must be increased.

By lowering the induction age to 18 years and 6 months, and taking into consideration all deferments authorized under the proposed bill, the net pool will be increased by 224,000 men who would qualify under present standards, and an additional 30,000 men who would qualify under the proposed lowered standards.

Such an addition to the pool of available men will:

1. Permit a rapid expansion to 4,000,000 men, if necessary.
2. Permit the maintenance of an *efficient* armed force of 3,500,000 men, and
3. Permit the earlier release of many hundreds of thousands of veteran National Guard men and reservists now on active duty than would otherwise be possible.

The Committee on Armed Services is convinced, therefore, that the proper defense of the Nation requires the reduction of the present draft age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The present international situation speaks for itself. The Nation now, and for the foreseeable future, faces the necessity of maintaining a large standing force. And, paradoxically, this undoubtedly is exactly what the enemies of our Nation hope we will do. *Every man in uniform on active duty* represents a cost to the taxpayers of *$10,000 per year.* We can continue, therefore, to drain the economy of the Nation for an indefinite period, or we can face the situation squarely and honestly and adopt the alternative proposed by the House Committee on Armed Services. The only practical, plausible alternative to a large standing force is the creation of a strong, well-trained, adequately equipped, *always available* Reserve, composed of National Guard and Reserve units. The proposed legislation will establish the manpower pool which will provide the men for this strong Reserve. The committee will, in the near future, present to the Congress its proposals for implementing such a Reserve program.

This, then, requires the initiation of a universal military training program, since a Reserve system is only as strong as the men who compose it. Unless provision is made for constantly feeding into the Reserve recently trained men, the Reserve program would otherwise wither and die. Without universal military training the Reserve would, in the nature of things, become smaller and weaker as the age of its members increase.

The position of the committee is that we must enact *now*, the machinery by which we can create and maintain our Reserve program.

Under the proposed bill, every person under the age of 26 inducted, appointed, or enlisted in the Armed Forces since June 25, 1950—and every person under 26 hereafter inducted, appointed, or enlisted in the Armed Forces or the proposed National Security Training Corps will be required to serve a total of 6 years, *including time spent* in the Reserve. This proposal does *not* mean 6 years of active duty. It does mean that men under 26 inducted for training and service, or men inducted only for training, will continue to owe an obligation to their country following their return to civilian life.

There is no claim to originality in this proposal. Section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 contained the following language:

> Each such man, after the completion of his period of training and service under subsection (b), shall be transferred to a Reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States and until he attains the age of 45, or until the expiration of a period of *10* years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such Reserve component, whichever occurs first, he shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law. [Italic supplied.]

But for a tortuous, highly legalistic opinion of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, which was used as a basis for setting aside the quoted provision, we might well have, today, a large number of reservists, at least on paper. But even with such a force it would have been necessary to continually add younger men, adequately trained and ready to relieve those who had fulfilled their Reserve obligation. No matter how large the Reserves may be in any given period of time, only a system by which men are given initial military training and then are required to join Reserve components can provide a continuing, permanent, always available Reserve ready to meet any emergency that may arise.

Only a universal military training system will permit us to reduce, with safety, the standing strength of our Armed Forces. Only a universal military training program will protect the Nation against the tremendously expensive and wasteful system of sudden expansion to meet emergency situations, followed by equally wasteful demobilizations when the crisis has temporarily passed.

There seems to be general agreement among all national figures that the present state of international unrest may continue for an indefinite period. Undoubtedly the present crisis will alternately grow hot and cold. If we do not establish an over-all manpower preparedness program, these fluctuations, with their resultant ups and downs in our state of readiness, will cost the Nation dearly, as it has in the past.

Therefore, the Committee on Armed Services strongly urges the adoption of the proposed legislation, for, as soon as we have created a strong Reserve, we can reduce the size of our standing forces. The committee does not wish to be unduly optimistic, nor does it wish to indulge in wishful thinking, but nevertheless, the fact remains that in the near future, as rapidly as men are released to the Reserve components, consideration can be given to reducing the size of our active duty forces. But we cannot reduce our Armed Forces unless we have established an enduring sytem for maintaining our Reserve forces.

We cannot indulge in the luxury of meeting each new emergency with temporary measures. We must either face the problem with a permanent solution, distasteful as it may be to our way of life, or face the malignant growth of economic instability. The present cost of living and the expansion of our Armed Forces is not purely coincidental. For each man in the Armed Forces, our national economy must produce $10,000 in taxes.

Each man on active duty in our Armed Forces means one less man engaged in useful production.

The Committee on Armed Services strongly urges the adoption of the proposed universal military training system. Its adoption may well be the greatest contribution the Nation can now make toward the achievement and maintenance of lasting peace.

## Establishment of a National Security Training Commission and a National Security Training Corps

The proposed legislation provides for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission and a National Security Training Corps.

The Commission shall be composed of five members consisting of three civilians, one active or retired member of the Regular forces, and one member of a Reserve component or a person drawing retired or retirement pay because of Reserve service. The Chairman must be a civilian.

The members of the Commission are to be appointed, by the President, for varying terms of years, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and are to be paid on a per diem basis. The Committee on Armed Services thoroughly discussed the merits of compensating the members of the Commission on a per diem basis as contrasted with a flat yearly salary. It was the view of the committee that the Commission should be composed of outstanding citizens who will devote a portion of their time to the affairs of the Commission, as a public service gesture of extreme importance, rather than consisting of persons who might be swayed more by the term-employment aspects, if a permanent yearly salary was attached to the office.

When the National Security Training Commission has been established, a National Security Training Corps is created.

The Commission, subject only to the President, shall direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, but the training must be basic military training. The Committee on Armed Services wishes to emphasize the requirement that the training must be basic military training. It should teach the youth of our Nation how to survive in war, how to make use of basic weapons, and acclimate them to the adjustments necessitated by the close associations with other men which is an inevitable part of military life.

In order to assure the establishment of a truly military training program for the members of the National Security Training Corps, the Commission must submit its plan for such a program to the Congress, to be referred to the Armed Services Committees of both Houses. The proposed legislation requires that the plan submitted provide for the types of basic military training to be given members, measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the members, a code of conduct for the members, including penalties

for violations, such other policies and standards as the Commission may incorporate in the plan, and recommendations with regard to the disability, death, and other benefits to be granted members of the Corps, along with the duties, liabilities, obligations, and responsibilities to be imposed upon such members.

After the plan has been submitted to the Congress, no person can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps if, during the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress following the date on which the plan is submitted, either House passes, by the affirmative vote of a majority of either House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such a plan.

To assure the Congress an opportunity to consider the merits or objections to the plan, the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses must, not later than the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress following the date on which the plan was submitted to the Congress, report a resolution to their respective Houses approving or disapproving the plan. This resolution shall be privileged and may be called up by any Member of either House.

The proposed legislation, therefore, removes any doubt that the Congress will have full opportunity to carefully analyze the training program to be operated by the Commission.

If changes to the plan are required after its adoption, they must be presented and acted upon in the same manner prescribed for the plan originally adopted.

But even then induction into the National Security Training Corps will not be authorized until, following the adoption of the plan, either the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution, eliminates the period of service (as contrasted with training) required of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of their birth.

### Initiation of Universal Military Training

Either the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution may initiate universal military training.

Whenever the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution eliminates the period of service for all persons who have not attained their nineteenth birthday then thereafter all persons who have not attained their nineteenth birthday will be liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps for a period of 6 months.

In effect this means that whenever it is deemed advisable to stop inducting men under 19 into the Armed Forces, and, for all intents and purposes, whenever all induction into the Armed Forces is terminated, men under 19, except those deferred, will be liable for universal military training only. Provision is made for inducting men beyond the age of 19 who have been deferred, in order to preserve the universality of application. Otherwise men in high school or college, or temporarily deferred for a variety of reasons, could escape the required training and the required Reserve obligation by simply remaining in a deferred status until passing their nineteenth birthday.

Men inducted into the National Security Training Corps will *not* be members of the armed services until the completion of their training and their assignment to a Reserve component.

As members of the National Security Training Corps, they will be paid $30 a month while in training, except that those with dependents

will be entitled to the allowances now paid to the dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

Such persons may not be assigned for training outside the United States, except that residents of the Territories and possessions may be trained in their respective areas.

After the program gets underway, comprehensive reports as to its operation will be required, semiannually, from the Commission and the Secretary of Defense.

It is the desire of the Committee on Armed Services that the Congress be kept fully informed on the entire program.

## Registration

Under the present Selective Service Act all male citizens between the age of 18 through 25 and all other male persons between those ages in the United States are required to register, except persons on active duty in the Armed Forces, members of the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service, cadets of the United States Military and Coast Guard Academies, midshipmen of the United States Naval Academy, foreign diplomats, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, other consular agents of foreign countries and members of their families, "and persons in other categories to be specified by the President." Except for those exempt by law, aliens residing in the United States are required to register and are subject to induction at the age of 19. However, resident aliens may be relieved from liability for training and service if prior to their induction they apply for such relief. If they make such application, however, they are thereafter debarred from becoming citizens of the United States. The proposed bill, however, adds a new provision to existing law which prevents any person who has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States from applying for noninduction. In effect, the new provision makes every alien between the ages of 18½ through 25 who has declared his intention to become a citizen subject to induction. This should prevent many persons from escaping military service. Thus the proposed change in existing law, by adding the language "who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States" precludes aliens who have declared their intention of becoming citizens of the United States by what is commonly referred to as "taking out their first papers" from being relieved from liability for service.

The proposed Universal Military Service and Training Act would not reduce the age of registration but it would require the classification of men prior to their attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months. This will be advantageous to the Government in that it will permit induction, without delay, at 18 years and 6 months, and it will be advantageous to the individual who, prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months will have been examined physically and mentally to determine his fitness for service. It will thus permit individuals under the age of induction, but past the registration age, to make their plans in accordance with their preinduction classification.

The proposed bill, therefore, contemplates continuing the present registration at age 18, but proposes classification prior to attaining the age of liability for induction.

### Induction

The proposed bill contemplates reducing the draft age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months. This will make available for induction, after deducting all estimated deferments, approximately 254,000 additional men.

### Reserve Service Required Following Active Duty or Training Duty

Under the provisions of the proposed act, all men under the age of 26 inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or the proposed National Security Training Corps, subsequent to June 25, 1950, will be required to serve on active duty or training duty, *and* in a Reserve component for a total period of 6 years, unless sooner released for personal hardship reasons under regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense. Under present law, men inducted, enlisted, or appointed who serve for less than 3 years, are required, upon release from active duty, to serve in a Reserve component for 5 years, although this requirement can be modified by additional active duty or Reserve service in organized units.

### Increasing the Period of Service From 21 to 26 Months

The proposed bill would increase the period of service from 21 months to 26 months. The net effect of such a proposal, is to reduce the number of inductees necessary in fiscal 1952 by 149,000 men. Stated conversely, if the present period of service remains at 21 months, the armed services will require an additional 149,000 men in fiscal 1952 to maintain their planned strength.

In addition to the savings in manpower and money, however, is the extremely important fact that fewer inductees means fewer experienced personnel detailed to train inductees.

Considering the fact that each inductee must be given 4 months' basic training, followed by 2 months' additional training, and will average 2 months spent in travel, plus an average of 1 month's leave, it can be seen that even by extending the period of service to 26 months the armed services obtain only 17 months of effective service from each inductee. Under 21 months of required service, only 12 months of effective service would be obtained. The addition of 5 months adds very significantly to the efficiency of the armed services.

### Each Inductee Guaranteed 4 Months' Training and Noncombat Assignment on Land for 6 Months

Under the House bill, each person inducted into the Armed Forces must be given military training for a period of not less than 4 months. It should be noted that this applies not only to men under 19, but to all persons inducted. The proposed section requires 4 months of military training; and this does not include time spent in travel to a training camp or station.

During this 4 months' period, no inductee may be assigned for duty (and this includes training duty) at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone).

Thus, no inductee, during his 4 months' training period can be assigned to duty in Asia, Europe, Africa, or South America.

Because of the necessity for ships and airplanes to cover large areas, even during training periods, and because they must, of necessity, go beyond the territorial limits of the United States and its Territories and possessions, the limitation prohibits only assignments to duty at installations located on land.

Of equal importance is the remainder of the proposed provisions which prevents any person inducted from being assigned for duty in any combat area during the 6 months' period immediately following his induction.

This provision thus guarantees that all persons inducted into the Armed Forces will, during their first 6 months of service, be kept out of land combat areas.

*Under this provision, no person inducted under the age of 19 can be sent into a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions.*

## ROTC and Equivalent Programs

Under the bill, a person selected for enrollment or continuance in a college ROTC or similar program, and who agrees in writing to accept a commission, if tendered, to serve not less than 2 years on active duty, and to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of receipt of a commission (less the period of his active service), may be deferred from induction for training and service until after completion of the course of instruction, providing that he has completed a period of training equivalent to that given in basic training, and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned. If the person has received financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any training program, he is obligated to serve one additional year on active duty.

The following is a brief explanation of the officer procurement programs mentioned in the bill:

*1. Reserve Officers Training Corps, Air Reserve Officers Training Corps, and Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps*

These students are enrolled in the training course and first complete a basic course after which they attend the advanced course, which are the junior and senior years of college. The students receive subsistence during the last 2 years of college and upon successful completion of the advanced course are eligible to be commissioned in the lowest officer grade of their service.

*2. Naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057)*

These students are classified as midshipmen throughout their full 4-year college course. They receive tuition, uniforms, and pay, and are subject to naval jurisdiction and discipline. Upon successful completion of the 4-year college course, they are eligible to be commissioned ensigns, United States Navy.

*3. Reserve officer candidate pogram of the Navy*

This program has for its purpose the selection of college students who are enlisted members of the Navy's Organized and Volunteer

Reserve. The students must complete the 4-year college course of instruction and actively participate with their Reserve unit during the 4-year period. In addition, they must complete two summertime periods of active duty training of 6 weeks' duration each. Upon graduation from college, they are entitled to be appointed ensigns, United States Naval Reserve.

*4. Platoon leaders class of the Marine Corps*

This program has for its purpose the selection of undergraduate students enrolled in accredited colleges. Persons must complete their college studies and obtain a baccalaureate degree, participate in two summer training periods of 6 weeks' duration each, and upon graduation are eligible to be appointed a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps or the United States Marine Corps Reserve.

*5. Officer procurement program of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve*

These programs include the selection of students in the United States Merchant Marine Academy and State maritime schools who, upon the successful completion of their studies and upon graduation, are eligible to be commissioned in the Coast Guard. In addition, a limited number of students who successfully complete a 4-year college course are commissioned in the United States Coast Guard. Some port security experts are also being trained in the Coast Guard Organized Reserve for commissions in the Coast Guard Reserve.

*6. Ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training*

These students are selected from those enrolled in approved colleges and universities for training in medicine, dentistry, or theology. They are appointed ensigns, United States Naval Reserve, while completing their professional training and are appointed to lieutenant junior grade, upon completion of the professional training and while serving in internships or on active duty.

## Educational Deferments

The proposed legislation provides for two types of educational deferments: (1) Deferment for instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, under subsection (q) of the bill; and (2) deferment while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institutions, under subsection (q) of the bill.

*1. High school deferments*

Existing law provides for the postponement from induction of students satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of study in a high school or equivalent institution, until such student has attained his twentieth birthday. The proposed legislation provides that students in this category shall have a statutory deferment, rather than a postponement from induction, until they have attained their twentieth birthday.

The primary goal of our educational system is to insure that the maximum number of persons will attain a high school education or its equivalent and the present provisions of the proposed legislation

are calculated to accomplish this goal to the maximum possible degree consistent with the requirements of the Nation during a period of national emergency.

There are some who propose that the deferment for high-school education be terminated at age 19. However, the committee has received sufficient factual information to convince it that the cut-off age should be 20 rather than any lesser age.

It has been determined that, in 1949, 122,000 high-school boys became 19 years old while in high school and before graduation, which is more than one-fifth of the male seniors of that school year. It is readily apparent that, if the cut-off age for deferment were set at any age less than 20, many thousands of male high-school seniors would be deprived of the opportunity to complete their high-school education. By establishing a statutory deferment for high-school students up to the age of 20, the committee has insured the graduation of approximately 95 percent of all male seniors from high school. While a small percentage yet remains, the committee feels that it cannot justify the establishment of a cut-off age in excess of the twentieth birthday.

The action which the committee has taken in this respect has been widely endorsed by numerous responsible educators and representatives of educational groups and in no instance has the committee been criticized for having established provisions which were either unfair or too restrictive in the deferment of high-school students.

*2. University and college deferments*

Under existing law the President is granted a broad, general authority to defer from induction those students who are satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution. When H. R. 1752, which embodied the views of the Department of Defense on this subject, was presented to the committee in January 1951, it contained, in addition to the general deferment authority granted to the President, a special provision authorizing the annual deferment of 75,000 male students for initial entrance into college. This group of students was to be selected by certain mental tests and other procedures to be prescribed before being authorized to enter colleges of their choice for the pursuit of certain specified technical and professional courses of study and *after* the completion of 4 months of basic training. While the committee is fully cognizant of the need to provide a minimum flow of certain types of students through our higher educational institutions, it has serious doubt as to the feasibility of a plan which might well place the military in a position of participating in the selection of those who would be deferred for college training under these special provisions for 75,000 deferred students. It is the overwhelming opinion of the committee that the deferment of students for educational purposes must be completely divorced from any military participation in the process of selection and, of necessity, determined by a civilian agency. For the foregoing reason the committee has deleted the special provision for the deferment of 75,000 students, leaving all educational deferments for college to be determined under the general deferment authority of the President.

Under existing law, the Director of Selective Service, under authority delegated by the President, has deferred approximately 570,000 students who are satisfactorily pursuing their courses of study in

colleges, universities, and similar institutions. In arriving at this number of educational deferments, the Director of Selective Service has had the benefit of the views of six committees on scientific, professional, and specialized personnel which he appointed late in 1948.

Since the committee has received no complaints against the present system of educational deferments, it assumes that the system is equitable, both to the students and to the educational institutions.

The Director of Selective Service has advised the committee that he proposes to continue the present plan for educational deferments, with certain modifications. There are some who urge that the details of educational deferment should be included in statutory provisions in the proposed legislation. The committee fully appreciates the uncertainty which prevails in the minds of male college students of draft age as to their future status and also the anxiety of educational institutions as to their future status. However, the committee deems it unwise to legislate the details of this deferment program. We recognize that no foolproof program for educational deferments has yet been devised. Leading educators and the Director of Selective Service are equally aware of this fact. On the other hand we feel that it is absolutely necessary, insofar as practicable, to resolve the doubts which exist in the minds of the students and the uncertainty which surrounds the educational institutions. With that in mind, the committee requested the Director of Selective Service to set forth the details of the plan for educational deferments which he proposes to follow. Those details are contained in his letter which is set forth in full as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
*Washington 25, D. C.*

Hon. CARL VINSON,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. VINSON: At the request of a member of this staff, I am enclosing herewith a copy of a statement prepared on Monday, March 12, and submitted to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, to the attention of Dr. Arthur Fleming.

This statement, as you will note, has in its first section the intent of Congress in the existing act and as contemplated in the pending bills before both Houses. The second section has to do with the problem dealing with students and the time element required to initiate and carry out any plan that will evaluate these students in accordance with the expressed wishes and legislative intention of the Members of Congress on your committee. The third section of this statement concerns the plan itself which, if approved by the executive branch of the Government and the President, will be translated into regulations by the Director of Selective Service. The fourth section of this statement indicates the urgency of such a plan, which is now being given consideration by those concerned and a decision will be rendered within a week.

If is felt that this statement is concise, clear, and understandable and would be proper for inclusion in the report relative to this plan that is contemplated by your committee.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY, *Director.*

I. INTENT OF CONGRESS

The Congress in the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and by consideration of provisions in pending legislation has clearly indicated its intent that there should be deferred from training and service in the Armed Forces, college students in such categories and in such numbers as are found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. In the 1948 act the Congress declared that adequate provision for national security requires maximum

effort in the fields of scientific research and development and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological and scientific resources [sec. 1 (e)]; it authorized the President to provide for the deferment of any or all categories of persons whose activity in study is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest [sec. 6 (h)]; it provided that the President should not be precluded from providing for the deferment of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate [sec. 6 (i) (2)]; and it stated that it is the "sense of the Congress" that the President should provide for the deferment of certain numbers of students in medical, dental, and allied specialist categories [sec. 4 (i) (3)].

### II. THE PROBLEM

All students, presently liable for induction and acceptable to the Armed Forces who are now in a college, university, or similar institution of learning, are under a postponement of induction until the end of the academic year, which ends generally in June 1951. At that time all postponements for such students will terminate, unless provision is made for deferment. These, therefore, will be the first to be called for induction during the last days of June and the ensuing months of the summer and early fall.

In addition to meeting the problem for those now in college, any provisions which may be enacted by Congress for future action in this regard will require interim solution until such newly enacted law would become fully operative.

Evidence regarding individual scholastic aptitude, as determined by aptitude testing, or scholastic achievement, as determined by class standing, must be in the hands of selective service local boards in sufficient time for consideration, prior to the date of induction. The acquisition and presenting of such evidence will require time. Work necessary to the administration of the first aptitude test will require a period of at least *60 days* from the date the program is initiated. Another *30 days* must elapse before tests can be given and graded, and scores of those tested delivered to local boards for consideration. From this it is evident that the plan must be put into operation by March 15, 1951, if any of these postponed other *30 days* must elapse before tests can be given and graded, and scores of those tested delivered to local boards for consideration. From this it is evident that the plan must be put into operation by March 15, 1951, if any of these postponed students are to be considered in time for further deferment. The colleges, also, face a tight schedule in determining the order in which male students stand in their college classes. Time is rapidly running out. This plan, to be effective, must be instituted without delay.

### III. THE PLAN

To develop a plan which relies simply upon the postponement of all college students per se is unrealistic and nonselective and will deprive the Armed Forces of needed manpower. The following plan provides for the deferment of only those students who have demonstrated required aptitude, or scholastic performance. The deferment is based either upon their capacity to learn as demonstrated by the results of a Nation-wide test or upon their performance in their study as evidenced by their standing in their class. While the plan provides for certain scores and class standing, it should be borne in mind that these are variables which may be raised or lowered to either increase or diminish the number of students in training, as the national interest shall require.

For the ensuing year the plan would be implemented in detail so as to provide for the deferment in the national interest of male students who are in any of the following categories:

(*a*) A student in a professional school of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, osteopathy, or optometry for whom the school in which he is enrolled has certified that he is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction leading to his graduation.

(*b*) A full-time graduate student seeking a graduate degree for whom the graduate school at which he is in attendance has certified that he currently is meeting degree requirements and is expected to attain his degree.

(*c*) A student who has been accepted for admission to a graduate school for the class next commencing as a candidate for a graduate degree and who, in his last full-time undergraduate academic year at a college, university, or similar institution of learning, had a scholastic standing which placed him in the upper one-half of the male members of that class or has attained a score of 75 or more on the prescribed qualification test.

(*d*) A student who has been pursuing a course of instruction which requires the completion of either 5 or 6 years of full-time undergraduate study to qualify him for the first academic degree and has successfully completed his fourth year, or his fifth year, as the case may be, at a college, university, or similar institution of learning and had a scholastic standing in his last completed undergraduate year which placed him in the upper three-fourths of the male members of that class or has attained a score of 70 or more on the prescribed qualification test, and has been accepted for admission by a college, university, or similar institution of learning to the fifth- or sixth-year class next commencing for a full-time course of instruction or has entered upon and is satisfactorily pursuing such course.

(*e*) A student who has successfully completed his third year at a college, university, or similar institution of learning, and had a scholastic standing in his third-year class which placed him in the upper three-fourths of the male members of that class or has attained a score of 70 or more on the prescribed qualification test, and has been accepted for admission by a college, university, or similar institution of learning, to the fourth-year class next commencing for a full-time course of instruction or has entered upon and is satisfactorily pursuing such course.

(*f*) A student who has successfully completed his second year at a college, university, or similar institution of learning, and had a scholastic standing in his second-year class which placed him in the upper two-thirds of the male members of that class or has attained a score of 70 or more on the prescribed qualification test, and has been accepted for admission by a college, university, or similar institution of learning, to the third-year class next commencing for a full-time course of instruction or has entered upon and is satisfactorily pursuing such course.

(*g*) A student who has successfully completed his first year in a college, university, or similar institution of learning, and had a scholastic standing in his first-year class which placed him in the upper one-half of the male members of that class or has attained a score of 70 or more on the prescribed qualification test, and has been accepted for admission by a college, university, or similar institution of learning to the second-year class next commencing for a full-time course of instruction or has entered upon and is satisfactorily pursuing such course.

(*h*) A student who is a high school graduate or is otherwise qualified for admission to the first-year class in a college, university, or similar institution of learning, has attained a score of 70 or more on the prescribed qualification test, and has been accepted for admission by a college, university, or similar institution of learning, to the first-year class next commencing for a full-time course of instruction or has entered upon and is satisfactorily pursuing such course.

IV. CONCLUSION

After consultation with educators and experts in the testing field, it is estimated that this plan, when put into operation, will fulfill the intent of the Congress that there should be deferred from military service college students in such categories, and in such numbers, as are found to be necessary for the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. It is, therefore, essential that this plan for college student deferment be implemented at this time, since it will provide for a procedure sufficiently flexible to fulfill the intent of Congress not only for the academic year commencing in 1951, but for the years ahead, regardless of the international situation.

The committee does not say that this is an infallible plan for educational deferments. However, we do say that it is the most equitable plan which has been brought to the committee's attention and that we endorse its implementation until a better plan is devised.

## Decreasing Periods of Service

The proposed bill permits the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, to decrease the period of required service to any lesser period he deems advisable, so long as the required period of service can be economically utilized. Likewise, the President can eliminate service entirely. The President is also authorized, under the proposed bill, to reduce or eliminate periods of service differently for different age groups if he so desires.

Likewise, the proposed bill empowers the Congress, by concurrent resolution, to reduce or eliminate periods of service, and such reduction or elimination may vary as to age groups.

### Right to Volunteer for Induction

Recognizing that many young men between the ages of 17 through 18 years and 6 months may wish to fulfill their obligation to serve either in the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps prior to the statutory age of liability for induction, the committee has provided that men may, with the consent of their parents or guardian, volunteer for induction after attaining the age of 17. At the age of 18 they may volunteer for induction without the consent of their parents or guardian, as provided under the present law.

Thus, the proposed bill will permit young men who complete high school at an age earlier than the median existing in the United States (18 years) to begin their required active service or training in advance of the statutory age for induction.

### Report Required From Director of Selective Service

In order to assure constant review of the operation of the proposed act, the bill requires the Director of Selective Service to report annually to the Congress on the operation of the Selective Service System for the preceding year. This report must include, among other things, an analysis, by States, of the number of persons registered, inducted, and deferred. The basis for each type of deferment must be stated.

### Reservists Ordered to Active Duty Not Affected by Extension of Period of Service From 21 to 26 Months

In view of the strong conviction of the committee that veteran reservists, including National Guard men, should be released to inactive duty as soon as practicable, the committee has taken the position that reservists ordered to active duty should not be required to serve on active duty for a period in excess of 21 months.

### Releasing Reservists From Active Duty

Section 21 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, authorizes the President to order to active duty all members of Reserve components for a period of 21 months. This authority expires on July 9, 1951.

The proposed legislation would extend this authority to July 1, 1953. In this respect, it should be noted, however, that such reservists may be ordered to active duty only for a period of 21 months.

The proposed legislation further provides, however, that any inactive or volunteer reservist now serving on active duty or hereafter ordered to active duty, pursuant to the provisions of this section, who served on active duty in any branch of the service for more than 90 days between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or for 12 months or more between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, and as much as 12 months on active duty after June 25, 1950,

shall, upon application to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is then serving, be released from active duty.

The criteria used for eligibility for release to inactive duty is identical to that which determines whether a person now registered for induction may be deferred as a veteran except for the requirement that reservists eligible under this section must serve 12 months after June 25, 1950. The proposed legislation will result in many thousands of reservists being released to inactive duty during the coming summer and fall months, and will thereafter permit the release of many other thousands of reservists, to be replaced by the inductees authorized under the provision of the proposed legislation.

## Section by Section Analysis

### SECTION 1

(a) *Changing the title of the present Selective Service Act*

This subsection changes the name of the Selective Service Act of 1948 to "Universal Military Training and Service Act" to be consistent with the purposes of the bill.

(b) *Lowering induction age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months*

The present Selective Service Act imposes an obligation for training and service on "every male citizen of the United States and every other male person residing in the United States" who is between the ages of 19 and 26. The proposed legislation would lower the induction age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months, thus making the age group 18 years and 6 months through and including 25 liable for induction into the military service or the National Security Training Corps. It should be noted that the proposed legislation does not change the existing law which requires registration at age 18.

The reference to section 6 (h) in the proposed section permits the induction of men who have passed the twenty-sixth anniversary of their birth and who are now or hereafter may be deferred from induction because of their activity as students, dependency status, or occupation. Such persons will hereafter, under the proposed section, remain liable for induction until they attain the thirty-fifth anniversary of their birth, unless deferred for other reasons.

### CLASSIFICATION AFTER REGISTRATION

The present Selective Service Act requires registration at age 18. The proposed bill does not lower this age. However, the proviso which is added to the present law would permit the classification of men following registration. At present registrants are not classified until after they have attained the *induction age*. It requires, on the average, approximately 90 days to classify and induct a man under present law. If the proposed change is adopted, local boards will be able to classify and authorize preinduction physical and mental examinations for men who have registered at age 18, during the 6-month period that elapses between registration and age of liability for induction.

In addition to the time saved, the proposed change will have the advantage of enabling registrants to learn their classification shortly after registration which will assist them in making their plans based upon the classification given to them.

(c) *Change of wording necessitated by temporary suspension of personnel strengths and selection by age group*

The present Selective Service Act authorizes the President to induct such numbers of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the personnel strengths authorized by section 2 of the act. Since the personnel strengths have been temporarily suspended by the act of August 3, 1950, the change of wording herein recommended becomes necessary.

The proposed legislation would also specifically authorize selection and induction by age groups, which is essential for establishing universal military training and service.

(d) *Standards of physical and mental acceptability*

Under the existing law no person shall be inducted unless and until he is acceptable to the Armed Forces and his physical and mental fitness for such training has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The proposed revised section is designed to clarify the present language of the Selective Service Act in order to assure uniformity in the Armed Forces.

Of even greater significance, however, is the proviso contained in the proposed section which requires the Secretary of Defense to put into effect for induction purposes the physical and mental standards in existence in January of 1945. This proviso is inserted in order to assure the induction of at least the same percentage of persons between the ages of 18 and 6 months through 25 under the proposed law, as were inducted in January of 1945. The present rejection rate of this age group is approximately 34 percent and the purpose of the proposed section is to reduce the rejection rate to 22 percent. The following is a brief analysis of the January 1945 mental testing program:

1. High school graduates were accepted without being required to take any type *mental test.*

2. All other selectees were given a *qualification test* which simply tested ability to read and write.

3. Those failing the qualification test were given the *Group Target Test.* This test consisted of 28 squares, each with 9 black dots. The examiner traced a pattern on an enlargement of one of these squares. He then instructed the inductee to draw that pathway on his sheet. No formal education nor ability to read and write was necessary to pass this test as it was purely a performance test demonstrating ability to follow simple directions.

Men failing the Group Target Test were administered either the Individual Test or the Non-Language Individual Test.

1. The Individual Test was given if the men understood English.

2. The Non-Language Individual Test was given if inductees did not understand English.

(e) *Requiring 4 months' training; preventing assignment to combat zone for 6 months*

The present Selective Service Act requires that individuals inducted into the Armed Forces shall be assigned to stations and units of such forces. The proposed addition to the present law requires that *every person inducted* into the Armed Forces be given full and adequate military training for a period of not less than 4 months. In addition, the proposed section *prevents any person inducted* into the Armed

Forces from being sent into a combat area located on land for the first 6 months following his induction into the Armed Forces. *During the 4 months' training period persons inducted may not be assigned for duty on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone).*

(f) *Increasing the induction period*

Under the present Selective Service Act induction is authorized for 21 consecutive months. The proposed legislation would increase the induction period from 21 months to 26 months. The reference to "active training and service" insures that the 26 months will include the required 4 months' training within the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone). Thus, the 26 months' service includes a minimum of 4 months' training and service of approximately 22 months. The reference to subsection (d) of section 4 conforms with the authority granted to the respective Secretaries of the Military Departments and the Treasury Department to release men from service prior to completion of the 26 months of training and service for transfer to the National Guard or other Reserve components.

It should be noted that section (k) of the proposed bill also provides for reducing or eliminating the total period of service required, varying by age groups if so desired, upon a finding by the President or upon the passage of a concurrent resolution by the Congress.

(g) *Repeal of short-term Army enlistment and General Classification Test, establishing age for voluntary induction*

The present Selective Service Act permits persons between the ages of 19 and 26 to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 21 months. The proposed section is written in such a way so as to eliminate this provision. This is a safeguard for the person who wishes to enlist merely for the period of required service. If persons were permitted to enlist for 21 months or 26 months believing they were fulfilling their total obligated service, another provision of the proposed bill which extends voluntary enlistments for 1 year might adversely affect such person's enlistment by extending his enlistment from a contemplated 21 or 26 months to 33 or 39 months of total service. To avoid this, the short-term enlistment in the Regular Army is abolished, although persons may still volunteer for induction.

The proposed section also abolishes the present law which establishes a passing requirement for the General Classification Test of 70 points. In view of the fact that the General Classification Test is no longer used in the armed services and in view of the requirement that the mental and physical acceptability standards be those of January 1945, this provision must be eliminated in order to prevent inconsistent requirements.

The present law permits persons between the ages of 18 and 26 to volunteer for induction. This provision is contained in the proposed new section. In addition, a proviso has been added to protect persons who were members of Reserve components on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such Reserve components. In the event such a person applies for active duty and his application is denied he is deferred from induction until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily as a member of a Reserve component. Three new paragraphs have been

added to the present law which will permit (1) persons to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps after attaining the age of 18 at such time as the National Security Training Corps is authorized, (2) permit persons with the consent of their parents or guardian to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces at the age of 17, and (3) to permit persons to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps at such time as the National Security Training Corps is authorized at the age of 17 with the consent of their parents or guardian. These last three paragraphs recognize the possibility that many men complete their high school education at the age of 17 or shortly thereafter and may desire to complete their military obligation prior to entering college. While men can enlist in the Regular services today at the age of 17 with the consent of their parents or guardian, persons heretofore have not been permitted to *volunteer* for *induction* at the age of 17. Likewise, when universal military training is put into effect it is desirable to permit young men to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps after attaining the age of 18 at their own volition and not be required to wait until they reach the age of 18½ or permit men below the age of 18 to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps with the consent of their parents or guardian.

(h) *Period of Reserve service*

Under the present Selective Service Act an individual who has served for less than 3 years is required to join a Reserve component and serve there for a prescribed period of time.

The period of Reserve service required by the present law is: 3 years of service if in an organized unit; 5 years of service if not a member of an organized unit.

The proposed legislation prescribes new post-service Reserve obligation for all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed subsequent to June 25, 1950, and prior to attaining 26 years of age. They are required to serve in a Reserve component for a period not to exceed 6 years less periods of active military service.

The Secretary of a military department (and the Secretary of the Treasury), may require transfer to an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program.

Persons transferred to a Reserve component or enlisted, appointed, or inducted prior to June 25, 1950, are not covered by the new requirement but retain the obligation under which they were transferred, enlisted, appointed, or inducted in effect under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as of June 25, 1950.

Persons entering the service at age 26 or older are not subject to any post-service Reserve requirement. This subsection also provides authority for the release of persons on active duty who volunteer to join certain organized Reserve units prior to the terminal date of their period of active service.

Persons may be discharged from their total obligated service of 6 years for reasons of personal hardships.

(i) *Repealing the 1-year enlistment program for 18-year-olds*

The present Selective Service Act contains a provision for the enlistment of persons between ages 18 and 19 for a period of 1 year. This 1-year period of service is followed by 4 to 6 years of service in the Reserve components.

The number of 1-year trainees is fixed at 161,000.

The actual operation of the program was of very brief duration. The proposed legislation would repeal those provisions of the 1948 act authorizing it.

(j) *Extending the period of service for physicians, dentists, etc.*

This subsection extends the period of service for physicians, dentists, and allied specialists from 21 months to 26 months in consonance with the period prescribed for other inductees.

(k) *Establishment of National Security Training Corps and National Security Training Commission; authority to reduce periods of service*

(1) Under this proposed section, which may justly be called the heart of the proposed legislation, the President, and the Congress by concurrent resolution, are authorized to reduce the periods of active service required of persons inducted under the provisions of this act. Likewise, the President and the Congress by concurrent resolution may eliminate all periods of active service. The authority to decrease or eliminate periods of service may vary as to age group or groups. In the event that the President, by Executive order, decreases the service for any age group or groups, or for all age groups, such period may be reduced only to a period of time that can be economically utilized by the services.

(2) Whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, eliminates the period of service required for persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of their birth, then all persons under 19 years of age shall thereafter be inducted into the National Security Training Corps subject to the adoption of a plan for such training. Such persons will be required to take an initial military training period of 6 months' duration and thereafter will be required to go into a Reserve component of the armed services for a period of 5½ years. In view of the fact that some persons will at that time be in college or high school or may be temporarily deferred and may pass the nineteenth anniversary of their birth before being inducted, a proviso is necessary which will permit the induction of such persons into the National Security Training Corps, even though they have passed their nineteenth birthday. However, the authority to defer persons for the various reasons contained in section 6 of the act will continue to be applicable to the persons liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps.

(3) Paragraph 3 of the proposed section establishes a National Security Training Commission to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission shall consist of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and one of whom shall be an active or retired member of a Regular component of the Armed Forces. The fifth member shall be a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a Reserve component. The Chairman of the Commission shall be selected by the President from among the civilian members of the Commission. No person may be appointed a civilian member of the Commission if he ever has been on active duty as a commissioned officer of a Regular component of the Armed Forces. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted.

Upon the appointment of the Commission the National Security Training Corps is established.

(4) Paragraph 4 of the proposed section prescribes the term of office and compensation of the members of the Commission. The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be 2 years. The term of office of the three remaining members of the Commission shall be 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively. While actually serving with the Commission members will receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission, together with transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes in connection with the business of the Commission. It should be noted that the military members of the Commission are subject to the statutes governing dual compensation.

(5) The Commission is given authority, subject to the direction of the President, to direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training must be basic military training. In the discharge of this responsibility, the Commission is directed to establish policies and standards necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. It also is required to make provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of the members of the National Security Training Corps. After consultation with the Secretary of Defense and subject to the direction of the President, the Commission shall designate the military departments to carry out the prescribed training.

(6) The Commission is authorized to employ, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, such persons as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

(7) In the exercise of the authority granted to the Commission in paragraph 5, the Commission is required to prepare and submit to the Congress a plan or plans describing the program of initial military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps, the measures to be taken by the Commission to safeguard the health, welfare, morals, and personal safety of members of the National Security Training Corps, and such other policies and standards as the Commission may establish to include a code of conduct, together with penalties for the violation thereof, to which members of the National Security Training Corps shall be subject. The Commission will also be required to submit recommendations with regard to the benefits to be granted and the duties and liabilities to be imposed upon members of the Corps.

(8) Upon the submission of the foregoing plan or plans to the Congress such plan or plans shall be transmitted to the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses of the Congress. These committees shall have a period of 45 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the plan or plans is received in which to report a resolution to their respective House of Congress approving or disapproving the plan or plans submitted by the Commission together with the committee's recommendation as to such plan or plans. Thereafter, and prior to the expiration of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan or plans was received by the Congress, such resolution, which shall be privileged, may be called up by any Member of either House. If at the end of such period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress there has not been passed by either of the two Houses of the Congress, by the affirmative vote of the majority

of either House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such plan, and the President or the Congress, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 2 of this subsection, has eliminated the period of service required of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth, persons thereafter shall be liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps.

(9) This paragraph permits the Commission to submit changes and modifications in its plans to the Congress from time to time. Such changes shall be acted upon by the Congress as prescribed in the preceding paragraph.

(10) Six months after the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, the Commission is required to submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing the operations of the National Security Training Corps. This report shall include statistics with respect to the number of persons undergoing training, a list of the stations and camps at which such training is being conducted, an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered and statistics with respect to injuries, deaths, number of employees of the Commission, and the administrative cost of the Commission. At the same time the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report giving his estimate of the value of the training and the cost of the training program chargeable to appropriations of the Department of Defense. Following the initial report, similar reports must be submitted semiannually.

(11) Paragraph 11 provides that persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be paid $30 per month. However, if such persons have dependents, the dependents will receive the amounts provided for the dependents of members of the armed services.

(12) Paragraph 12 of the proposed section prevents the assignment of any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps to any installation located on land outside the United States, except that residents of the Territories and possessions may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.

(l) *Selection by age*

The proposed legislation would amend the technical provisions relating to selection and induction to authorize selection and induction by age groups.

The Selective Service System has been inducting from the older groups downward since 1948, and this section removes any doubt as to the legality of such a procedure.

(m) *Clarifying the status of certain deferments for Reserve service; enlistments in the National Guard of persons below 18½ years of age*

(1) *Status of persons who enlist in organized units of the Reserve components subsequent to date of enactment of 1948 act.*—Individuals who became members of the Reserve components through voluntary enlistment subsequent to June 24, 1948, are not eligible for deferment under the authority of the present statute, inasmuch as they acquired their Reserve status subsequent to the date of enactment of the act. The Director of Selective Service is suspending administratively the processing of these individuals on the grounds that it would be illogical to induct them into another service. The amendment would clarify their position by placing them on a deferred status, the same as those who enlisted prior to the 1948 act, so long as they were members of such units on February 1, 1951.

(2) *National Guard enlistments.*—The present Selective Service Act authorizes a person who enlists in an organized unit of the National Guard prior to attaining age 18½ to be deferred from induction so long as he serves satisfactorily in such unit. The purpose of this provision of the 1948 act was to provide the National Guard with a source of personnel.

The proposed legislation establishes a method whereby the Secretary of Defense may terminate this enlistment program when he finds that trained men from other sources are available.

(3) *Technical amendment.*—This is a technical amendment made necessary by the two preceding paragraphs.

(n) *Merchant marine, midshipmen, and military college students*

The proposed legislation provides that Naval Reserve midshipmen attending merchant marine schools and students enrolled in military colleges which have ROTC programs and which are approved by the Secretary of Defense shall be exempt from registration and induction. These categories of students receive military training and upon graduation are commissioned in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(o) *ROTC, college, and other programs*

The present Selective Service Act authorizes the deferment within the authority (as established by the Secretary of Defense) of members of the ROTC. This deferment is subject to the individual agreeing in writing to accept a commission and serve for not less than 2 years after his graduation. Under the present quotas, a total of approximately 200,000 persons are serving in the ROTC on a deferred basis.

The proposed section therefore is substantially a reenactment of present law which authorizes the deferment of students in the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or its equivalent in other branches of the service.

Persons selected for enlistment or continuance in such programs must agree to accept a commission and serve 6 years after their appointment as commissioned officers (including 2 years on active duty or 3 years on active duty if financial assistance is received). Such persons, however, will be required to complete or have completed an initial period of military training while enrolled in such programs.

(2) The Secretary of each military department (and the Secretary of the Treasury) is authorized to establish officer candidate programs. This paragraph is designed to give personnel who are not selected for one of the other programs under this section, an opportunity for attending commissioned status while on active duty.

(3) This paragraph states that nothing in this subsection shall prejudice the President's deferment powers under section 6 (h) of the act.

(p) *Deferments; liability for induction of married nonveterans who have no dependents other than a wife*

This provision substantially reenacts subsection (h) of section 6 of the Selective Service Act of 1948 with several important changes. The present law permits the deferment of persons—

whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment * * * or whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other en-

deavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest * * *.

This language is reenacted in the proposed subsection. The present law also permits the President to defer persons who have dependents, but it should be carefully noted that section 6 (h), as written, removes the authority of the President to defer married men who have no dependents other than a wife solely on the basis of such marriage, unless there is extreme hardship involved. Likewise, it should be observed that the new section permits the induction of persons now or hereafter deferred until the thirty-fifth anniversary of their birth should their basis for deferment terminate after passing their twenty-sixth birthday. This will prevent persons now deferred from escaping induction by continuing their education past the twenty-sixth anniversary of their birth, or by continuing to remain engaged in an essential industry or occupation until they pass their twenty-sixth birthday.

This subsection also adds the words "dental, optometric, osteopathic, and chiropractic" to the list of endeavor that may be considered by the President for deferment purposes, as necessary for the national health, safety, or interest.

(q) *Deferment for high-school and college students*

(1) The present Selective Service Act authorizes the postponement of induction of a high-school student until he graduates or until he attains the age of 20. The proposed legislation would authorize such students to be *deferred*, but does not affect the age. By permitting a deferment in lieu of the present postponement students will have an opportunity to enlist in a branch of service of their choice during such deferment period.

(2) The present Selective Service Act authorizes the postponement of induction of any person pursuing a full-time course of instruction in college until the end of the academic year. The proposed subsection removes the postponement feature and permits such students to be deferred until the completion of the academic year. However, the proposed provision will not permit college students who have once been deferred to complete an academic year, or whose induction has been once postponed to complete an academic year, to be further deferred to complete another academic year, under the authority of this subsection. This, however, will not preclude the additional deferment of such students under regulations issued by the President.

(r) *Period of active duty for certain reservists*

Under the present Selective Service Act a member of a Reserve component who has had less than 90 days of active duty may be ordered into active service for the normal induction period of 21 months. This provision was, in 1948, intended to apply to recent graduates of the ROTC.

The proposed legislation would repeal this provision which has been superseded by later amendments to the act.

(s) *Clarification of certain provisions relating to reemployment rights*

Section 9 of the 1948 act prescribes in considerable detail the reemployment rights which accrue to an individual who is enlisted or inducted into the military service. This section of the existing statute has worked very satisfactorily excepting with respect to cases which are discussed in this section of the proposed legislation.

Under existing law employees who leave Federal, State, or private employment are entitled, if they make application for reemployment within 90 days and if they are still qualified to perform the duties of such position, to "be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay." Because of the alternative choice which appears to be given to the employer, veterans have in the past been restored to jobs of "like seniority, status, and pay" which may be less desirable than the job held before entering the service. For example, a salesman with a certain territory might, upon release from active duty, be given a job of like seniority, status, and pay, but be given an entirely different sales area. The proposed change to existing law would require that such person would be restored to the same position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority. If the position no longer exists or a person of greater seniority occupies the position, then, and only then, can the veteran be given a position of "like seniority, status, and pay."

The foregoing comment applies to all three of the paragraphs of this subsection.

(t) (1) *Extending reemployment rights to persons who serve not more than 4 years.*—Under existing law reemployment rights are extended to persons who enlist for not more than 3 years. The proposed legislation would extend these rights to persons who serve for not more than 4 years. Thus it will be seen that the test is the length of time an individual serves and not the length of time for which he originally enlisted.

Under the proposed legislation an individual who enlists for 5 or 6 years but is released from service in 4 years or less would be entitled to reemployment rights; under the existing law he would not. Furthermore, under existing law an individual is entitled to reemployment rights only upon the expiration of his first enlistment after the date of enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1948. Under the proposed legislation it is immaterial how many times an individual may have enlisted after the date of enactment of that act so long as his total service does not exceed 4 years.

(2) This paragraph extends to persons entering upon active duty subsequent to June 24, 1948, other than for the purpose of determining physical fitness, whether or not voluntarily the same reemployment rights and benefits upon relief from active duty under honorable conditions as are provided for persons inducted or enlisted in the Armed Forces.

(3) *Reinstatement rights for persons rejected for military service.*—This proposal gives for the first time reinstatement rights to those persons who leave private or Federal employment to enter the Armed Forces, but who are rejected by such forces. As written, the proposed legislation provides these reinstatement rights shall also be applicable to persons who leave private or Federal employment for the purpose of induction into, entering, determining their physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces. The proposed legislation provides for the reinstatement of such persons provided they make application within 30 days following release.

(u) *Nonapplicability of certain laws*

The present Selective Service Act exempts uncompensated officials of the Selective Service System and individuals appointed to conduct

hearings on certain appeals from certain laws applying to Government officials.

The proposed legislation would include members of the National Selective Service Appeal Board within such exemption.

(v) Section 10 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1948, among other things, provides for the creation of civilian appeal boards and other appeal agencies and provides that there shall be at least one appeal board for each State (sec. 10 (b) (3)). The first amendment to this section proposed by the bill requires the establishment of at least one appeal board within each Federal judicial district and further provides for such additional panels of such appeal boards as may be prescribed by the President.

There also is added a new subsection to section 10 of the present law which requires the Director of Selective Service to report to the Congress annually on the operation of the Selective Service System. The report must include, by States, information concerning the number of registrants, the number of registrants inducted, the number of registrants deferred, and the basis for such deferments.

(w) *Termination provisions*

(*a*) *Provisions in case of conflict with existing law.*—Section 17 (a) of the present Selective Service Act suspends all laws which are in conflict with the provisions of such act, to the extent of such conflict, for *the period in which the act shall be in force.* The proposed bill will remove the italicized portion from the present language.

As section 17 (b) of the present Selective Service Act now stands it enumerates the portions of the act which shall remain in force after the act itself shall have become inoperative *and prescribes the termination date.* Originally the termination date was to be the second anniversary of the date of enactment, which would have been June 24, 1950. This termination date was extended to July 9, 1951, by the Selective Service Extension Act of 1950. Provision regarding termination of the act both as respects the National Security Training Corps and service in the Armed Forces is covered in paragraph (c) of this section.

(*b*) *Authority for appropriations.*—The authority for appropriation language contained in section 17 (c) of the present Selective Service Act is not changed by the proposed legislation except that a sentence has been added which provides that funds appropriated for the administrative expenses for the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission, and funds appropriated to pay the expenses of the National Security Training Corps program, to be carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission, shall be appropriated to the Department of Defense.

(*c*) This paragraph provides for termination, or for suspension for any stated period of time, of induction into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps by concurrent resolution of the Congress. Upon the passage of such concurrent resolution persons theretofore inducted into the National Security Training Corps must be released from such corps not later than 6 months following the adoption of the resolution. This does not, however, relieve such persons from their obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this act.

(*d*) This paragraph prohibits the induction of persons for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954. In effect, this limits the operation of selective service to that date in the absence of further legislation by the Congress, insofar as induction of persons for the Armed Forces is concerned.

(x) *Extending present authority to order Reserve components to active Federal service*

The present Selective Service Act originally contained no authority whereby Reserve components could be ordered to active Federal service excepting the rather limited authority contained in section 7 of the original act referring to those reservists who had previously had less than 90 days of active service.

The Selective Service Extension Act of 1950 added to the original statute an additional section which authorized the ordering to 21 months active Federal service of the Reserve components effective until July 9, 1951.

The proposed legislation would extend the effective date of this authority from July 9, 1951, to July 1, 1953.

This subsection also requires that any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of more than 90 days in any branch of the Armed Forces between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or for a period of more than 12 months between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, who is now on or who may hereafter be ordered to active duty shall be released upon his application therefor after completing 12 or more months of active duty subsequent to June 25, 1950.

SECTION 2. EXTENSION OF VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENTS

The act of July 27, 1950, authorizes the President to extend all enlistments for a period of 12 months; this authority expires on July 9, 1951. As a consequence, an enlistment expiring at any time prior to July 9, 1951, could be extended for a period of 12 months. Enlistments expiring after that date could not be extended.

Section 2 (a) of the proposed legislation would move the expiration date of this extension authority from July 9, 1951, to July 1, 1952. It would also provide that no enlistment which had been extended under the previous authority could again be extended for any additional period.

Section 2 (b) would extend Public Law 779 of the Eighty-first Congress which authorizes the induction of physicians, dentists, and specialists until July 1, 1953.

SECTION 3. EFFECT ON PERSONS NOW SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY

This section provides that whenever the period of active service or any category of persons is increased such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of enactment of this act, with the exception of members of the Reserve components.

SECTION 4

This section amends section 3, the present registration section of the Selective Service Act of 1948, by providing that persons required to

register shall at the time of such registration be accorded the right to express a preference in writing to discharge their obligation for training in the National Security Training Corps or training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race and that such preference will govern any future assignment of such persons for training or training and service, insofar as military necessity will permit.

SECTION 5. SEPARABILITY

This section is a routine separability clause.

SECTION 6. SHORT TITLE

This section provides that the bill, when enacted, shall be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".

The Department of Defense is strongly in favor of the principles of the proposed legislation as indicated by the following letter:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, January 17, 1951.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes.

This bill would establish a program of universal military service and training; it would lower the minimum age for induction into the armed services from 19 years to 18; it would extend the period of service for those inducted from 21 months to 27, and it would add 1 year to the enlistment period of all men whose original enlistments were scheduled to expire during fiscal years 1952 or 1953.

This is the principal proposal in the Department of Defense legislative program for 1951. The principles embodied in this legislation have the approval of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Director of Selective Service, and all the civilian agencies concerned with manpower problems. Its prompt enactment by the Congress is urged by the Secretary of Defense and the civilian and military heads of all the Armed Forces.

Purpose of the legislation:

In the judgment of the Department of Defense, this bill represents the best way to meet our immediate need for expanded fighting forces and, at the same time, provide an enduring base for our military strength. Any program that fails to accomplish both these objectives, at a cost we can support, will be inadequate to guarantee our own security or to contribute to the establishment of lasting peace.

We are confronted with a world situation of such gravity and such unpredictability that we must be prepared for effective action, whether the challenge comes with the speed of sound or is delayed for a lifetime. To continue to put our reliance on our forces in being without making provision for a dependable civilian reserve of trained military manpower would put a crushing burden on the productive economy that is the basis of our national strength.

What we need, and what this bill would provide, is the assurance that we would be able to build up our combat forces with all possible speed and that we would be able to maintain whatever strength might be needed for as long as might be necessary to insure world peace. Through the authorization of a permanent system of universal military service and training, we could achieve these ends with minimum cost in men and money and with the least necessary dislocation of industry, agriculture, education, and family life.

The bill would make it the national obligation of all physically fit young men reaching the age of 18 to undergo military service and training and to follow that service with a specified term of duty in a Reserve component. The obligation to serve would be universal, but care would be taken in the first years of the program not to bring in 18-year-olds so rapidly that they could not make a useful contribution to our immediate military strength. As part of this orderly introduction of universal military service and training, effort would be made to confine initial

calls to those closest to their nineteenth birthday. This would insure the greatest fairness in the way we put the plan into operation.

Under the bill, moreover, no youth under the age of 19 could be sent overseas with less than 4 months of training. This would virtually rule out, except in a dire emergency, the probability that any young man brought into service in the early years of this program would go into a combat area before he was 19. However, it is our strong fear that writing into the law a specific prohibition against sending men out of the United States before their nineteenth birthday would cripple the services in meeting a sudden, ruthless, and violent action by our possible enemy.

Experience in both world wars has shown that men of 18 are among our bravest and best fighters; they have a strength and spirit that is both a support and an inspiration to their comrades-in-arms. But if they are to make their full contribution to our defense efforts, we must make certain that they receive adequate training and that they then be allowed to take their rightful place as a mainstay of our fighting forces, to the extent that the national interest requires.

In the present period of urgent need for enlarging our combat potential, those who were brought into the universal military service and training program would serve for a total period of 27 months, of which at least 4 would be devoted to training. As soon as the need abated, the President would have the right to cut down the service requirement and eventually to eliminate everything, except training. There would remain at all times an obligation that these young men reaching 18 devote from 4 to 6 months to training so they could be fitted into Reserve units and thus give us a durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of public alarm or complacency.

The suggestion that the term of service and training be longer than the present selective service period of 21 months is based on the unanimous opinion of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps that 27 months is the shortest period of service that is consistent with national security in this period when so much of our effort and our personnel must be devoted to the training of men entering military duty for the first time.

It takes so long and requires such an outlay in both funds and training personnel to impart the basic military skills required in our highly-mechanized military forces that the release of men in less than 27 months at this crucial stage of world history represents a major element of military weakness. The proposal that the total term of service be 27 months would apply not only to those coming in under universal military service and training, but also to those under selective service. Under the present 21-month term, men return to civilian life just at the point when their military usefulness becomes greatest. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, has estimated that we would gain nearly 50 percent in practical utility by the extra 6 months of service we recommend.

We recognize that 6 months is a long time in the lives of our young men. We make this recommendation for longer service only because we believe it is imperative to the attainment of the combat readiness we need in the tense months and years that lie ahead.

It is the recognition that our plans must be as dependable over the long haul as they are in the next year or two that makes the Department of Defense so emphatic in its belief that universal military service and training should be enacted without delay. We do not contend that there is no other way to meet the immediate manpower goals of the armed services, but we do insist that there is no other method that answers our immediate and our long-term needs with the same degree of certainty, the same economy, and the same regard for the total needs of our country, both civilian and military.

Since Washington first tried to win congressional approval for a program of universal training 150 years ago, our military effectiveness has been hampered and our survival as a Nation imperiled by the lack of trained reserves. Our desire for peace has caused us to throw aside our military strength before peace was secure, and the result has been to encourage aggression and war on the part of our potential enemies.

Universal military service and training represents the most effective, economical, and democratic answer to this problem. It avoids the necessity for maintaining over the years a large standing Army, Navy, and Air Force and thus contributes not only to a Military Establishment that is within our capacity to sustain but also keeps intact our American tradition of holding the professional military forces to the lowest level compatible with our security.

This is the time to give convincing proof both to those who hate us and those who look to us as a citadel of liberty that we have adopted a military posture that we can and will maintain for as long as it may be needed, on a basis that

guarantees equality of sacrifice and that will not impose a ruinous financial drain on our productive energies.

We feel that the year between a young man's eighteenth and nineteenth birthdays is the proper year in which to begin fulfilling the obligation for service this bill would establish. This is the age that would entail the least upset in the life of a young man and the smallest dislocation of education, industry, and family life.

At 18 most young men are finishing high school and not yet embarked on college or a life work. Few have married, and even fewer have children. They are at a transitional stage in their careers. We do not minimize the hardship it causes them or their families to have these young men enter military service, but this hardship is substantially less than that involved in calling in men after they have their roots more deeply fixed in jobs, higher education, and family or community affairs.

We would be operating too closely to the danger line if we had to satisfy our present military manpower ceiling of 3.5 million men with no changes in the present selective-service law, other than a 27-month period of service and a 1-year extension of enlistments. Any rise in casualties or any worsening of the military situation that forced an upward revision of our strength requirement would wipe out the safety margin and jeopardize attainment of the needed force.

It would, of course, be possible to call up husbands and fathers among the nonveteran group between the ages of 19 and 26, but the social damage of such a call would be incalculably greater than that involved in calling 18-year-olds, very few of whom have dependents. It would also be possible to ask congressional authorization to recall veterans, but no one could seriously argue that it was fair and democratic to recall those who have already given so much to the service of their country while these younger men remained immune from duty.

We feel that broadening the liability for service to take in 18-year-olds is not only necessary and just but, also, it will make it easier for us to build our military strength to the required levels with minimum disruption of the industrial, agricultural, scientific, and educational resources that play so substantial a part in our greatness as a Nation and a force for world betterment.

We recognize that there can be no long-range security for America in a program that denudes our industries and farms of skilled technicians or that interferes with our preeminence in science and general education. The proposed legislation contains specific safeguards intended to keep our colleges, laboratories, and industries healthy. Moreover, the calling up of 18-year-olds will considerably increase our abilitp to recommend deferments in the 19-to-26 group for men who possess skills that are essential to the promotion of high industrial and agricultural production or who are pursuing courses of study in fields of vital importance to both our civilian and military economy.

In recognition of the democratic principle that all military undertakings should have civilian understanding, interest, and support, provision is made for the appointment of a committee of distinguished citizens to advise the President on administration of the universal military service and training program and the welfare of men inducted under it. Similarly, all procedures for selecting students to be deferred and for supervising any program of national scholarships that might be set up to insure fullest equality of educational opportunity would be in the hands of civilian experts, rather than the military authorities.

We are mindful that the principle of equal obligation requires that every young man who can be effectively used in the Military Establishment participate in the program. Accordingly, we ask the Congress to consider the establishment in a civilian agency of a plan to assist in the rehabilitation of those who suffer from minor physical handicaps and who are desirous of making their contribution to the national welfare through induction into this program.

It is our conviction that this bill will give our country the maximum return in security for every dollar we invest in a military program that may have to be maintained at a high level for years to come.

We feel that it represents the practical way to put into effect an enduring program for the protection of our country and the defeat of aggression—a plan that is geared both to our immediate and long-term problems and that can be sustained with minimum strain on our human and industrial resources. Its adoption will be a major contribution to the strengthening of the country and the attainment of stability and peace in the world.

Respectfully submitted.

(Signed) GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

HON. CARL VINSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives.*

The Committee on Armed Services, after almost 2 months of intense study, exhaustive hearings, and many executive sessions, has favorably reported the proposed legislation by an overwhelming vote. It strongly urges the adoption of the proposed measure.

## Comparison of S. 1 as Passed by the Senate March 9, 1951, With the Selective Service Act of 1948, as Amended

Changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows: Existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

AN ACT To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### TITLE I

Section 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the [''Selective Service Act of 1948''.] *''Universal Military Training and Service Act''.*

(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the [armed forces and the reserve] *Armed Forces, including the Reserve* components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system [of selection] which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both [Ground and Air] *ground and air*, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the [Ground Forces] *ground forces* and the [Air Forces] *air forces*, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both [Ground and Air] *ground and air*, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible *development and* utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

*(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.*

*(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command.*

[AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS]

[SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand plus one hundred ten thousand one-year enlistees; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two, plus thirty-six thousand one-year enlistees; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand plus fifteen thousand one-year enlistees. The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year.]

REGISTRATION

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

TRAINING AND SERVICE

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of [nineteen] *eighteen* and twenty-six, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of [nineteen] *eighteen* after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the armed forces of the United States. Any citizen of a foreign country, who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the armed forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (*including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups*) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain [the personnel strengths (other than one-year enlistee personnel strengths) of the respective armed forces authorized by section 2 of this title and such number of persons as in his judgment may be required for the United States Coast Guard] *adequate Armed Forces.*

No person shall be inducted *into the Armed Forces* for training and service under this title [unless and] until [he is acceptable to the armed forces for such training and service and] *his acceptability in all respects (including* his physical and mental fitness for such training and service*)* has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense *(*or the Secretary of the Treasury *with respect to the United States Coast Guard).*

No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury to be essential to public and personal health.

The persons inducted into the armed forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps or the United States Coast Guard, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the

Air Force of the United States. *Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least four months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.*

No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) *of this section* shall serve [in the armed forces for a period of twenty-one consecutive months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury.] *on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.*

(c) [(1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.]

(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of department concerned: *And provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component.

(3) The passing requirement for the General Classification Test shall be fixed at seventy points.

(4) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the armed forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

(d) (1) Each person who hereafter *and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act* is inducted, enlisted, or appointed (except a person enlisted under subsection (g) of this section) and serves for a period of less than three years in one of the armed forces and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed force in which he serves, shall be transferred to a reserve component of such armed force, and until the expiration of a period of five years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter *and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act* be prescribed by law for such reserve component: *Provided*, That any such person who completes at least twenty-one months of service in the armed forces and who thereafter serves satisfactorily (1) on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least one year, which extension is hereby authorized, or (2) in an organized unit of any reserve component of any of the armed forces for a period of at least thirty-six consecutive months, shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such person, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces.

(2) Each person who hereafter *and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act* is enlisted under the pro-

visions of subsection (g) of this section and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed forces shall, upon discharge from such enlistment under honorable conditions, be transferred to a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of six years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall, so long as he is a member of such reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty, but except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress no such person shall be ordered to active duty, without his consent and except as hereinafter provided, for more than one month in any year. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can without undue hardship be filled by, any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program and to serve satisfactorily therein for a period of four years. Any such person who fails or refuses to perform such duty may be ordered to active duty, without his consent, for an additional period of not more than twelve consecutive months. Any such person who enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit and serves satisfactorily therein for a period of four years shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such person, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the transfer of such persons within and between reserve components of the armed forces and determining, for the purpose of the requirements of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the credit to be allowed any person so transferring for his previous service in one or more reserve components.

*(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force.*

(e) With respect to the persons inducted *into the Armed Forces* for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, *for training and service*, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other [enlisted men] *members of the uniformed services* of like grades and length of service of that component of the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* to which they are assigned, *except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate*

*of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.* Section 3 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: "Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148, ch. 166), as amended". The Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended, is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this title.

(f) Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted into the armed forces of the United States for training and service under this title, or to members of reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction or order to active duty, were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

[(g) Subject to the authorized one-year enlistee active duty personnel strengths established by section 2 of this title for the respective armed forces, the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of one year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of eighteen and nineteen.

(h) No person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (g) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.]

(i) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, except subsections 6 (j) and 6 (o), the President is authorized to require special registration of and, on the basis of requisitions submitted by the Department of Defense and approved by him, to make special calls for male persons qualified in needed—

(A) medical and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of fifty at the time of registration, and

(B) dental and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of fifty at the time of registration.

Persons called hereunder shall be liable for induction for not to exceed [twenty-one] *twenty-four* months of service in the Armed Forces. No such person who is a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces shall, so long as he remains a member thereof, be liable for registration or induction under this subsection, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the President under any other provision of law to call to active duty members and units of the reserve components. No person in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the fifty-first anniversary of the date of his birth.

(2) In registering and inducting persons pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President shall, to the extent that he considers practicable and desirable, register and induct in the following order of priority:

First. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the categories referred to in clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection, who have had less than ninety days of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

Second. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of

the above categories, who have had ninety days or more but less than twenty-one months of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

Third. Those who did not have active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940.

Fourth. Those not included in the first and second priority who have had active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940. Inductions of persons in this priority shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President which may provide for the classification of such persons into groups according to the number of full months of such service which they have had and for the induction of the members of any such group after the induction of the members of any other such group having a lesser number of full months of such service.

In the selection of individuals from among the categories established by subsection (i) for induction, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment of any individual whose deferment is found to be equitable and in the national interest, taking into consideration the length of his previous service in the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service) of the United States, the extent of his participation in the Army specialized training program or similar program administered by the Navy, reasons of hardship or dependency, and the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

(3) It is the sense of the Congress that the President shall provide for the annual deferment from training and service under this title of numbers of optometry students and premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preoptometry and predental students at least equal to the numbers of male optometry, premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preopto metry and predental students in attendance at colleges and universities in the United States at the present levels, as determined by the Director.

(j) The President shall establish a National Advisory Committee which shall advise the Selective Service System and shall coordinate the work of such State and local volunteer advisory committees as may be established to cooperate with the National Advisory Committee, with respect to the selection of needed medical and dental and allied specialist categories of persons as referred to in subsection (i). The members of the National Advisory Committee shall be selected from among individuals who are outstanding in medicine, dentistry, and the sciences allied thereto, but except for the professions of medicine and dentistry, it shall not be mandatory that all such fields of endeavor be represented on the committee.

In the performance of their functions, the National Advisory Committee and the State and local volunteer advisory committees shall give appropriate consideration to the respective needs of the Armed Forces and of the civilian population for the services of medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel; and, in determining the medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel available to serve the needs of any community, such committees shall give appropriate consideration to the availability in such community of medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel who have attained the fifty-first anniversary of their birth.

*(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed six months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—*

*(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of four months but not in excess of six months which may be designated in such resolution;*

*(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or*

*(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,*

*the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than four months.*

*(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.*

SELECTION

SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided,* That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further,* That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.*

*(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—*

*(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and*

*(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction.*

(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for training and service under this title shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia,

and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such training and service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

DEFERMENT AND EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; *midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;* members of the reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4 (b).

(b) (1) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of twelve months or more, or between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, for a period in excess of ninety days, in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(2) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of ninety days or more but less than twelve months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, if—

(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in any organized unit of a reserve component of the armed force in which he served, provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities (including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled), or in a reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of such armed force in any case in which enlistment or commission in an organized unit of a reserve component of such armed force is not available to him; or

(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a reserve component of such armed force is not available to him or that he has voluntarily enlisted or accepted appointment in an organized unit of a reserve component of an armed force other than the armed force in which he served.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to be applicable to any person to whom paragraph (1) of this subsection is applicable.

(3) No person who after the date of enactment of this title is honorably discharged upon the completion of a period of three years or more of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(4) No person who is honorably discharged upon the completion of an enlistment pursuant to section 4 (c) or section 4 (g) shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(5) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, no credit shall be allowed for—

(A) periods of active duty training performed as a member of a reserve component pursuant to an order or call to active duty solely for training purposes;

(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Force college training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such academies; or

(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

(c) (1) Persons who, on [the effective date of this title,] *February 1, 1951*, were members of organized units of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, shall, so long as they continue to be such members and satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, be exempt from training and service by induction under the provisions of this title, but shall not be exempt from registration unless on active duty.

(2) (A) In any case in which the Governor of any State determines and issues a proclamation to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of his State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons referred to in subsection 6 (b) (2) or persons who are not liable for training and service under this title, any person who prior to attaining the age of eighteen years and six months, *prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction*, enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such organized unit.

(B) Except as provided in subsection (b), *paragraph (1) of this subsection*, or clause (A) of this paragraph, no person who shall become a member of a reserve component after the effective date of this title shall thereby be exempt from registration or training and service by induction under the provisions of this title.

[(d) (1) Any person who, on the effective date of this title, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.

(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) on or after the effective date of this title, is selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or who, on or after the effective date of this title, is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, and (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.]

*(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the*

*Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed in the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.*

*(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.*

*(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.*

*(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.*

(e) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, or Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed four months, from induction for training and service under this title but shall not be exempt from registration.

(f) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States.

(g) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, as defined in this title, and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools, or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, shall be exempt from training and service (but not from registration) under this title.

(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f) ) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (*other than wives alone*) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have [wives or] children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, [is ordered to report for induction under this title prior to his graduation from such school or institution,] shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board [, have his induction under this title postponed] *be deferred* (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the [twentieth] *nineteenth* anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. [The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this paragraph beyond the date so determined.]

(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, [of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this title,] shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, [have his induction under this title postponed] *be deferred* (A) until the end of [such] *the* academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or catagories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.

[ (j) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, [be deferred] *in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction.* Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this title, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, [he shall be deferred] *he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction.* If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

(k) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from training and service, under this title, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(l) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one shall be discharged from service in the armed forces of the United States while this title is in effect because such person entered such service without the consent of his parent or guardian.

(m) No person shall be relieved from training and service under this title by reason of conviction of a criminal offense, except where the offense of which he has been convicted may be punished by death, or by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made under subsection (h) of this section may, within five days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

(o) Where one or more sons or daughters of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this title.

[ACTIVE DUTY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS]

[SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this title, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, without their consent and for a period not to exceed twenty-one consecutive months each, members (other than those exempted or deferred from training and service under the provisions of section 6 (c)) of any or all reserve components of the armed forces of the United States who shall have had less than

ninety days' continuous active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty. No member of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall be ordered into the active service of the armed forces of the United States under this section unless the governor of such State or Territory, or the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard in the case of a member of the District of Columbia National Guard, has consented to the ordering into active service of the armed forces of the United States of members of the National Guard of his State, Territory, or District, as the case may be, in accordance with such program or programs as may have been mutually agreed upon. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or abridge any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of reserve components of the armed forces into active service.]

BOUNTIES; SUBSTITUTES; PURCHASES OF RELEASE

SEC. 8. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for training and service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training and service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for training and service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such training and service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such training and service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training and service or liability therefor.

SEPARATION FROM SERVICE; REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

SEC. 9. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of training and service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of training and service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service, and upon the completion of his period of training and service under this title, each such person shall be given another physical examination and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such training and service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, and (2) makes application for reemployment within ninety days after he is relieved from such training and service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year—

(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall—

(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case;

(B) if such position was in the employ of a private employer, such person shall—

(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of such employer or his

successor in interest, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should—

(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case.

(c) (1) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during this period of training and service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time such person was inducted into such forces, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within one year after such restoration.

(2) It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) should be so restored in such manner as to give him such status in his employment as he would have enjoyed if he had continued in such employment continuously from the time of his entering the armed forces until the time of his restoration to such employment.

(d) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) or subsection (c) (1), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party respondent to any such action.

(e) (1) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by any Territory or possession, or political subdivision thereof, or by the District of Columbia, shall be so restored by such agency or the successor to its functions, or by such Territory, possession, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia. In any case in which, upon appeal of any person who was employed immediately before entering the armed forces by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by the District of Columbia, the United States Civil Service Commission finds that—

(A) such agency is no longer in existence and its functions have not been transferred to any other agency; or

(B) for any reason it is not feasible for such person to be restored to employment by such agency or by the District of Columbia,

the Commission shall determine whether or not there is a position in any other agency in the executive branch of the Government or in the government of the District of Columbia for which such person is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position, such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists or by the government of the District of Columbia, as the case may be. The Commission is authorized and directed to issue regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this section insofar as they relate to persons entitled to be restored to positions in the executive branch of the Government or in the government of the District of Columbia, including persons entitled to be restored under the last sentence of paragraph (2) of this subsection. The agencies in the executive branch of the Government and the government of the District of Columbia shall comply with such rules and regulations and orders issued by the Commission pursuant to this subsection. The Commission is authorized and directed whenever it finds, upon appeal of the person concerned, that any agency in the executive branch of the Government or the government of the District of Columbia has failed or refuses to comply with the provisions of this section, to issue an order specifically requiring such agency or the government of the District of Columbia to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with such provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment, unemployment compensation, or readjustment allowances: *Provided*, That any such compensation ordered to be paid by the Commission shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the agency concerned or by the government of the District of Columbia out of appropriations currently available for salary and expenses of such agency or government, and such appropriations shall be available for such purpose. As used in this paragraph, the term "agency in the executive branch of the Government" means any department, independent establishment, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the United States Government.

(2) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the legislative branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces. In any case in which it is not possible for any such person to be restored to a position in the legislative branch of the Government and he is otherwise eligible to acquire a status for transfer to a position in the classified (competitive) civil service in accordance with section 2 (b) of the Act of November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1212), the United States Civil Service Commission shall, upon appeal of such person, determine whether or not there is a position in the executive branch of the Government for which he is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists.

(3) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the judicial branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces.

(f) In any case in which two or more persons who are entitled to be restored to a position under the provisions of this section or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits left the same position in order to enter the armed forces, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right to be restored thereto, without prejudice to the reemployment rights of the other person or persons to be restored.

(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to [the date of enactment of this title and while it is in effect,] *June 24, 1948*, enlists in the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* of the United States (other than in a [reserve] *Reserve* component) *and who serves* for not more than [three] *four* years (*plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law*) shall[, if such enlistment is his first enlistment in the armed forces subsequent to the date of enactment of this title,] be entitled upon [the expiration of his enlistment (including any extension thereof by law but not including any voluntary extension thereof) or upon his discharge] *release from service* under honorable conditions [prior to the expiration thereof,] to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

(2) Any person who, subsequent to [the effective date of this title and while it is in effect,] *June 24, 1948,* enters upon active duty *(other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily,* in the [armed forces] *Armed Forces* of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than [three] *four* years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such [three] *four* years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

*(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated.*

(h) The Secretary of Labor, through the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, shall render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States or the Public Health Service. In rendering such aid, the Secretary shall use the then existing Federal and State agencies engaged in similar or related activities and shall utilize the assistance of volunteers.

(i) Any person inducted into the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than one day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election. No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, be required to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

(j) The Secretaries of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Treasury shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM; CONSTRUCTION; CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

SEC. 10. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

(3) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the Act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That, effective upon the termination of this title and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (A) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the effective date of this title, (B) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for liquidating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (C) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to

be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

(b) The President is authorized—

(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title;

(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and for the District of Columbia, who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System; to employ such number of civilians, and to order to active duty with their consent and to assign to the Selective Service System such officers of the selective-service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments and such other officers of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States or other armed forces personnel (including personnel of the reserve components thereof), as may be necessary for the administration of the national and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System;

(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other civilian agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, classification, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this title, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this title. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided,* That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the President determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation. Any such intercounty local board shall have within its area the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, or separate panels thereof each consisting of three or more members, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, have the power within the respective jurisdictions of such local boards to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local board shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training and service under this title, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from training and service, as provided for in this title, by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

(4) to appoint, and to fix, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any reserve component thereof with his consent, or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this title (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 10 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the armed forces or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof, and the District of Columbia, and of private welfare organizations, in the execution of this title;

(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blankbook work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, with or without advertising or formal contract;

(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this title, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this title;

(8) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purpose, to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease pursuant to existing statutes, except that the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this title;

(9) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge such existing installations; to construct, install, and equip, and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of such buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances (including the necessary grading and removal, repair or remodeling of existing structures and installations), as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this title, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended;

(10) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this title, such personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof with their consent, and such civilian personnel, as may be necessary. For the purposes of this title, the provisions of section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress) with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees shall not be applicable to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this title, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

(d) In the administration of this title, gifts of supplies, equipment, and voluntary services may be accepted.

(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this title.

(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated

personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE

SEC. 11. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, funds available to carry out the provisions of this title shall also be available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization, of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this title, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

PENALTIES

SEC. 12. (a) Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this title, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said title, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant to this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise, with the administration of this title or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this title unless such person has been actually inducted for the training and service prescribed under this title or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this title. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

(b) Any person (1) who knowingly transfers or delivers to another, for the purpose of aiding or abetting the making of any false identification or representation, any registration certificate, alien's certificate of nonresidence, or any other certificate issued pursuant to or prescribed by the provisions of this title, or rules or regulations promulgated hereunder; or (2) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, has in his possession any such certificate not duly issued to him; or (3) who forges, alters, or in any manner changes any such certificate or any notation duly and validly inscribed thereon; or (4) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, photographs, prints, or in any manner makes or executes any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any such certificate, or any colorable imitation thereof; or (5) who has in his possession any certificate purporting to be a certificate issued pursuant to this title, or rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, which he knows to be falsely made, reproduced, forged, counterfeited, or altered; or (6) who knowingly violates or evades any of the provisions of this title or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto relating to the issuance, transfer, or possession of such certificate, shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $10,000 or be imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of any certificate not duly issued to him, such

possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to establish an intent to use such certificate for purposes of false identification or representation, unless the defendant explains such possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS

SEC. 13. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections *or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board.*

(b) All functions performed under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such Act.

(c) In computing the lump-sum payments made to Air Force reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 16, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 300a), and to reserve officers of the Navy or to their beneficiaries under section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1942, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 850k), no credit shall be allowed for any period of active service performed from the effective date of this title to the date on which this title shall cease to be effective. Each such lump-sum payment shall be prorated for a fractional part of a year of active service in the case of any reserve officer subject to the provisions of either such section, if such reserve officer performs continuous active service for one or more years (inclusive of such service performed during the period in which this title is effective) and such active service includes a fractional part of a year immediately prior to the effective date of this title, or immediately following the date on which this title shall cease to be effective, or both.

CIVIL RELIEF

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the Act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), and the provisions of section 4 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall be applicable to all persons in the armed forces of the United States, including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this title or the Public Health Service, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent Act of the Congress: *Provided*, That, with respect to persons inducted into the armed forces while this title is in effect, wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while such Act is in force, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

NOTICE OF TITLE; VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS

SEC. 15. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this title upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

(c) If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(d) Except as provided in section 4 (c) or section 4 (g), nothing contained in this title shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, except that no person shall be

accepted for enlistment after he has received orders to report for induction and except that, whenever the Congress or the President has declared that the national interest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. When used in this title—

(a) The term "between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six" shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

(b) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "armed forces" shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard.

(d) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(e) The term "local board" shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

(f) The term "Director" shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

(g) (1) The term "duly ordained minister of religion" means a person who has been ordained, in accordance with the ceremonial, ritual, or discipline of a church, religious sect, or organization established on the basis of a community of faith and belief, doctrines and practices of a religious character, to preach and to teach the doctrines of such church, sect, or organization and to administer the rites and ceremonies thereof in public worship, and who as his regular and customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion and administers the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of such church, sect, or organization.

(2) The term "regular minister of religion" means one who as his customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, a religious sect, or organization of which he is a member, without having been formally ordained as a minister of religion, and who is recognized by such church, sect, or organization as a regular minister.

(3) The term "regular or duly ordained minister of religion" does not include a person who irregularly or incidentally preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, religious sect, or organization and does not include any person who may have been duly ordained a minister in accordance with the ceremonial, rite, or discipline of a church, religious sect or organization, but who does not regularly, as a vocation, teach and preach the principles of religion and administer the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of his church, sect, or organization.

(h) The term "organized unit," when used with respect to a reserve component, shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof are required satisfactorily to participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(i) The term "reserve components of the armed forces" shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be deemed to include the federally recognized National Guard of the United States, the federally recognized Air National Guard of the United States, the Officers Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and shall include, in addition to the foregoing the Public Health Service Reserve when serving with the armed forces.

*(j) The terms "active training and service" shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; "trainee" shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; "initial period of basic training" or "initial basic training" shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; "inductee" shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service.*

TERMINATION OF TITLE

SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title[,] all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby [suspended] *repealed* to the extent of such conflict. [for the period in which this title shall be in force.]

[(b) All of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 2, the second sentence of section 4 (a), section 4 (b), sections 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), 14, and 17 (b), shall become inoperative and cease to apply on July 9, 1951, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.]

*(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by Departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated Departments and agencies.*

[(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.]

UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

SEC. 18. (a) Whenever the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces of the United States, or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

(b) It shall be the duty of any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may prescribe, and (2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible.

(c) In case any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) refuses or fails—

(1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may have prescribed;

(2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible as determined by the President;

(3) to produce the kind of quality of articles or materials ordered; or

(4) to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as shall be negotiated between such person and the Government agency concerned; or in the event of failure to negotiate a price, to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as he may subsequently be determined to be entitled to receive under subsection (d);

the President is authorized to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility of such person and to operate it, through any Government agency, for the production of such articles or materials as may be required by the Government.

(d) Fair and just compensation shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to render inapplicable to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession is taken pursuant to subsection (c) any State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, or employment standards of employees.

(f) Any person, or any officer of any person as defined in this section, who willfully fails or refuses to carry out any duty imposed upon him by subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years, or by a fine of not more than $50,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine.

(g) (1) As used in this section—

(A). The term "person" means any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or other form of business organization.

(B) The term "Government agency" means any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation in the Executive branch of the United States Government.

(2) For the purposes of this section, a plant, mine, or other facility shall be deemed capable of producing any articles or materials if it is then producing or furnishing such articles or materials or if the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it can be readily converted to the production or furnishing of such articles or materials.

(h) (1) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available, to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries orders for steel products or steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each six-month period following the date of enactment of this Act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the armed forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 per centum.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 19. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 20. This title shall become effective immediately; except that unless the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares a national emergency after the date of enactment of this Act, no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this title within ninety days after the date of its enactment. The Secretary of the Army, for the Army and the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, for the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Secretary of the Treasury, for the Coast Guard, are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strengths.

AUTHORITY TO ORDER RESERVE COMPONENTS TO ACTIVE FEDERAL SERVICE

SEC. 21. Until [July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended,] *July 1, 1953*, the President shall be authorized to order into the active military or naval service of the United States for a period of not to exceed [twenty-one] *twenty-four* consecutive months, with or without their consent, any or all members and units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces.

*SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fourth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act and each year thereafter, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such reviews, the committees shall report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable.*

○

Union Calendar No. 57

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

[Report No. 271]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 12, 1951

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 15, 1951

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

# AN ACT

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

~~TITLE I~~

~~SECTION 1. That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:~~

~~(a) Section 1 of such Act is amended to read as follows:~~

~~"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'.~~

"~~(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.~~

"~~(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.~~

"~~(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.~~

"~~To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.~~

"(c) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

"(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect

~~the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command."~~

~~(b) Section 2 of such Act is repealed.~~

~~(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen".~~

~~(d) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate Armed Forces."~~

~~(e) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:~~

~~"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects (including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard)."~~

~~(f) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least four months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."~~

~~(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:~~

~~"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary~~

of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.

(h) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such Act is repealed.

(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and

shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(j) The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E-1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an

allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(k) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.

(l) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-four".

(m) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed six months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of four months but not in excess of six months which may be designated in such resolution;

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security

Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than four months.

"(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall, subject to the direc-

tion of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

(n) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons

who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not

attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(o) (1) Section 6 (e) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (e) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the following: "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (e) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interests and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance

with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 4946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon lead-

ers' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury

with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting in clause (1) of the second sentence after the word "persons", where it appears the second time, the

following: "(other than wives alone)", and (2) by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof the words "wives or".

(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Subsection (j) of section 6 of such Act is amended

(1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction", and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction".

(u) Section 7 of such Act is repealed.

(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in

the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(x) Section 16 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(j) the terms 'active training and service' shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(y) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission

and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by Departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated Departments and agencies."

(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four".

(aa) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fourth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act and each year thereafter, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such reviews, the committees shall report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64

Stat. 379), is hereby amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828); is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".

SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed

a total of four million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this Act."

SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

SEC 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".

TITLE II

SEC 21. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out the words "until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed two thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in

~~the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed twenty-five thousand".~~

~~(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955".~~

*That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:*

*(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'."*

*(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act are amended to read as follows:*

*"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of eighteen years and six months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: Provided, That any such person who has not attained the age of eighteen years and six months shall,*

*as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of eighteen years and six months. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."*

*(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereafter provided (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to pro-*

*vide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act."*

*(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: Provided, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six in January 1945."*

*(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the*

*provisions of this title shall, during the six-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone).*"

*(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-six consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secreary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title.*"

*(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

"*(1) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: Provided, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: Provided further, That active service*

*performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: And provided further, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.*

*"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.*

*"(3) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of eighteen, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.*

*"(4) Any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be*

*afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).*

*"(5) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."*

*(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:*

*"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of six years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National*

*Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other*

*reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force."*

*(i) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.*

*(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six".*

*(k) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:*

*"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.*

*"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—*

*"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this*

*title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-six months which may be designated in such resolution; or*

*"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,*

*the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under section 4 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of six months: Provided, That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of nineteen years during the period of such deferment.*

*"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians; of the remaining two members one shall be an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, the other shall be a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a reserve component. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.*

*"(4) The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be two years. The term of office of the remaining three members of the Commission shall be for three, four, and five years, respectively. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal*

*of a member, shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. Members of the Commission, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.*

*"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. Subject to the direction of the President, and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies, standards, and directives of the Commission.*

*"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ*

*and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.*

*"(7) The Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a plan or plans for—*

*"(i) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, which program shall include the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;*

*"(ii) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;*

*"(iii) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;*

*"(iv) such other policies and standards as may be established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and*

*"(v) recommendations with respect to disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.*

*"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—*

*"(1) the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress and referred to the Committees on Armed Services during which sixty-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses of the Congress, by the affirmative vote of a majority of either House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such plan: Provided, That the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses to which the plan is referred shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of forty-five calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress, report a resolution to their respective Houses approving or disapproving the plan submitted by the Commission, and its recommendations thereon, and such resolution shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House; and*

*"(2) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress*

*in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.*

*"(9) Following the adoption of a plan submitted by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (8), the Commission may, if changes to the plan are deemed desirable by the Commission, submit such changes to the Congress in accordance with the procedure prescribed in paragraph (8), and such changes shall be acted upon as prescribed in paragraph (8).*

*"(10) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding six months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding six months, the cost of the training program charge-*

*able to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.*

*"(11) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: Provided, however, That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.*

*"(12) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."*

*(l) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": And provided further, That nothing herein*

*shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."*

*(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".*

*(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".*

*(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".*

*(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".*

*(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:*

*"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but*

*shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.*

*"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.*

*"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the defer-*

*ment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."*

*(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: Provided, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: Provided further, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This*

*proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such*

*rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."*

*(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.*

*"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or*

*similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: Provided, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."*

*(r) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.*

*(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held*

*by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".*

*(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".*

*(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".*

*(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.*

*"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948,*

*enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.*

*"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."*

*(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended*

*by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".*

*(v) Section 10 of said Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President."; and*

*(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:*

*"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."*

*(w) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.*

*"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense."*

*"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than six months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.*

*"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954."*

*(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking*

*out "July 9, 1951," inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of ninety days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of twelve or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty."*

*SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session), is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1952" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."*

*(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat.*

*828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".*

*SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act, except members of the reserve components.*

*SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: Provided, That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written preference to discharge their obligation for training in the National Security Training Corps or training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race,*

*which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training or training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit."*

*SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.*

*SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".*

Passed the Senate March 9, 1951.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

*Secretary.*

Union Calendar No. 57

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

[Report No. 271]

# AN ACT

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

MARCH 12, 1951

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 15, 1951

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

S. 683. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 695. An act for the relief of William Greville Birkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2268. An act to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

287. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska', as amended"; was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committee were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 163. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 99; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 196. Joint Resolution to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2394. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; with amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2829. A bill to exempt the members and certain employees of the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights from the operation of certain conflict-of-interest statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1. An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3244. A bill to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to computation of accredited service of duly designated official representatives of national organizations of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3245. A bill to provide that leaves of absence granted duly designated official representatives of national organizations of postal employees in respect to organizational duties be construed as allowable service in determining eligibility for promotion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3246. A bill to establish a chiropody section in the Army Medical Service Corps and in the Navy Medical Service Corps, and to authorize appointments to such corps from among graduates of accredited schools of chiropody; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3247. A bill to provide for emergency furlough or leave for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States in the event of the death of a member of such person's immediate family; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3248. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in annuities, pensions, and certain lump sums payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3249. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in the survivor annuities and insurance lump sum payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3250. A bill to provide that certain determinations with respect to Federal assistance for school construction may be based on school attendance figures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, instead of for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 3251. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to require that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by the full Court, and that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3252. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3253. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3254. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labeling of soaps and detergents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3255. A bill to enlarge the definition of cosmetic contained in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by removing the exception made in the case of soap; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3256. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by requiring the labeling of bread or rolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of chemical additives in food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3258. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as amended, to provide reimbursement for fines paid and for lost pay and other benefits upon correction of military and naval records; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3259. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to raise the income limit for admission to low-rent housing provided under the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend section 6 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, so that for purposes of passage of a resolution of disapproval by either House of Congress the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of such House will not be required; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 3262. A bill to provide for the payment of certain unrecovered costs incurred by producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals for use in the prosecution of World War II; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3263. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district courts with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3264. A bill to increase by $30 per month the retired pay and disability retire-

ment pay of enlisted persons of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 3265. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to provide for the payment of certain compensation to William E. Cook; to the Committee on House Administration.

---

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to proposed discriminatory and excessive increases in the Federal tax on wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to requesting Congress not to enact any legislation or make any appropriations for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to instructing delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to requesting legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to requesting Congress to admit Hawaii as a State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to requesting Congress to remove all racial restrictions on the privilege of naturalization for citizenship in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3266. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Harman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3267. A bill for the relief of Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 3269. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vasilios Georgantas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 3270. A bill for the relief of Anthony N. Goraieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3272. A bill for the relief of King Mayberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3273. A bill for the relief of George F. Willis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of John A. Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Blasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Narcisso and Slava Zomberlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 3278. A bill for the relief of Enrico Colandria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Magda Erdossi Frosh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

125. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Letter from Richard H. Nelson, vice president, Herman Nelson Division, American Air Filter Co., Inc., Moline, Ill., regarding capital gains tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

126. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

127. Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to pass anti-poll tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

128. Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for the President and the Congress to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

129. Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to pass law to grant a special name to a new United States Veterans' hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

130. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

131. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress for legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the committee on the Judiciary.

132. By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress, the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Animal Industry to continue its cooperation with the Joint United States-Mexican Aftosa Commission in its program of combating and ultimate eradication of the dread disease among livestock known as foot-and-mouth disease, prevalent in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

133. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to require military service of all qualified citizens without regard for race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Armed Services.

134. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to ward off foreign invasion of fundamental American rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

135. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to repeal section 241 of title 25, United States Code, annotated, known as the Indian liquor law and all laws or parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

136. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

137. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to propose and adopt an amendment to section 11 of the act of Congress of February 22, 1889; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

138. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the use of the State of South Dakota in relieving counties in said State from the burden imposed by nontaxable Indian land and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction, and health, in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

139. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief Engineer, to continue its investigations and work to prevent future waste of water from the Artesian Basin by sealing existing wells within the areas to be flooded by the Missouri River dams in South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works.

140. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota opposing and protesting the proposal of the United States Treasury to impose a tax on State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

141. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, proposing that the United States delegation to the United Nations propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

142. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, advocating facilitation of citizenship for parents of deceased members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pecoraro and Scanlan, New York City, N. Y., relative to Plymouth Brethren IV, Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Mar. 20, 1951
For actions of Mar. 19, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 49

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....5
Budget.....26
Cotton.....2,16
Dairy industry.....21
Education..... 13,22,27
Electrification,10,12,18,29
Expenditures.....26
Farm program.....22
Fertilizers.....33
Food and drugs.....19
Food production.....8
Forests and forestry..11,23
Housing.....36
Irrigation.....8
Labor, farm.....6,14,34
Livestock and meat.....3
Lobbying.....31
Military training.....4
Organization, executive .....15,20,35
Peanuts.....1
Personnel.....17
Poultry.....21
Prices, control.....2,16
farm.....24
R.F.C.....7,28,37
Rent control.....9
Reports.....3,13
Rice.....25
Selective service.....4
Small business.....30
Trade,foreign.....32,38
Transportation.....29
Water utilization.....8,18

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed peanut-quota bill. Rep. Hoffman introduced bills to carr out Hoover Commission recommendations. H. Rules Com. cleared military training bil

SENATE

1. PEANUTS. Passed as reported H. R. 2615, to permit additional acreage allotments and marketing quotas for certain peanuts of which there is a short supply (pp. 2647-9). Reps. Cooley, Poage, Grant, Hope, and Andresen were appointed House conferees (p. 2714).

2. PRICE CONTROL. Received a resolution from the N. C. Legislature opposing the cotton price-control order (p. 2642).

3. REPORT. Both Houses received the USDA report on the foot-and-mouth disease campaign for Jan. 1951 (pp. 2638, 2715).

HOUSE

4. MILITARY TRAINING. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of S. 1, the military-training, selective-service bill (pp. 2689, 2715).

5. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 3282, without amendment (H. Rept. 272) (p. 2715). The bill contains appropriations for the Treasury Department, Post Office Department, and the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to provide for the consideration of the bill and to waive points of order against it (p. 2715).

6. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported H. R. 3283, to provide for the recruitment of foreign farm workers (pp. D207-8). See also item 14.

7. R.F.C. Reps. Mansfield, Mont., and Curtis, Mo., urged continuation of the investigations of RFC (pp. 2682, 2713-4).

8. FOOD PRODUCTION; IRRIGATION. Rep. Engle, Calif., inserted William E. Warne's (Assistant Secretary of Interior) recent speech pointing out that by increased use of irrigation and development of new irrigation facilities food production in the world can be greatly increased (pp. 2707-9).

9. RENT CONTROL. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 39, to continue rent controls until June 30, 1951 (pp. 2689-99). This measure will now be sent to the President.

10. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Withrow, Wis., inserted and discussed a constituent's letter objecting to having the Defense Electric Power Administration allocate the critical materials needed for the rural electrification program, and urging the REA make such allocations (pp. 2683-4).

11. FOREST ROADS. Received an Oreg. Legislature memorial relative to the construction of timber access roads in the public forests (p. 2717).

12. ELECTRIFICATION. Received an Idaho Legislature memorial relative to the construction of a power plant at American Falls Dam and construction of Palisades Dam (p. 2717).

13. REPORTS. Received from the President the report of the State Department on the program authorizing a student's exchange program with funds from the disposition of surplus property abroad (H. Doc. 86) (p. 2685); the annual report of the American Chemical Society; the annual report of the Treasury Department (H. Doc. 3); and the report of GSA on contracts for experimental and research work and testing (p. 2715).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

14. FARM LABOR. H. R. 3283, by Rep. Poage, Tex., to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for the recuitment of foreign farm workers; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2716). See also item 6.

H. J. Res. 208, by Rep. Mahon, Tex., to provide that Federal legislation which prohibits the employment of children during certain hours shall not apply with respect to the harvesting of basic agricultural commodities; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 2717).

15. REORGANIZATION. Rep. Hoffman, Mich., introduced the following bills to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission: (p. 2716):

H. R. 3308, to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture; to Agriculture Committee.

H. R. 3303, to establish a temporary National Commission of Intergovernmental Relations.

H. R. 3304, to establish principles and policies to govern the management of the executive branch of the Government.

H. R. 3305, to consolidate certain hospital and public health functions in a Department of Health.

H. R. 3306, to establish a Department of Social Security and Education.

H. R. 3307, making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government.

H. R. 3309, to reorganize the Interior Department; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

H. R. 3310, to expand the activities of the Commerce Department; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

H. R. 3311, to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

H. R. 3312, making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

H. R. 3313, to reorganize the Treasury Department; to Ways and Means Committee.

H. R. 3314, to place in GSA the responsibility for several miscellaneous

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this action is necessary because of legislation already passed by the House. It was omitted from the last appropriation bill.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the general fund of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the following sum:

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

For an additional amount for "Office of Administrator of Rent Control," $21,250: *Provided,* That the limitation of $34,000 for payment of terminal leave only, in the appropriation of $113,100 for necessary expenses for "Office of Administrator of Rent Control," contained in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong.), is hereby repealed.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE AND SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COX from the Committee on Rules, at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 171, Rept. No. 276), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 196) to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for a 3-month extension of the Housing and Rent Act of 1950. The rent-control legislation, if you remember, was extended last December for 3 months, to March 31, 1951. At the time of the extension of this act last December it gave power and authority to any incorporated city, town, or village that saw fit to decontrol itself from the Federal rent-control law. A great number of cities over the country have taken advantage of the decontrol aspect of the law, and there are a great number of cities, especially the large industrial areas, that have not taken advantage of the decontrol phase of this law.

I do not think there is any opposition to this rule. The extension of 3 months is merely to give the Congress an opportunity to draft a rent-control law for this coming mobilization emergency that will coincide with the price-control legislation which will be considered within the next few months. So the purpose of the rule is to call up this extension legislation so as not only to protect a great number of industrial areas from losing the protection of rent control, but also to prevent rent gouging in military areas. The other day when we had the housing legislation up I called the attention of the Congress to the statements made by commanders in control of various military installations regarding the terrific difficulty officers and servicemen are having at those installations in securing any kind of rental quarters. In practically all cases the rental quarters they are securing are at prohibitive rents.

As I say, this is merely an interim 3-month extension of the present law.

If this legislation is not extended for 3 months, about 600 cities and towns will lose rent control on March 31. Twenty-seven cities of over 100,000 population will lose rent control, which includes my own home town of Gary, Ind. The Calumet region of Indiana is now undergoing a great influx of workers in the various steel mills and other industries in that locality. Housing is at a premium. The Housing Authority of the City of Chicago states that there are 270,000 dwellings needed. The Federal Bureau of Statistics states that all Chicago rental dwelling units are 99.2 percent occupied. Of course, a fraction of the unoccupied percentage is uninhabitable or cannot be occupied for various reasons. Chicago is not any different from Los Angeles, Detroit, and other major industrial areas as far as the rental crisis is concerned.

Our military personnel have already referred to the rental problem at the various military establishments as "operations gouge."

I hope the Congress extends this rent control protection legislation without a dissenting vote.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1950 Congress provided for an orderly system of discontinuing rent control, because Congress thought that it was a local proposition. We extended that time until December 31, 1950. On December 7 we extended it to March 31, 1951. Now we are here again to extend it until June 30.

As far as I am individually concerned, this in itself is probably not so bad, except it just continues to keep the nose of the Federal bureaucracy under the tent. In other words, when these bureaucrats downtown get a little power they do not want to relinquish it.

I personally feel that the municipalities in our local States and communities are in better condition to know whether they want rent control than we down here in Washington, especially the bureaucrats downtown. The fact is that those cities have now had nearly a year to decide whether they do or do not want rent control. If they wanted it, all they had to do was vote for it. In most cases, I believe 93 percent of the communities, they have taken no action on it; consequently, they do not want rent control. But here Congress again is saying, "we know better than you know what you need back in your local communities."

My good friend from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has said there are some places that want rent control. Why do they not vote for it if they wanted it? There is nothing now in the present law that can stop them from having rent control, whether it be Hammond, Ind., in the district of my good friend, or a town in the district of any of you. If they wanted rent control, they could have had it. The fact that few communities have voted for it makes it quite clear that they do not want it.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that after the Members hears the splendid argument the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will make against this bill there will be no question that it will

be voted down. Personally I am not opposing the rule, however, although I will vote against the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. What effect would this have on the communities that have already refused to sustain this rent-control program and that have already let it die?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It would have no effect whatsoever, and they would remain that way. But the fact is that these bureaucrats here in Washington, once they get a little power, do not want to relinquish it. Last week we turned down the housing bill, which was a major defeat for them, and here they come with this bill, again trying to put the shackles on the people back home. That is their sole purpose. Once they have obtained a little power they want to keep it. If it were not for what we did to the bureaucrats on the housing bill last week they would probably be here with a bill trying to control everybody in every community. Now they are coming in here gently, but I predict that they will soon be back trying to force rent control and other controls on all communities in every way possible.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that if a man in charge of rent control knows as little about it as this man who calls himself DiSalle—but whose real name I understand is DiSalvo—knows about cotton, the people who have houses to rent, and probably the people who rent them, will be in a terrible predicament before it is over. It is about time that we got back to the Constitution of the United States and began to run the Government by laws that the people can understand and not by bureaucratic regulations.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The gentleman always brings forth good, old-fashioned American statements.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 196) to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 196, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am astonished at the opposition to this bill. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency voted it out unanimously and passed it without a record vote. The House passed the rent control bill for the District of Columbia by unanimous consent. Are we going to protect ourselves in the District of Columbia and give no protection to the people elsewhere?

This bill was passed originally in June 1950, and expired on December 31 of that year, but since then we have engaged in war, a war that has grown in importance and in the effect it will have on our institutions and our economy. Times have changed since the bill was passed. We extended it on December 31 to March 31 because of the impact of that war, and we are again extending it for the same reason. Are we going to pay no attention to the fact that we are now fighting for our liberties and that we are now in the midst of a war which imperils our institutions? Are we going to sabotage all of the measures that have been introduced merely because they have the approval of those charged with administering the law? You to my left may talk about bureaucrats, but how can a law be administered without a department to administer it? Laws do not administer themselves; they are not self-executing. You must have men, with all their imperfections, to administer the laws of the United States.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. No, not at this time; I want to talk a little bit about this bill.

This bill is essential, it seems to me, because of conditions that prevail in America now. We are making a defense effort; it means the shifting of large segments of our population. Housing is as essential to the defense effort as machinery, as plants; because, unless we house the people they cannot perform their functions, and the efficiency of our productive machinery will be destroyed. That is one reason for continuing rent control and for the introduction of this resolution; that is the reason that impelled the Senate. But now, much to my surprise, it is obvious that a fight is going to be made on the resolution.

Many of the defense contracts are tied in to the cost of living. Rent is one of the greatest elements of living costs. Are we going to have no control over rents in these defense areas, when housing is so essential?

Before long a bill will be introduced in the House to amend the Defense Production Act. In that bill there will be a provision for rent control. We expect to have lengthy hearings on the subject; we expect it to be considered dispassionately and earnestly. At that time we expect the House also to take into consideration the general needs for the economic stabilization. We expect to consider rent control, price control, wage control, and the controls that may be essential to making us strong in these perilous times in our Nation.

I hope that the House will at least give us an opportunity to consider these matters and to consider them in relation to the other things that are so essential for our national welfare.

The great problem that presents itself to the American people at this time is how to make our Government efficient in the fight we are waging to preserve the liberties of mankind. I think everybody recognizes the importance of housing in this great effort; I think everybody recognizes that if you do not house your people properly they will not be efficient. I think everybody recognizes the necessity for increased housing accommodations in many defense areas of of the Nation where there have been great shifts in population and great increases in employment, and I think we all realize, we must realize, the necessity of fair and reasonable rents to these people who are going to do a great service to their country and to the preservation of its institutions.

Now, are you going to brush that off and say that this is a bureaucratic measure, that some bureaus are going to misuse their power, that we do not like what they have done? It is a broader and deeper question than that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Did I correctly understand that this bill, whether passed or not, would have no application whatever to the State of New York in that the State of New York already has a rent control law?

Mr. SPENCE. It would not. There are about 7,500,000 units that have been decontrolled. In that number are included 2,500,000 units in New York that are decontrolled federally but are probably more strictly controlled by reason of State action.

Mr. KEATING. They are covered by State law.

Mr. SPENCE. They are covered by State law, but decontrolled federally. The State, however, has recognized the necessity for rent control at this time.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct. My only desire in making the inquiry is to be sure that the passage of this bill will not affect them one way or the other.

Mr. SPENCE. No, it will not affect New York one way or the other.

Mr. Chairman, there are 6,000,000 units still under control. It is true they could be decontrolled by local action. But if this bill does not pass by the 1st of April all of those communities will be decontrolled. That means the local organization for rent control will be discontinued. If after consideration we desire to put controls on it will be just that much more difficult. If we do not pass the resolution, the city of Detroit, the city of Cleveland, the city of Minneapolis, and other great defense areas, will be decontrolled. It is true that the local government could continue control by affirmative action, but they have not done so. If you do not pass this resolution, you will impair the authority of the Government to continue those controls in defense areas where they are needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, is this a matter of sufficient importance to consider it in its larger aspects? Do you think we would

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include additional matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain additional matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the extension of remarks which I asked for today, inserting the lecture of William Jennings Bryan, may be made regardless of the cost, although I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $307.50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. RANKIN. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, may I say that it will not cost that amount, for the simple reason that all the employes are already on the job and it will merely cost for paper and ink.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. BUSBEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader of January 19, 1951.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend the remarks he made on the bill H. R. 314 during the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 445. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1498. An act to provide compensation for duty voluntarily performed on their days off by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

288. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Trustees, National Trust for Historic Preservation, transmitting a report for the calendar year 1950 for the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, pursuant to section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes," approved October 26, 1949; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

289. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

290. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1950, pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 358, Seventy-fifth Congress, chapter 762, first session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

292. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, and for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, for the period July through December 1950, pursuant to Public Law 152, as amended, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

293. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of January 1951, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

294. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Olcott Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 17, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

295. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, in the amount of $34,350, for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

296. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision authorizing a transfer between appropriations of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year 1951 (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

297. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $473,878 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

298. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision and a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $25,000,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

299. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $3,650,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

300. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $1,999,044.26, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

301. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 located respectively, at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle, also a copy of the interim report covering the operations of foreign-trade zone No. 1 at New York, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1949, pursuant to section 16 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended by Public Law 566, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 17, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3282. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 169. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 196, joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 273). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 170. Resolution providing for the waiving of points of order against H. R. 3282, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 274). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 171. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1, an act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 276). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 277. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 278. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 3282. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 3283. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3284. A bill to amend section 401 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, so as to exempt cotton from price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 3285. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 3286. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so that persons receiving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system can earn as much as $100 a month, in lieu of $50 a month, without forfeiting insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3287. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pertaining to the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule, and to place the position of char employee working part time in the appropriate grade of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3288. A bill to provide promotional credit for certain postal employees now under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3289. A bill to grant longevity credit to former postal employees now under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 3290. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to compensate members of the military and naval forces of the United States for losses sustained as a result of Japanese sequestration of bank accounts in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3291. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3292. A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 3293. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3294. A bill to conserve water and power for irrigation and related purposes and to conserve petroleum used in power generation and to direct the construction, operation, and maintenance of transmission lines interconnecting Federal power systems of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Pacific Northwest and northern and central California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3295. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3296. A bill to provide a Federal old-age pension for citizens of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 3297. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 3298. A bill to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 3299. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3300. A bill to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3301. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce," approved January 2, 1951, so as to require that information furnished to the Attorney General thereunder shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3302. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 3303. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3304. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3305. A bill to establish and to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public health functions of the Government in a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3306. A bill to establish a Department of Social Security and Education in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3307. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government so as to effectuate the recommendations regarding regulatory agencies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committe on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3308. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3309. A bill to effectuate recommendations relating to the Department of the Interior of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3310. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3311. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3312. A bill making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3313. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of the Treasury in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3314. A bill to place in the administrator of General Services responsibility for coordination of certain miscellaneous activities in the District of Columbia in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3315. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Labor in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3316. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3317. A bill creating a Veterans' Insurance Corporation in the Veterans' Administration to exercise all of the functions with respect to Government life insurance and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3318. A bill to provide for the creation of a board of Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects and Drainage Area Advisory Commissions, in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3319. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the Department of State in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 3320. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3321. A bill to increase the excise tax on malt beverages and to prevent loss of revenue derived from excise taxes on malt beverages and other products packed in tin containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3322. A bill to increase the excise tax on malt beverages and to prevent loss of revenue derived from excise taxes on malt beverages and other products packed in tin containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3364

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 20, 1951

Mr. BARDEN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Selective Service Act of 1951'."

(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of nineteen after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of nineteen shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces upon his attaining the age of nineteen. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act."

(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six in January 1945."

(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given

full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the six-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone)."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any enlisted member of any reserve component

of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"(3) Any person after attaining the age of seventeen

shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b)."

(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces and in a reserve component for a total period of six years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that

enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(i) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-four".

(k) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of active service of the age group or groups desig-

nated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be."

(l) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President".

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Re-

serve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission;

and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may

approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided,* That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis

of his individual status: *Provided further,* That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations

and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, unde such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."

(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided,* That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such

position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948,

enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the words

"or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(v) Section 10 of said Act is amended (1) by amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President."; and

(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."

(w) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated,

out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954."

(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of ninety days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of twelve or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session), is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1952" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".

SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act, except members of the reserve components.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six,

to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided,* That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written preference to discharge their obligation for training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race, which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit."

SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Selective Service Act".

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3364

## A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BARDEN

MARCH 20, 1951
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3453

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 2, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This title may be cited as the 'Selective Service Amendments of 1951'."

(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of eighteen years and six months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps as provided in the Universal Military Training Act of 1951: *Provided,* That any such person who has not attained the age of eighteen years and six months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of eighteen years and six months. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and

service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as provided in the Universal Military Training Act of 1951 such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this title."

(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided,* That the minimum standards for physical and

mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six in January 1945."

(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the six-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone)."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-six consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with pro-

cedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this title, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided,* That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further,* That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further,* That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any

person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"(3) Any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b)."

(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of six years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service

in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into

organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force."

(i) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six".

(k) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of

any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-six months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be."

(l) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National

Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer

procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any

person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in indus-

try, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided,* That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further,* That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this title until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this title. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of

any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon finnacial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at

the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."

(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided,* That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this

subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.

(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by

a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration

of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(v) Section 10 of said Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President."; and

(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this title; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this title; and the number of deferments granted under this title and the basis for such deferments."

(w) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title,

no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954."

(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of ninety days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period of December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of twelve or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty."

SEC. 102. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session), is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1952" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months

pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".

SEC. 103. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act, except members of the reserve components.

SEC. 104. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided,* That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written

preference to discharge their obligation for training in the National Security Training Corps or training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race, which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training or training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit."

## TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians; of the remaining two members one shall be an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, the other shall be a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a reserve component. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be

appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

(b) The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be two years. The term of office of the remaining three members of the Commission shall be for three, four, and five years, respectively. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member, shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. Members of the Commission, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

SEC. 202. The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. Subject to the direction of the President, and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Com-

mission shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies, standards, and directives of the Commission.

SEC. 203. The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

SEC. 204. The Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a plan or plans for—

(a) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title, which program shall include the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;

(b) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

(c) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;

(d) such other policies and standards as may be established under the provisions of section 202 of this title; and

(e) recommendations with respect to disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obliga-

tions, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

SEC. 205. Whenever the period of service required under title I of this Act of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the provisions of title I of this Act, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under this Act who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial military training for a period of six months: *Provided*, That persons deferred under the provisions of this Act shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of nineteen years during the period of such deferment.

SEC. 206. (a) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of eighteen, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in this title.

(b) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in this title.

SEC. 207. No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

(a) the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in section 204 of this title is transmitted to the Congress and referred to the Committee on Armed Services during which sixty-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses of the Congress, by the affirmative vote of a majority of either House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such plan: *Provided,* That the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses to which the plan is referred shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of forty-five calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in section 204 of this title, is transmitted to the Congress, report a resolution to their respective Houses approving

or disapproving the plan submitted by the Commission, and its recommendations thereon, and such resolution shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House; and

(b) the period of service required under section 205 of this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the provisions of title I of this Act.

SEC. 208. Following the adoption of a plan submitted by the Commission pursuant to section 207 of this title, the Commission may, if changes to the plan are deemed desirable by the Commission, submit such changes to the Congress in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 207 of this title, and such changes shall be acted upon as prescribed in section 207 of this title.

SEC. 209. Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during

such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding six months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding six months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

SEC. 210. Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: *Provided, however,* That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of

such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

SEC. 211. No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.

SEC. 212. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than six months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a reserve component as provided in title I of this Act.

SEC. 213. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training

Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.

SEC. 214. This title may be cited as the "Universal Military Training Act of 1951".

## TITLE III

SEC. 301. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 302. This Act may be cited as the "Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951".

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3453

## A BILL

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California

APRIL 2, 1951
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 4, 1951
For actions of Apr. 3, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 59

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....28,29
Auditing.....12
Civil defense.....14
Committees.....2
Daylight saving time.....8
Farm program.....20
Foreign affairs.....12
aid.....17,23
Forests and forestry.18,21
Grain.....23
Lands.....4
Livestock and meats.....22
Loans, disaster.....13
farm.....15
Marketing.....19
Military training.....7
National defense.....27
Personnel.....6,11,16
Potatoes.....19
Prices, control.....11,22
farm.....10
Reports.....12
Roads.....21
Taxation.....9,26
T.V.A.....3
Territories and possessions.....1,24
Trade, foreign.....25
Weed control.....5

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated military training bill. Senate committee voted to report bills granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. Rep. Smith defended farmers against charges that they are to blame for inflation. House committee reported bill authorizing daylight-saving time in D. C. during 1951. Sen. Ellender introduced bill to amend disaster-loan law.

## SENATE

1. STATEHOOD. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 49, to provide statehood for Hawaii, by a 9-4 vote; and S. 50, to provide statehood for Alaska, by a 7-6 vote (p. D242).

2. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Sen. Long was transferred from Banking and Currency to Armed Services, Sen. Benton from Expenditures in the Executive Departments to Banking and Currency, Sen. Clements from Post Office and Civil Service to Public Works; and Sen. Underwood was assigned to Expenditures in the Executive Departments and Post Office and Civil Service (p. 3279).

3. TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee was discharged from further consideration of S. 1165, relating to compensation of TVA commissioners, and the bill was referred to the Public Works Committee (p. 3290).

4. PUBLIC LANDS. Received a Mont. Legislature memorial favoring payments in lieu of taxes on Federal lands (p. 3281).

5. WEED CONTROL. Received a Nev. Legislature memorial favoring Federal funds to combat halogeton (p. 3283).

6. PERSONNEL. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted its report on personal services for Jan.-Feb. 1951 (pp. 3285-9).

## HOUSE

7. MILITARY TRAINING. Began debate on S. 1, the military training and service bill (pp. 3229-54).

8. DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME. The D. C. Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2612, authorizing the D. C. Commissioners to provide for daylight-saving time in D. C. during the summer of 1951 (H. Rept. 290)(p. 3276).

9. BEER-CAN ALLOCATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states: "Committee on Ways and Means: Chairman Doughton announced today the adoption of a resolution sponsored jointly by Representatives Dingell, Forand, Eberharter, and Keogh, that it is the sense of the committee that the NPA should not, without prior consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, issue any order curtailing the production or distribution of products upon which Federal excise taxes are levied. It was recommended that this Treasury consultation be had before the NPA issue orders which might adversely affect revenue. Hearings were held recently at which NPA...was interrogated regarding the effect upon Federal revenues of the order curtailing the use of tin cans in the distribution of beer." (p. D244.)

10. FARM PRICES. Rep. Smith, Miss., defended farmers against charges that they are to blame for inflation and argued against any change in the parity formula (pp. 3254-5).

11. PRICE CONTROL; PERSONNEL. Rep. Bender, Ohio, urged stronger efforts for price control and charged that Government agencies are overstaffed (pp. 3275-6).

12. AUDIT REPORT. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the audit of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs for the fiscal year 1951 (H. Doc. 105); to Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (p. 3276).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

13. DISASTER LOANS. S. 1253, by Sen. Ellender (by request), "to amend the act of April 6, 1949, so as to further define the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and stockmen who suffer losses from production disasters..."; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. (p. 3289.)

14. CIVIL DEFENSE. S. 1260, by Sen. Russell (by request), to authorize acquisition of property for establishment of a Federal civil defense technical training school; to Armed Services Committee (p. 3290).

15. FARM LOANS. H. R. 3481, by Rep. Elliott, Ala., to extend to June 30, 1952, the authority for direct home and farmhouse loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 3277).

16. CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT. H. R. 3484, 3485, and 3486, by Rep. Patten, Ariz. (by request), to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3277).

17. FOREIGN AID. H. R. 3488, by Rep. Martin, Mass., to provide for granting financial aid to Israel; to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 3277). Also H. R. 3492, by Rep. Rogers, Mass. H. Con. Res. 88, by Rep. Lantaff, Fla., "to express the sense of the Congress with respect to providing emergency food relief assistance to India"; to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 3277).

18. FORESTS. H.R. 3491, by Rep. Engle, Calif., to abolish the Lakeview Federal sustained-yield unit, Fremont National Forest, Oreg.; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3277).

...VISION OF LEGISLATIVE ...
Office of Budget ...

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1951 No. 59

# House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the companion and counselor of all mankind, we rejoice that in our times of doubt and uncertainty and greatest need we may unburden ourselves to Thy listening ear and understanding heart.

We humbly confess that we are often afraid to look into the future for it appears so dark and full of mystery. Help us to see the rainbow promise of Thy grace and go forth with a grateful acknowledgment that hitherto Thou hast blessed us and with a continuing faith that in all our days Thy presence will be our joy and strength.

Grant that in communion with Thee we may have those gracious experiences which always come to all who truly pray. May we also find poise and peace for our restless spirits, enlightenment for our confused and troubled minds, guidance in the midst of disturbing circumstances, and inspiration and hope for our noblest plans and purposes.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. There being only four bills on the Private Calendar today, that calendar will not be called, if there is no objection.

There was no objection.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 176) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that yesterday's RECORD be corrected to show that the editorial I inserted in the RECORD entitled "Grain for India Has Now Become an Ugly Barter," appearing on page A1781 of the Appendix of the RECORD was taken from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

## 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 171 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Albert | Fugate | Moulder |
| Allen, Ill. | Gamble | Multer |
| Allen, La. | Gillette | Murphy |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gordon | Murray, Wis. |
| Armstrong | Hall, | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Bailey | Edwin Arthur | O'Konski |
| Bakewell | Halleck | Ostertag |
| Baring | Harden | Poage |
| Barrett | Harrison, Wyo. | Potter |
| Bates, Ky. | Hart | Poulson |
| Beamer | Havenner | Powell |
| Beckworth | Hays, Ark. | Prouty |
| Bolling | Heller | Rishlman |
| Bolton | Herlong | Roberts |
| Boykin | Hill | Roosevelt |
| Brown, Ohio | Hunter | Sabath |
| Buchanan | Jackson, Calif. | Scott, Hardie |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Jackson, Wash. | Seely-Brown |
| Canfield | Kee | Sheehan |
| Carlyle | Kennedy | Shelley |
| Carnahan | Kilburn | Sieminski |
| Chatham | Kluczynski | Smith, Kans. |
| Chelf | Latham | Springer |
| Combs | Lyle | Stanley |
| Cooley | McCormack | Stefan |
| Cooper | McDonough | Taber |
| Coudert | McGrath | Tackett |
| Crosser | McKinnon | Talle |
| Curtis, Nebr. | Machrowicz | Towe |
| Dawson | Mack, Ill. | Welch |
| Deane | Mansfield | Whitaker |
| Dingell | Meader | Winstead |
| Dollinger | Miller, N. Y. | Wolcott |
| Dorn | Mitchell | Wood, Ga. |
| Evins | Morton | Woodruff |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 328 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Reapportionment of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. But the Chair desires to make this statement: When this or any other important bill is under consideration henceforward, there will be no consent for any committees to sit, that is, any committee over which the House has control, because the Chair himself will object to that.

1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and I now yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of Senate bill 1 which is the so-called draft and universal military service bill. The rule is about as liberal a rule as could be devised. It provides for 4 days of general debate. It provides that the substitute of the Committee on Armed Services, which is in the bill, may be considered as an original bill under the 5-minute rule. It waives points of order.

I can think of no provision that could have been put in this bill that would make it more liberal or more suitable to work the will of the House on the legislation proposed. I think, my friends, that this bill that comes up under this rule is probably going to be the most controversial measure that will come before the House during this session of the Congress. I am sure you are all going to be deeply interested in the debate which will take place.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman said the provisions of the rule are so broad that they waive all points of order. Does that include the point of order that will be made, possibly, against the sending of troops to Europe?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The rule waives points of order against the bill and against the substitute. There are no particular points waived; all points are waived. The bill is subject to any germane amendment. It is subject to a substitute bill if it is germane within the general rules of the House.

I want to take a minute or two to speak about the bill, because the Committee on Armed Services has put in months and months of study on this bill. They have brought out a bill that is not the bill of the administration, it is not the bill of the Army or the Navy, it is a bill devised and written by the combined wisdom of the individual members of the Committee on Armed Services, a committee in which this House, I believe, has the utmost confidence.

I do not believe any committee in the House has more the confidence of the individual Members of this House than the Committee on Armed Services. I think when you look at this bill you ought first to weigh in the balance the great amount of work this committee has put in on it, and weigh in the balance the confidence you have always shown in the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services after they have considered a bill.

There will be two points in controversy in this bill that are, I believe, the issues that are most controversial. One is the age limit. The administration has asked for induction at the age of 18. This committee after full consideration has made that age 18 years and 6 months, but it put a further provision in this bill. After that induction at 18 years and 6 months, no member of the armed services can be sent to foreign lands until he has had 4 months of basic training in the United States. Even if he is sent abroad after 4 months, there is a further provision that he cannot be stationed in a combat area until 6 months after induction. So that no member of the armed services is subjected to combat until he passes the age of 19. It seems to me that is a very fair compromise. I do not think that is going to be much in controversy when the Members consider it.

The real controversy in this bill is going to come over what is known as universal military training. Universal military training has been kicking around this Congress ever since I can remember. It has been like the weather; everybody has felt something ought to be done about it but nobody ever did anything about it.

The Committee on Armed Services has given months of study to the whole problem of universal military service.

A good many of us were here in 1940. I was one of them. I remember when we had up the bill to extend the draft. I remember just 4 months before Pearl Harbor that bill came to a vote in this House. We extended the draft by a vote of 1 majority. If I had voted the other way, or if any other Member who voted for an extension of the draft had voted the other way, we would have discharged our draftees just 4 months before the Pearl Harbor attack. I am not saying that in criticism of anybody who voted the other way. This country is opposed to war. We are a peaceful nation. Nobody wants to fight. But there was a widespread sentiment in this country that if we continued this draft it would look like we had a chip on our shoulder, and those Members who voted not to continue the draft were voting in response to the vast majority of the opinion of this country, an opinion which, it turned out, was a misinformed opinion because within 4 months we were in the midst of the most desperate war that this country has ever been in. I had to sit here during that period, as many of you did, and I had to vote to draft young men who were untrained and we had to put them under the guns with less training than should have been had. I had members of my own family, as you did, who were put into the service without adequate training. I thought to myself then—and I have been thinking ever since—that if we are going to have to have a war, and this is a warlike world, and everybody knows it, and there is no use in hiding our heads in the sand about it—but if you have to have a war, would you rather send your boy to war raw and untrained and unable to protect himself, or would you rather do the sensible thing and see that the boy, before he ever has to be called into the service, has had the amount of basic training—as they call it—which will enable him to protect his life when he does come under the guns? That is the simple proposition that is presented to you here. Do you want your boys to go to war, if they have to go to war—and God forbid that they should—do you want them to go to war untrained and ignorant, or do you want them to go so that they will have the basic training to make them real soldiers and be in a position where their safety is not so much endangered as it is in the case of raw troops. That is the simple proposition which is going to be presented to you.

You are going to hear an awful lot of fuss and feathers during this debate about this universal military training. When I first heard about the bill which had come out, why, I thought the bill provided for just throwing them all in right now, that this was universal military training. Well, it is not universal military training at all. Do you know what this bill does? When you sift it down and analyze it, all this bill does is to say that we are willing to consider the question of universal military training and we are willing to consider it on a basis of a plan submitted to the Congress. All this bill does is to furnish a method by which this Congress may determine whether they want universal military training, or whether they do not want it. In other words, basically all this does is to submit the proposition for consideration. Here is exactly what it does. It provides that a commission shall be set up. Is it a military commission? No, it is not a military commission. It provides that that commission shall consist of five people, three of whom shall be civilians and none of whom ever had a commission in the United States Armed Services, and two of them shall be army officers. The chairman of that commission must be a civilian. They will devise for you a plan. You cannot write a plan for universal military service on the floor of the House, any more than you can write a tax bill on the floor of the House, and we all know that. So this Commission will devise a plan and that plan will be submitted to this Congress, along the same theory as we have our reorganization plans. That bill must be considered by the Armed Services Committee. The plan must be considered by the Armed Services Committee within 45 days after it is submitted. They must report to the House a resolution that either favors the plan or that repudiates the plan. Then the matter comes to the House. It is a highly privileged resolution. Any Member of this Congress can call it up within the 60-day limit. Not any member of the Armed Services Committee, but any Member of the House can call it up. Then what do we do? We consider the plan. It is not a law. It is a plan. This House considers the plan just as you are considering this bill today. If you like the plan you approve it. If you do not like the plan you disapprove

it. The only difference is that you approve it or disapprove it with a constitutional majority vote. I do not think there is any difficulty there.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. It is approved or rejected by a majority of a quorum; not a constitutional majority.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to be corrected on that.

Mr. VINSON. Two hundred and ten Members can disapprove it.

Mr. SMITH of Virgina. So that all in the world you are doing in this bill is to say, "We are ready and willing to consider a plan which may be submitted by this commission;" and we take it or we do not take it, just as we see fit, when the plan is submitted.

Now, if the House is willing to just consider the question of whether you want universal military training, and accept it or reject it, then that is all this bill does. Nobody can, by any stretch of the imagination, say that it does anything else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to ask the gentleman one question. I am puzzled about this being a privileged resolution. As I understand the rules of the House, 30 minutes on a side is allowed to discuss a privileged resolution. Could that be amended so that we may have 3 or 4 days to debate this important question of universal military training?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not see any reason why you cannot amend this bill and have as many days' debate as you want on any plan that is proposed by the Commission.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. I want to yield now to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The committee is foreclosed from making any amendments to the House when that resolution comes before us. Is that the fact?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is the fact. In other words, here is a plan submitted, and the House says, "We like it" or "We do not like it." But if the Armed Services Committee says, "We do not like this plan but we would like to have a plan and therefore we are going to amend it and introduce another bill," they can do that. All this thing does, as I see it, is to lay the foundation for a plan of universal military training, and if this Congress does not like it or the next Congress does not like it, they can just reject it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think it might be wise to amend it so that the Armed Services Committee could make amendments or recommend amendments to the House?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee and therefore I am not qualified to say that. I personally would see no objection to it, however.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman failed to make clear, I think, whether or not this bill does or does not establish universal military training. It does establish universal military training but fails to establish a program to implement universal military training, but universal military training is established.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now, wait a moment. Perhaps you and I can get a little closer. I do not understand just what you mean by that.

Mr. ARENDS. In other words, we establish universal military training. It is done in this bill. We set up universal military training. Nothing can be done about it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, no.

Mr. ARENDS. But we set up no means to implement it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, no. Oh, no. You do not set up universal military training. All you do is to set up a commission to propose a plan. When the commission proposes a plan, if you do not like it, you simply reject it, and that is all there is to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield further at this point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I wish we might make this clear: Whether or not we establish in this bill a universal military training corps. I think that was the understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. You do not.

Mr. ARENDS. If the gentleman will ask the chairman of the committee, I think the chairman can clear that up.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is a member of the committee, of course, and he knows better than I do, but all I see in the bill is that you establish a commission, the commission establishes a plan, and the Congress takes the plan or rejects it. That is all there is to it. I come back and I still insist that, if you adopt this bill, all the House is doing is saying that we are ready, able, and willing to consider a plan for universal military training; and we can reject it or take it, as we please.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not fair, I ask the gentleman from Virginia, that if the House rejects the plan offered by the commission that is set up that they come right back with another plan? And if the House refuses to accept the second plan they can come back with a third until we repudiate the law that we enact?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course; they can keep coming back as many times as they want to, and as far as I am concerned I hope they do keep coming back until we perfect the thing. I want to see this thing perfected.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. The bill does provide for the creation of a universal military training corps, but it specifies that nobody shall be inducted into the corps until a plan and program of training has been approved by Congress.

I point out further that if a plan is adopted by the Congress for universal military training that it may be repealed by concurrent resolution of the Congress without requiring the approval of the Commander in Chief.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; I am glad the gentleman from New York has brought that out, because even after you have adopted the plan, if you like the plan and it gets into operation and then you find you do not like it, you can repeal it by concurrent resolution.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Virginia made it clear, I think, that there is not anything to consider until this commission presents a plan. If that be so why should we be considering establishing this program in a part of this bill at this time? Why not wait until this so-called emergency is over? Some people think this emergency is going to last for 20 years. Why consider something that is not before us?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield further. Answering the gentleman's question, I do not know why the committee put it in; I am not a member of it. But I will tell you why I would have put it in, because as soon as the emergency is over nobody will be willing to consider it. I think that now is the time to put it in.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think it is better to let the legislation be considered on its merits instead of trying to put it in under some subterfuge like they are trying to do as part of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Illinois and the membership will have every opportunity to consider it under this bill. You can offer a substitute and one perhaps will be offered to strike it out if they want to. There is not any skulduggery about this thing. We hear a lot of talk about skulduggery but I cannot see that there has been any skulduggery about it. The committee has considered the matter. They think this is an opportune time for the House to consider it.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Do I interpret what the gentleman is trying to say is that what we are trying to do here is to put our foot into the door of every home in America?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know what construction the gentleman places on my remarks, but they speak for themselves.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more brief observation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield for a question. Does the gentleman wish to ask a question?

Mr. BUSBEY. I asked the gentleman to yield for a brief observation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman stated that a program for universal military training should not be written on the floor of the House. Does the gentleman also feel that the Armed Services Committee of this House which he states he holds in such high consideration, cannot write such a program at all?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I think they could write it if they wanted to; they could write a bill if they wanted to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why not have the program written by the Armed Services Committee and presented to the House?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They are prepared to do it. I will go a step further; as a matter of fact I would rather have the combined judgment of this commission plus the Armed Services Committee than to take either the Armed Services Committee or the commission separately.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Having in mind the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] as well as the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], does the gentleman addressing the House now agree that the bill sets up a universal military training corps?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I agree that it sets up a commission, but it does not set up any corps until this House adopts it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, the reason I asked that question—and I wanted to get the gentleman's opinion on it—I understood the gentleman to say in response to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] about the corps, that it set up a corps.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, so far as this rule is concerned there is evidently no controversy and no dispute over it. If a matter ever deserved to come before this body for full and complete discussion this bill is that type of legislation. There should be no question regarding the granting of a rule for the consideraiton of this bill.

As a member of the Rules Committee I wish to compliment the Committee on Armed Services for the care, the length of time and the hard work that we know has been put in on this matter. The significant thing about the bill is that it was actually written by the Committee on Armed Services. Testimony to that effect was abundant in the hearing before the Rules Committee which brought the pending resolution to the floor. In my opinion, that is the way legislation should be written and brought to the House for consideration. I wish I could say as much for some of the other bills that we have considered and will consider in the future. In too many instances, bills have been handed to legislative committees, more or less rubber stamped and then sent to the floor for consideration.

This bill, controversial as it is, and it is very evident that it is controversial, is based on the best thinking and the best judgment of the members of our great Committee on Armed Services. They have favorably reported the bill to the floor for the consideration of the House.

I may say further that, as the rule so clearly states, the substitute offered by the Committee on Armed Services as an amendment to Senate bill No. 1 will be considered in the Committee of the Whole House as an original bill. Under the rule all of the procedure generally followed in the consideration of original bills will prevail when the Committee of the Whole considers the pending bill. The question will finally come on the committee amendment to the Senate bill, but in perfecting the amendment of the Committee on Armed Services it will be handled as original legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include an article appearing in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, at 2:30 o'clock, at the Pentagon, the highest military honor our country can give to one of its defenders will be bestowed, posthumously, upon Pfc J. Raymond Ouellette, of my home city of Lowell, Mass.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will make the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Raymond Ouellette's mother, Mrs. Rose B. Ouellette, who lives at 23 Cabot Street, Lowell.

This 20-year-old boy was one of eight young children left fatherless 17 years ago by the accidental drowning of his parent. His mother, devoted to her large family, worked hard to clothe and feed them until some became old enough to help out. Today the Ouellette family is typical of many such Lowell families, successfully bound together by the solidarity of family ties which only a devoted mother can gain over a long period of years looking after her children.

Raymond Ouellette became interested in military training through the National Guard, and he received his early training at the State armory on Westford Street. He volunteered for service shortly after the beginning of the Korean conflict and soon landed in Korea as a member of Company H, Ninth Infantry Regiment, Second Infantry Division.

The action which won the Medal of Honor for Private First Class Ouellette was one of continued personal sacrifice in his successful effort to save his unit from complete annihilation. Repeatedly he exposed himself to enemy machine gun and small-arms fire, carrying water for his wounded comrades who had been without water for 3 days; fighting against terrific enemy concentrations, he instilled in his comrades by his example an esprit de corps that delivered his unit from its perilous position. Even after being severely wounded, he continued to fight by throwing hand grenades at the attacking enemy. This he did until a direct hit upon his fox hole ended his life.

It is very difficult to find appropriate words to pay the deserved tribute to this young hero. He gave far more than duty called upon him to give. Fighting in a strange country, under indescribable conditions of hardship, he made the supreme sacrifice that his comrades and his unit might be saved. No man could give more than that.

Mrs. Rose B. Ouellette should be very proud of her boy, and I know she is. Today is a very trying day for her, but I know that her sadness over the loss of her brave son will be tempered by the realization that he lived and died in keeping with the greatest and most esteemed tradition of the military service.

The city of Lowell, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the entire Nation should be extremely proud of this Lowell hero who gave his life that freedom might live. We in the Congress should do him homage.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include the following articles from the Lowell Sun:

AWARD CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO LOWELL SOLDIER—PFC J. RAYMOND OUELLETTE WAS KILLED IN KOREAN WAR—LOCAL GI GAVE LIFE ON VOLUNTEER MISSION TO RESCUE HIS BUDDIES

LOWELL.—The Congressional Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award to its fighting men, has been awarded posthumously to Pfc J. Raymond Ouellette, son of Mrs. Rose B. Ouellette, of 23 Cabot Street, it was announced today by Army authorities in Washington, D. C.

Announcement of the awarding of this coveted honor by the Department of the Army, also carried the news that the presentation will be made next Tuesday, April 3, at the Pentagon in Washington, to the hero's mother, and that at the ceremonies will be his sister, Mrs. Estelle B. Lefebvre, also of 23 Cabot Street, and his brothers, Robert, of 12 Cabot Street, and Roland, residing with his mother.

The late Pfc J. Raymond Ouellette attended St. Joseph's Boys School on Merrimack Street, this city, prior to enlisting in the Army for a 5-year term on January 30, 1948, after serving with the National Guard. He was first reported as missing in action somewhere in Korea on September 3 and news of his death, correcting the earlier report, come later.

Death came to the young man during 4 days of fierce fighting near Yongsan and honoring him in death at the Pentagon, Tuesday, April 3, will be Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who will make the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Ouellette was 20 years old and a member of Company H, Ninth Infantry Regiment, Second Infantry Division. He enlisted at Fort Banks, Boston, and accompanied the Second Infantry Division overseas in July of 1950.

EYE-WITNESS ACCOUNT

The action which won the Medal of Honor for Private First Class Ouellette is dramatically described in an eye-witness account by his platoon sergeant, Master Sgt. Grover L. Bozarth, of Austin, Tex., as follows:

"About 11:15, the night of August 31, 1950, the North Korean forces attacked the position held by the Second Batallion, Ninth Infantry, on the east bank of the Naktong River.

"Early the next morning, Private First Class Ouellette volunteered for a patrol

which was to reconnoiter Hill 209, approximately 400 yards north of the perimeter. This patrol was to try to establish contact with friendly forces thought to be on the hill. The patrol was halted at the base of Hill 209 by extremely heavy machine gun fire and Private Ouellette volunteered to reconnoiter the hill alone. He proceeded to the top of the hill and to the far side while exposed to the fire of enemy machine guns. He found that friendly forces had vacated the hill.

"During the afternoon of September 3, Private First Class Ouellette volunteered to attempt to retrieve a 5-gallon water can which had been air dropped about 600 yards east of the perimeter. The men had been without water for 3 days and the only moisture available was the early morning dew licked off rifle stocks, grass, and items of equipment. Many of the wounded were delirious from lack of water.

"The route to the water can was down hill and covered by machine-gun fire from two enemy tanks and two gun positions. Against this heavy fire, Private Ouellette made his way to the water can which he found to be shot full of holes and empty of water.

"On his way back to the perimeter, he found a water hole and filled his helmet. Enemy fire became so heavy he was unable to keep the water from spilling from his helmet as he crawled along the ground. Although he returned to the perimeter empty-handed his brave action witnessed by men on the perimeter, stirred them to the highest spirits and increased their morale greatly.

"Later, the same day, five Koreans were killed about 25 yards on the north side of the perimeter and Private Ouellette volunteered to go to their bodies and retrieve their grenades, which were sorely needed.

"He stepped out of the perimeter unknown to anyone and worked his way to the bodies. One of the North Koreans was still alive and was killed by Ouellette with a trench knife in a hand-to-hand battle. He then returned to his unit with five enemy hand grenades that were covered with blood.

"The North Koreans assaulted Ouellette's position many times and on six occasions the enemy threw hand grenades directly into his foxhole. Each time he would leap from the fox hole into the enemy small arms fire covering the area until the grenade exploded and would then return to his hole and continue to fight.

"At the seventh attempt to neutralize Private Ouellette's position, he was severely wounded by an enemy grenade. Although rapidly weakening from the loss of blood from his wound, Ouellette continued to fight by throwing hand grenades at the attacking enemy until the enemy blasted his position once more with a direct hit in his fox hole.

"This grenade ended his life."

The Medal of Honor citation contains all the facts related by Sergeant Bozarth and ends with the words "The extraordinary heroism and intrepidity displayed by Private Ouellette reflects the highest credit upon himself and was in keeping with the esteemed traditions of the military services."

---

MOTHER AND MARIST BROTHERS LOOM LARGE IN BACKGROUND OF HERO—PRIVATE FIRST CLASS OUELLETTE LEARNED DEMOCRACY THE HARD WAY

(By Leon W. Lamoureux)

LOWELL.—"He was always obstinate, even in his younger days when he decided to do a thing, nothing could stop him."

Thus spoke Mrs. Rose B. Ouellette, mother of Pfc Raymond Ouellette, the second man in the history of Lowell to win the Congressional Medal of Honor. It was back in 1898, during the Spanish-American War that Lt. George Charette, United States Navy, gained this honor by helping in sinking a ship at the entrance of the harbor of Santiago, Cuba, thus hemming in the Spanish Fleet.

Charette lived to enjoy the fruits of his heroic action and died a few years ago, being buried in Arlington National Cemetery with others of the Nation's heroes.

Pfc Raymond Ouellette lies today in a grave in Korea where he helped make history by his heroic actions by which his companions, without water and running low in ammunition, were saved from certain death by this 20-year-old Lowell man who gave his all that democracy might survive.

Full details of the action which won the coveted honor for Private First Class Ouellette are contained in a story which appears elsewhere today. What the people of Lowell are interested in also is the background of Ouellette and his family. Is the family rich, is it poor?

FATHER ACCIDENTALLY DROWNED

It was 17 years ago that Elisee Ouellette accidentally drowned in the Merrimack River near the mouth of Beaver Brook. His death left Mrs. Ouellette with eight young children and thus began a battle for survival and bringing up a family of boys and girls.

Indications point to the fact that it hasn't been easy for Mrs. Ouellette but next Tuesday, she receives a reward accorded few mothers, that of knowing that her labors were not in vain. After all, proof of her success with her family lies in the fact that her son's heroism serves today as a beacon light for Americans fighting in other parts of the world to prevent the spread of communism.

PROUD TEACHERS

And the Marist Brothers of St. Joseph's Boys' School, on Merrimack Street, must feel some pride in their former pupil. When they look at his successors facing them today, these good teachers can't help but think that among them may be heroes who some day will become the Charettes of 1898 or the Ouellettes of 1951 and that what is taught them today in the form of love of God and country will help sustain them when the time comes to make the all important decision between life and death.

MILITARY TRAINING

And the National Guard officers and men of this city can well be proud of Private First Class Ouellette. After all, didn't he receive his early training there on Westford Street, at the State armory? It was there that this young hero learned the rudiments of military training which served him so well in Korea. So that, in honoring the memory of the late Pfc. Raymond Ouellette, the people of the United States also paid tribute to the units which nurtured him militarily, the Massachusetts National Guard.

TYPICAL FAMILY

The Ouellette family is typical of many in Lowell today, forced by the housing shortage to live in a house at 23 Cabot Street when its members could well stand extra space. One thing that isn't missing there, however, is this solidarity of family ties which only a devoted mother can gain over a long period of years of looking after children, working hard to clothe and feed them until some become old enough to help out.

When work became scarce in Lowell, one boy, Roland, moved to Barre, Vt., where he married the former Gloria Inman. Not long ago, he brought her and their child to Lowell after obtaining work and, like the good mother that she is, Mrs. Ouellette changed things around in her home and found a place for these three additions to her family.

Robert, his wife, Alice, and their three children reside at 12 Cabot Street.

Her next oldest boy was Raymond. A junior high student at St. Joseph's High School, Raymond could wait to graduate from school to join the Army when conditions grew worse in world affairs and he soon landed in Korea.

His former teachers and all his chums agree on one thing and that is that Raymond was a go-getter. Anything he undertook, he wanted to finish, whether he was playing baseball, football, hockey, or enjoying other sports on the North Common. Nothing stopped him in his younger days and only death was successful in stopping him there in Korea.

Sharing in the honor conferred the hero is his grandfather, Ephrem Heroux who today observes his seventy-fourth birthday anniversary. Hr. Heroux, who lives with his daughter, Mrs. Ouellette, has seen his grandchildren grow and has shared with his daughter the many trials and tribulations which go with bringing up a family.

Living in the downstairs apartment at 23 Cabot Street is a sister of Raymond, Estelle, now Mrs. George Lefebvre. The oldest of the Ouellette children, she has two of her own.

Rita and Therese are residing with relatives in Wrentham while Beatrice is with relatives in Middleboro, these changes having been necessary by lack of space at home.

Last but not least is Edward, a student at Green School who looks forward, he says, to going to work to help his mother and replace, in some way, his big brother, Raymond.

LEAVE LOWELL SUNDAY

Mrs. Ouellette with her daughter, Mrs. Lefebvre and her sons, Robert and Roland, will leave Lowell Sunday, at Government expense, so as to arrive in Washington by Tuesday when the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor will be made at the Pentagon by Gen. Omar Bradley.

At play or at work, Raymond Ouellette proved determined to the point of being obstinate. When he set his heart on something, he did it. He proved this in Korea. It was not the act of a man under pressure, not the act of a man battling for his life.

Ouellette's actions were cool and calculated. He knew the risks. He faced them for the sake of his companions. He couldn't stand by while some were suffering from wounds. He knew that after 3 days without water, ammunition running low, with hundreds of the enemy waiting like vultures to spring on the Americans and annihilate them, that something had to be done.

Pfc Raymond Ouellette did it.

He had what it takes to be a hero.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, our greatest defensive strength in America today is our wonderful manpower—skilled, educated, trained in the industrial arts, familiar with every technique of mass production, world leaders in the know-how of machinery.

The distinctive, and probably decisive, contribution of this mighty Nation to the defense of freedom is, and must remain, this tremendous industrial capacity—our ability to produce planes, guns, tanks, ships, ammunition and heavy transportation equipment, labor-saving farm machinery, machine tools, and precision instruments. These are the very sinews of victory. They are the only possible weapons with which we may hope to hold to a sense of decent accountability the wanton and cruel expenditure of manpower by the Communist masters of Asia's nomadic hordes.

But we can never supply these vital, essential, and decisive tools of security

and defense if we if we are to squander our skilled manpower in numberless divisions and vast armies of foot soldiers for Europe, Asia, Africa—and where next?

Admiral Nimitz has said:

The American productive economy is our greatest strength and our greatest weapon. Weaken it and you undermine our military power at its source.

And let me call as another witness, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report as recently as January 25, this year. He said:

We should recognize the fact that our unrivalled productive capacity is our strongest line of defense, that our ability to produce is determined largely by our available manpower; that our country is the arsenal of the free nations, and must not be weakened by a military program which we cannot maintain indefinitely without regimentation or inflation, or which leads to war. We should keep our ground forces as small as possible so as to maintain our production at full strength. Our manpower can contribute far more to the defense of the free world in our production lines, in our Navy and Air Force, than in the front lines of land armies in Asia or Europe. Under the protection of American and British air and sea power the free nations on the periphery of the Soviet empire can readily rearm with the great help we can give them from our production lines.

These are the reasons I call Mrs. Rosenberg's program a plan to defeat America. It is a plan which, intended or not, would sabotage America's greatest strength—ample manpower skilled in the daily know-how of mass production.

Already we see this sabotage weakening us in many industries. Young men who have been developing their skills for 2 to 5 times in a given line of production are gathered in pell-mell into the military camps. They cannot be replaced on the production lines in less than 12 to 18 months, at the minimum.

In our grain belt of the Middlewest, skilled, able, and trained farm boys are being yanked from their productive tasks for shipment to Korea, Germany, or to the four points of the compass in the United States. And these young men are being replaced by field workers imported by the Department of Agriculture from Jamaica, Puerto Rico, or Mexico—men who have not the skill to operate a tractor, combine, or truck, and to whom a milking machine is but one step removed in complexity and confusion from an atom bomb. By this program we are exporting Nebraskans to do battle in the rice paddies of Korea, and importing Jamaicans to do their essential productive work in Nebraska. By this formula, Prof. Albert Einstein would make his great contribution to the defense effort by taking an emergency assignment driving a delivery truck. Man power is manpower under Mrs. Rosenberg's system, which measures values in numbers, without regard to skills, training, education, and that rich heritage of energy and ingenuity which is the peculiar gift of free men. Such a determination of manpower programs in this country today is sheer madness. It must be called sabotage in high places, because it has never been defended, even by its sponsors, save on the ground of hysterical expediency which takes no account of the long-term needs of American life. Destroy America's advntage in skilled manpower for our industries, and you destroy America at one strike from within.

If universal military training for all youths at 18 years of age is the first necessity for the defense of free Europe, as we are so emphatically told, why is it that no nation on the Continent had adopted the 18-year-old draft for itself?

France, Italy, Belgium, and Denmark do not draft men until they are 20. Portugal and the Netherlands do not draft before 21 years of age. Luxemburg, Iceland, and Canada have no draft laws whatever for overseas service, but rely entirely upon voluntary enlistments.

Nor does any nation in the North Atlantic Pact draft any man for as long as 27 months, the minimum terms proposed by the administration in the pending bill. Most nations on the continent take men for only 12 to 18 months. Yet we are told that every American youth must be drafted at 18 for a stretch of 27 months. I ask again, if the 18-year-old draft is the obvious answer to Europe's defense problems, why has no European nation adopted that solution for itself? And if 27 months of service is the very minimum required to save Europe, why is it that no nation on the Continent has adopted that period of service?

Or are we to understand that only American 18-year-olds are fit to be drafted for Europe's wars?

Under the Rosenberg selection system, the Government would decide who, and how many, among those drafted, should go to college. But the basis for selection for college is not set forth in the bill. It would be a matter for administrative regulations to be promulgated later. This is statism in its rawest and most repulsive form—bureaucratic selection for higher education, not one whit different from the system now in full force and effect in Russia, whereby the Kremlin picks its elite corps on the basis of proficiency in the godless dogmas and routines of pagan communism.

In other aspects, the Rosenberg proposals are shocking to American traditions. They are proposals to make every young man the property of the Government on his eighteenth birthday. Under such a program all concerns of family relationship would terminate. All considerations of individual choice, preference, personal predilection, and special aptitudes would end as factors governing the careers of American boys. They would all be tossed into the military maw, like so many apples into a cider mill—each counted as one, regardless of those special values and qualities of human nature which differ men from beasts of the field. These are the measurements of stark paganism, unblushing godlessness. The American people will never tolerate them.

The Government alone would determine who would go to college. The Government would select the college. The Government would hand the student his course of studies. After June 1954 every college graduating class in the United States would be composed of men selected and directed 100 percent by the Rosenberg selection system.

And then what? At graduation these men would go into the military service to finish up the remaining 23 months they still owed on their original draft term of 27 months. All they get before college is 4 months of basic training. They then would be in the Reserves until 26 years of age.

This is not an emergency program. It is a proposal for a fixed national policy. It is an attempt to establish a manpower dictatorship in these free States. To rule the future lives of all men beyond their eighteenth birthday easily could be an entering wedge for practices and program already in operation behind the iron curtain.

It is worthy of note that in the debates in another body it was stated openly against this bill that it was a Trojan-horse project to force iron-curtain policies upon America in the name of crisis and emergency. The Association of American Colleges, comprising some 900 university presidents, has petitioned Congress to stop this mad, hysterical rush to a made-in-Moscow regimentation of the entire educational system beyond high school.

The universal drafting of 18-year-olds would seriously undermine professional and technical education in this country in the short space of perhaps 5 years. Freedom in education would be at an end.

As long ago as 1945 the National Advisory Committee on Higher Education strongly urged upon the attention of Congress "the rapidly increasing shortage of men in professional fields essential to the national welfare, such as medicine, dentistry, engineering, physics, chemistry, divinity, and others. With each year of war the gap in the flow of young men into these essential fields becomes a more serious threat to the national health, safety, and interest."

I would suggest to every Member on the floor of the House who believes there is some value to education in the preservation of our form of government to get the April Atlantic magazine and read the article by the president of Yale University. It is a masterpiece. In that article he shows exactly what this type of legislation is going to do to the educational system in this country.

Furthermore, he points out that Russia is filling all her schools with technical trainees in these engineering professions.

How much more acute would this problem become with universal military training? During the first years of operation under the pending bill, only 75,000 men a year would be authorized to remain in the colleges—at the personal selection of the President.

This is why we are justified fully in saying that historically universal military training is a tool of dictators. And it is also a fundamental dogma of Communist militarism. Article 132 of the Soviet constitution reads: "Universal military service is law."

Neither is it true that universal military training provides real national security. It did not save France at Waterloo. And in both World War I and World War II France again was rescued from

the outside—and both times by nations which did not have universal military training—the United States, Britain, Canada, and Australia.

In Germany universal military training has been the rule since 1814. And there militarism has produced its usual harvest—poverty, destruction, and national impotence.

Japan adopted her universal military training in 1873; and once again runaway militarism ground the nation to the dust of poverty, destruction, and humiliation.

Russia had universal military training under the czars. It did not save her from internal destruction in 1917. Nor did it ward off invasion in 1941. And here again, Russia was saved by powers which did not have universal military training in 1942–45. Not only did our boys save Russia with the second front in Europe, but we supplied some $12,000,000,000 in lend-lease from our unmatched production lines.

Let us look to prewar Japan for a picture of universal military training at work. Militarism in Japan at length gained the upper hand over the parliamentary system. Then militarism indoctrinated the draftees with these instructions:

> To make a good soldier, there must always be an immediate enemy. He must be led to believe that this enemy may strike today. He must be convinced that the enemy is prepared to annihilate our country at the first opportunity.

From this state of mind it is, of course, but a short step to the complete police state, in which every function of government—and ultimately every human thought and fancy—is subordinated to the dictates of the requirements of defense. This is the capstone of militarism—the complete garrison state. And when people cry out that they can no longer carry the load of nonproductive militarism, what happens? First, a war incident develops. Bismarck once observed in a moment of political candor during a Berlin crisis: "A small war—not too big—would be a great convenience."

Would this cruel philosophy of power politics explain our situation in Korea today?

To date the United States forces have suffered more than 57,000 casualties in Korea—more casualties than the total number of all forces supplied in that war by all other members of the United Nations combined.

Our operation in Korea is called collective security. But in that operation since last June 25 the United States is furnishing more than 90 percent of the armed forces, and suffering more than 90 percent of the casualties. We have already suffered more battlefield casualties in this Korean misadventure than our American forces suffered in the Revolutionary War. In that war for national independence our total casualties were about 12,000. In the War of 1812 we suffered 7,000 casualties. In the Mexican War we suffered 17,000; and in the Spanish-American War, 10,000. In those four wars we suffered about 46,000 casualties to win four great victories for American freedom. In Korea we have had 57,000 casualties, for what? Will it be a great victory when we get back to the thirty-eighth parallel?

General MacArthur recently told the world that he has been operating in Korea under abnormal military inhibitions. Because of these inhibitions, he said:

> The battle lines cannot fail in time to reach a point of theoretical military stalemate. Thereafter our further advance would militarily benefit the enemy more than it would ourselves.

Who is running this war to make an advance of our fighting men a greater gain to the enemy than to the victor?

Who delivered some 200,000 American boys for cannon fodder into this death trap of the New Deal's still-born United Nations?

Is it the intention of this Congress of free men to deliver into Mrs. Rosenberg's hands a perpetually renewed standing army of 4,000,000 American boys, ready to leap to fire-alarm wars at a moment's notice anywhere around the world? Who will declare these wars which our boys are to fight—as in Korea? Congress was not even consulted on the Korean decision.

Now, General MacArthur tells us frankly that his hands are tied. He has overwhelming air power, but he may not strike his enemy's supply lines and bases in Manchuria. Never before in military history has a field commander had a a narrower field of judgment and decision in the field. Every move he considers must first be submitted to the United Nations, at Lake Success. But now the United Nations is in recess. A midwinter vacation in Florida is of utmost importance to the cultivated diplomatic temperament. Let all wars be started in the balmy June of Washington—and then let all wars run themselves, so long as American replacements are available from Mrs. Rosenberg's selection pool.

The whole history of America argues against passage of this bill at this time.

Universal military training is not a defense measure. It is a grab for power—the old shell game of power grabbing under the hysteria of emergency. A systematic campaign of fear—a form of psychological warfare against the American people—has been waged by the administration for several years. The theory is that if you can scare the American people to the very bottoms of their feet, Congress will grant any power requested—notwithstanding doubts as to its constitutionality and no matter how socialistic, no matter how far removed from the American tradition of freedom and liberty under law.

The time has come for Congress to save America. The power-grabbing bureaucrats are running wild in their encroachments upon the Constitution and the sovereignty of the American people. Our boys already have been sent to war without the consent or approval of Congress. Now, we are asked to sign a blank check turning over all American young men to Mrs. Rosenberg for whatever wars the Lake Success "debating society" may deem meritorious in the future.

We can defend America, and we can defend freedom, only if we keep America strong, and we can keep America strong only by reclaiming and restoring and reviving the full force and vigor of American constitutional government. We must here and now turn back the power grabbers, the Treasury-busting Socialists, the authors of regimentation—and once more declare America free.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

(Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by the president of the Queens County Bar Association, Charles K. French.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, probably later in the debate I shall want to express my views on the measure, consideration of which this rule provides, but at this point I do wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in spite of the hostile atmosphere in which the bill will be considered, surcharged as it is with resentment and bad feeling, most of which is justified—in spite of that, we must remember that this bill presents a test of the capacity of this body to provide its own leadership and legislate in accordance with its free will.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule general debate is limited to 4 days to be equally divided between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 hour.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, placed before each of us today, in this bill, is a decision of crucial importance. The

Nation is truly at the crossroads. The choice is crystal clear. We can choose, as set out in this bill, military preparedness—immediate preparedness and sustained, lasting preparedness. Or we choose to continue that bloodstained, costly, and perilous course of entrusting our freedoms and our national security to the fickle hope that our enemies will in the future, as they have in the past, give us time to prepare.

Communist imperialism is no passive specter on the horizon. It is a dark and threatening cloud blotting out the light of truth and freedom in more and more areas of the world. The entire Nation is grimly aware of this threat that looms ever larger before us. In 11 short years we have seen the paws of the Russian bear reach out and ensnare Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and eastern Germany. Yugoslavia and Iran are actively threatened. Thousands of militant vassals of Russia are working ceaselessly in all nations of Western Europe. And in Asia, Indochina is fighting for her life; Korea is in flames; China is already lost. And with each new political conquest there is fed into the Soviet octopus the natural resources and the manpower of the stricken area, and brutal tyranny is imposed upon its inhabitants.

How easy it is when our Nation is not involved in all-out war, and when the freedom being destroyed is not our very own, to forget the basic facts of international life—to keep our attention riveted on the easy way—to continue to demand business as usual, to seek to return to the good old days. How easy it is to believe that when the freedom being lost is far away and not our own, it is not a matter of American concern. But that is the easy road, the road of fantasy unrelated to the facts before us.

Every Member of this House knows that, basically, the world situation has not yet improved. It is common knowledge that Russia has at least 175 ready divisions—a 4,000,000-man Army—that she has some 300 submarines, many of them snorkels—far more than Germany had at the beginning of the last war—that she has over 400 mighty bombers capable of attacking our cities from Seattle to Washington—from Chicago to San Francisco. Every member of this Committee knows that the atom bomb is in the hands of the Soviet Union and being produced in daily increasing numbers. We all know that there is a military vacuum today in Western Europe and that if Russia's mighty military power is turned in that direction, and if we and our allies have insufficient power to resist, ultimately our own land and our very existence will be placed in jeopardy.

Yes, and we now know the most terrible fact of all. We now know that the rulers of the Soviet Union are willing to resort to the direct use of military force, as we have seen in Korea. We know that in a short space of time Russia will have a sufficient stockpile of atomic bombs as to be capable of initiating a terrible aerial attack on our cities and homes whenever she wishes to do so. We know that the Soviet Union's ambitions are boundless—that the Russians are brutal and remorseless—that they are firmly intent upon bringing pressure all over the world until their plan for world conquest is carried through. In each and every generation the time comes to preserve and maintain its liberties, for itself and the future. That task and challenge is with us today.

Yes, all of us know these facts. Then why emphasize them again to the committee here today? It is because of my deep concern and apprehension that we are likely—once again—to let our minds drift back into the channel of business as usual. How clear it is that the situation in the world today does not permit it. If we do so, we terribly imperil our freedom and the American way of life. And, make no mistake about it. Free people throughout the world are watching mighty America today and wondering if she has the determination to meet the challenge of the times.

And, no doubt, our enemies, too, are eagerly watching to see if we will return to our same old attitude of meeting each crisis as it develops without any thought of the future.

We are living in an atomic age; we are living in a time when 85 percent of the industrial production of the Soviet Union is devoted to the munitions of war. Until recently we were even reducing the size of our Armed Forces, while the Russians were expanding their already gigantic military machine. Our industries were producing washing machines, vacuum cleaners, and television sets, while the Soviet Union was producing rockets, tanks, and machine guns. While we were producing for the happiness and the peaceful pursuits of life, the Soviet Union was developing the means by which she could engage in an all-out war. We all know how precarious the world situation still is. Just the other day the Secretary of Defense stated that in his opinion world conditions are, if anything, worse than they were a year ago. Not long ago General Vandenberg warned the Nation that although we are rapidly building a radar fence and expanding our Air Force, we could not possibly intercept all enemy bombers that might attack our cities. Some would get through, destroy our great industrial centers and kill or main hundreds of thousands of our citizens.

We have started a program to increase our military production for the defense of the Nation, but if we fail to have the trained military personnel, weapons of war will be useless. Will we hide our world conditions as threatening, as unheads in the sands of complacency, with predictable, and as tense as they are today? I say no, Mr. Chairman. We must be prepared for any eventuality, and it is imperative that be done at once.

We must meet the present emergency and at the same time we must establish a long-range preparedness and training program.

That is what this bill does.

We can and must develop the weapons to protect our Nation; we can and must train the youth of the Nation to use these weapons; we can and must develop the weapons of retaliation; and by so doing it is our hope that we can build up our forces to such a degree that world war three can be averted, for the Soviet Union respects only force. To accomplish this will require sacrifices on the part of all the people; it will require military service for our young men; it will require the adoption of a well-considered long-range preparedness and training program as set out in the bill.

This present system of raising large armies for short periods of time, followed by complete and total demobilization, results in waste and extravagance and will lead to economic chaos. And to continue this policy in the fact of conditions of modern war will surely invite disaster.

This tremendous urge for an all-out effort in time of emergency, followed by a let down after the emergency has passed, plays right into the hands of the Soviet Union. If we do not adopt a system based upon a permanent plan for preparedness and training for the years to come, we are on the road to wreck the economy of the Nation.

For the foreseeable future and perhaps beyond, this Nation has no alternative but to be ready for any form of aggression that may be forced upon us.

To meet this situation, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that the minimum security requirements of this Nation require an armed force of 3,462,000 men by July 1, 1951. But they do not guarantee and cannot guarantee that this force may not have to be increased. No human being can possibly predict what the size of our Armed Forces will have to be 1 year, 6 months, or even 3 months from now. How dangerous, how shortsighted, how unrealistic it would be, in these perilous times in which we live today, to write in this bill a rigid statutory limitation on the number of men our Nation can have under arms to defend her liberties.

No Member of this House, nor even the Joint Chiefs of Staff, can accurately forecast what the military needs of the Nation will be tomorrow, or a week from tomorrow, or 6 months or a year from now. No one can tell. The only thing we do know is that we must have an adequate force to meet any military emergency that may arise.

On July 9, 1951, the present Selective Service Act will expire. The security of the Nation requires that the act be extended. This bill extends the Selective Service Act until July 1, 1954, a period of 3 years.

World conditions have made selective service an integral part of our defense structure. We must, therefore, continue to induct men into the Armed Forces for the immediate future in order to build up an armed strength and particularly our Army to the size deemed necessary for our minimum security requirements. The draft is an indispensable source of manpower for the Army. It is perhaps less important to the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps because men volunteer for those branches in greater numbers than for the Army. But without a selective service law it is quite possible that we would not be able to maintain the enlistments in the

Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps on a voluntary basis, because it may well be the thought of induction into the Army that prompts men to join another branch of the service. The Army is the backbone of our defense structure.

Under the present law men register for induction at the age of 18. They are liable for induction at the age of 19, and remain subject to induction until they pass their twenty-sixth birthday. Now the change made in the proposed bill reduces the induction age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months, and requires classification of the registrants before reaching the age of 18 years and 6 months. They are classified by their local draft board before they become 18 years and 6 months, and every man will know long before he is called just where he stands.

If the members of the committee will refer to the hearings and the report they will see how we have made and justified our case. Statistically, we think it is proper to reduce the age from 19 to 18½ years. If you will read the report it will give you a complete analysis, a complete justification as to why, in the opinion of the Committee on Armed Services, we were warranted in reducing the age.

I may say this, that in all the controversies before the committee not a single objection at any time was raised with regard to reducing the age limit from 19 to 18½. We feel that 18½ is the correct age. If you went down to 18, you would have a larger pool than the facts warrant and justify, so we create only a sufficient pool to meet our requirements.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the bill passed by the other body sets the age at 18?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. So that if the House wants 18½, it would probably have to set it at 19, and then in conference it might come out at 18½; is not that right?

Mr. VINSON. No, we are not traders. We deal square across the table.

Mr. JUDD. It seems to me that is a square proposition, the way things operate here in Washington.

Mr. VINSON. I am not going to dicker in conversation, nor am I going to dicker when I go to conference. I say what I mean and I mean what I say.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will assure us the conferees will come out with 18½, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. VINSON. I assure you now that whichever way this House votes this bill, that is the way the conferees are going to stand, until you direct us to the contrary.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman give us the wisdom of the chairman of the committee and of the committee itself as to what is the difference between 18 and 18½?

Mr. COX. Six months.

Mr. VINSON. As my distinguished colleague from Georgia suggests, it is 6 months. But what prompted us to do it was this: At 19 years of age you will hardly have a sufficient number in the pool. You will scrape the barrel dry. But there will be flexibility and a leeway if you go to 18½.

Another reason that we put 18½ in this bill is that we hope to have a sufficient manpower pool to require the Department to send back home the veterans from the inactive and volunteer reserves who serve 12 months following their recall to active duty. If you keep it at 19, then you are going to be forced to keep in every inactive or volunteer reservist that has been called to duty. So I certainly hope that any man who moves to keep it at 19 will remember that at the same time he is fixing it so that the reservist who has already served 5 or 6 years and is called back to active duty will have to stay there, because you will have no man to take his place unless you go into the 18½ group.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is it not a fact that the great bulk of the involuntary reservists are officers?

Mr. VINSON. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Could the gentleman give us the percentage?

Mr. VINSON. I will give you the figures tomorrow, but I do not have them at my fingertips today.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Speaking about the manpower pool, what have the armed services done or what are they going to do to reduce the physical standards for noncombat troops?

Mr. VINSON. If you will read the report you will see where we have reduced the standards in this bill down to the very lowest standards which existed for physical and mental qualifications in January 1945.

By the standards that we put in this bill, some 608,000 men will be put in the pool who are not in the pool today.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. That is, there will be 608,000 more men than we have under the present standards.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. In addition to that I wish our chairman would tell the Committee that by virtue of that amendment others will be reclassified and we will get additional troops from those who have already been deferred under the present standards.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. Here at the desk is a complete analysis of the bill and if Members will get the report it will give them a complete explanation of what we are recommending, and we will stand by what we have said in the report. The report will give you the reason why we reduced the age and the reason why we have reduced the mental and physical requirements to a lower level than it is today. If we do not do that, then we will be forced to go to the 18-year-old class. I am unwilling to go to the 18-year-old class when there are over 600,000 people who are not being made to serve within the draft age.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am very much interested in the subject of physical standards because apparently at the present time there is a different physical standard for the Army than there is for the Air Force and the Navy. Is there any reason why the physical standards should not be identical for all across the board?

Mr. VINSON. The Navy and the Air Force get them by the voluntary method.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the question?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman from California is overlooking the fact that this bill provides that the physical standards shall be approved by the Secretary of Defense and shall be uniform for all the services, except as to the Marine Corps which has no supply lines and no medical detachments, which are furnished by the Navy. But as to the branches other than the Marine Corps they must be uniform for all the services.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder whether the Armed Forces say that the 1945 standards will be sufficient for their purposes.

Mr. VINSON. Of course it would create a pool, and of course the Department is very much opposed to lowering the standards. But we had to do it, or else go to the 18-year-old class. There is no escape from that because you have to have men for the local board to draft. If we do not reduce the standards there will be nobody in the pool and nobody will be drafted between the ages of 19 and 26.

Mr. VORYS. They may object to the standards, but the standards were good enough to win the war with.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes; and we are going to put that in the law now.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COX. I am also interested in the mental qualifications of the people who are going to be drafted. From the announcement made on yesterday the President authorized, and I believe he has so declared, that the smart boys will be deferred and not drafted at all, which means that it is the Joneses and the Smiths who plow the fields and feed the hogs and milk the cows who are going to do the bleeding and dying.

Mr. VINSON. Let us get that straight now for the committee. No one can escape the draft because he goes to college or high school. He gets a statu-

tory deferment if he is in college. We have a provision in the bill which will give him a deferment for one academic year, and then under the provision dealing with the President's powers the President can grant deferments where it is in the interest of the national health and safety. But sooner or later he has got to come before his draft board and be subject to the draft, just as the boy who is on the farm is subject to draft. The mere fact that one is in high school, the mere fact that one is in college and gets a deferment does not mean that he is escaping his draft obligation. Deferment means that for a temporary period he will not be required to serve, but after that deferment ceases he will be subject to induction.

Mr. ABERNETHY. He gets deferment, but it does mean that somebody else has got to take his place during the time he gets deferment.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, that is true; and when the boy on the farm is deferred on account of agriculture, it means that somebody must take his place. That is all it means. It does not mean anything more than that. If you go down to Mississippi, in the gentleman's district, and defer 10 of his constituents on account of agriculture, who is going to take their places? Somebody else in that local board takes their places, and the same thing runs right through the bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman will agree that it would have been well if that announcement had been deferred until after this bill had been considered?

Mr. VINSON. No. It is all right, because what is in the bill controls the educational situation, and I will explain that in a minute.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I go just a little further?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The facts are that there are many boys in this country who are not so fortunately situated financially that they can go to school.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Since they are in that unfortunate situation, a man who is able to send his boy to school, his son receives a preference over the man who is unable to send his boy to school, and I think that is wrong.

Mr. VINSON. He goes to school, and if he stays there one academic year——

Mr. ABERNETHY. He goes to school if he is financially able to go.

Mr. VINSON. If he is financially able to go, and he stays there one academic year, and then after that academic year the draft is on his neck again; if he fails to meet the educational requirements, he will have to go in just like everybody else.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The boy who is not financially able to go to school has the draft on his neck now.

Mr. VINSON. That is it, exactly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the difference.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, but no one escapes the obligation. Eventually he will have to serve.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, he escapes to the extent of one year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I must yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. An act passed by this Congress is not binding on another Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Of course not.

Mr. GROSS. Then he can be deferred forever, if the act is changed.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. If they change the law.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell me what percentage are required in noncombat duty as compared with combat duty?

Mr. VINSON. I do not want to go into that now. What is known as a "divisional slice" is about 40,000 men. On the battleground you have only about 12 or 14 thousand. I will say there is a waste of manpower, and we have too many men behind the lines for the few number that is doing the fighting. We are trying to correct it, but I cannot go into that now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill, where the Senate bill provides you are deferring men for educational purposes?

Mr. VINSON. The Senate bill sets aside 75,000 people. There is nothing like that in this bill. The magnificient speech that our very learned friend from New York [Mr. REED] made relating to all of that, has no application to this bill at all. There is not a line in this bill about any 75,000 people being sent to school and selected.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I asked the chairman this question before, as to the difference between the 18-year-olds and the 18½, and he spoke of the need of a pool of manpower that the Army needed. In this announcement by General Hershey the other day, it was estimated, in the newspaper at least, that 800,000 of these intellectual, smart boys that someone referred to would be deferred. Does not the gentleman thing that those who do not qualify under this fancy examination would be stigmatized as being mentally inefficient, at the same time we are showing discrimination to some 800,000 who are in college?

Mr. VINSON. I do not think so, but there are some 550,000 students deferred now under the present law. What General Hershey is doing is practically carrying out what the eight committees that have been advising him suggested be done.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Did the gentleman mean to indicate a moment ago that under this bill, through Selective Service, they would take boys before they had completed their high-school work?

Mr. VINSON. No; I will get to that in a moment if the gentleman will just bear with me.

Under the bill we draft at 18 years and 6 months. The boy registers at 18, is classified before he gets to be 18 years and 6 months, but when he reaches 18 years and 6 months the draft will put him into the service.

What happens after he gets in? He has to have 4 months' basic military training, and that training must be in the continental United States; it cannot be in Asia, Europe, Africa, or South America; it has got to be here, and before he can be put into combat duty he must have been in the service at least 6 months. Therefore, it makes him 19 years of age before he gets in combat duty unless there is an invasion of this country. If any invasion of this country takes place, of course, we are not going to stop to think about age when we are fighting for our homes and our liberties.

We have reduced the age. The next thing we change is the length of service, which is increased from 21 months to 26 months and we do it for this reason: The longer a man serves the less drain there is on the manpower pool. In fiscal 1952 if the length of service is not increased to 26 months we will have to get 149,000 more men than we will with the service increased to 26 months.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman keeps discussing the question of the pool. I presume the gentleman is accepting the statement of the Department of Defense and General Hershey as to the size of the pool resulting from the operation of the draft act today.

Mr. VINSON. That is it; what is the gentleman's question about it?

Mr. BARDEN. We have plenty of time.

Mr. VINSON. I get tired talking for an hour.

Mr. BARDEN. I will try to refresh the gentleman a little. I believe the gentleman is aware of the manner in which these examinations have been held at the induction centers.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; I am aware of that.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman has discussed that with both the Department and with myself and others. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. As a result of that discussion does not the gentleman believe that they are turning loose about 50 percent or better of those who are mentally qualified that should not have been turned loose?

Mr. VINSON. That is right, and that is the reason we are making the change in the law.

Mr. BARDEN. Has the gentleman any explanation as to why the Department of Defense has not changed its policy when the man to whom we look to direct the Department of Defense, the

gentleman from Georgia, calls it to their attention?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is erroneous, of course, when he says anyone looks to me to direct the Department of Defense; I am only here to cast one vote, but I hope the gentleman will look to me for guidance on this bill.

The committee had the pleasure of listening to the gentleman for 1 hour. I know his bill. We will debate it when when we get down to him. Let me make my speech now and explain the bill and we will come to all of thise things.

Mr. BARDEN. I thought the gentleman himself was going to have a little friendly chat with me.

Mr. VINSON. Well, I had a friendly chat with the gentleman back in 1948 when the gentleman had certain views. I do not think his views have changed from 1948 to 1951.

Here is the reason why it is necessary to have 26 months. Now listen. Considering the fact that each inductee will be given 4 months basic training and we require that to be followed by 2 months additional training, he will in addition average 2 months of travel, plus 1 month of leave. Thus it can be seen that even by extending the period to 26 months the armed services only obtains 17 months of effective service from each inductee. When you go up to 26 months it only nets the armed services for each man in the ranks, a total length of service of 17 months. If you let it stand at 21 months, why it is 5 months less and it increases for every month that you decrease the length of time. In addition, for each month by which you reduce from 26 months you increase the cost by 5 percent for each inductee.

Let us take up education. Under existing law today we grant a postponement—bear in mind I use the word "postponement"—to high school students up to their twentieth birthday. Under the bill we are more liberal. We grant a statutory deferment. There is a big difference between a postponement and a statutory deferment. We grant a statutory deferment to that high-school student until he reaches 20 years of age. That is a great benefit for him. Not a single high school or university of the country or any educators have complained about that.

Let us talk about the colleges. Under existing law the President is granted broad general authority to defer from induction those students who are satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of study at a college, university, or similar institution. Under this provision the director of selective service, under the authority delegated to him by the President, has deferred 570,000. Now we propose to continue in section 6 (h) the broad authority of the President to grant deferments to college students, but we also provide that the college student instead of getting a postponement will get a statutory deferment for one academic year. In other words, your boy goes to college in September. Suppose the draft board calls him in October. The law steps in and says: "You cannot lay your hand on him until he has finished that academic year." And at the end of that academic year he might qualify under the broad deferment authority that the President has to grant deferments where it is in the interest of the national health, safety and interest, but, remember, he is not escaping the draft. He is merely getting a statutory deferment for 12 months or 9 months, and later on he will have to serve just like everyone else if he meets the other qualifications.

I have been talking about induction in the draft. Here is what it all means to sum up:

First. We reduce the present draft age from 19 to 18½ years.

Second. We require the classification of men at registration and prior to attaining the age of 18½.

Third. We have increased the period of service from 21 to 26 months.

Fourth. We have eliminated the loophole by which aliens have escaped military service.

Fifth. We have lowered physical and mental standards for acceptability.

Sixth. We have guaranteed 4 months training and 5 months noncombatant assignment for each inductee.

Seventh. We have eliminated the authority to defer married men who have no dependents other than a wife.

Eighth. We have liberalized reemployment benefits.

Ninth. We have liberalized high school and college deferment.

Tenth. We have placed a termination date on the authority to induct men for service.

Eleventh. We have required the release of thousands of veteran reservists after 12 months' service.

Remember, if you put the age back of 19, then on the other hand you are holding in some 800,000 reservists, many of whom, under our bill, will go out if you reduce the age to 18½.

Twelfth. We provide authority to extend voluntary enlistments for 1 year.

Thirteenth. We have permitted registrants to indicate whether they desire to serve in segregated units.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the phase of drafting for service. Now I want to talk to you about drafting for training.

The bill authorizes—and I want everybody to understand it, and when you understand it I am perfectly willing to leave it to the conscience of every man here to do what he thinks is right, and I have no hesitancy in predicting what the ultimate outcome will be—the bill authorizes the establishment of a National Security Training Commission and creates a National Security Training Corps. By the language of this bill we establish a National Training Commission and by the same provision of the bill we create what is known as a National Security Training Corps.

Now let us see what the Commission does. The Commission is composed of individuals, outstanding American citizens, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They hold office for a certain length of time. They receive $50 a day when they are working. All of that is written out just as plain as the nose on your face, in the bill. Then we say there is established a training corps.

What happens next? You have got to have some work for the Commission to do. Now what is the job of that Commission? The job of the Commission is to prescribe the type of training and the bill says it must be basic military training.

Then what happens? Now let us not create a big bugaboo in our minds that there is going to be regimentation or that we are grabbing the youth of the country and throwing them in armed camps. It is set forth in this bill, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia pointed out, that Congress will always retain control.

We create a commission and it is composed of five men. They are confirmed by the Senate. Then they must formulate a plan. Now, what do we say about the plan? We write out the requirements in the very heart of the bill on page 37. You will see here what the Commission must deal with in its plan. Here is the yardstick. This is the very substance of the Commission's plan. Then when the Commission writes it out, what becomes of it? This is not the usual kind of a bill. This is not left to the departments to determine what happens. As far as our committee is concerned, we have grown tired of delegating authority when we are qualified to reach a decision and to establish a policy, instead of delegating it down to the departments.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to emphasize the importance of what the gentleman has just said. This bill is the product of an agency of this House, of the Armed Services Committee. Again, may I say that it is the test of the competency of this House to provide its own leadership, to legislate according to its own judgment.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I will have to yield to the gentleman from Florida. He does not have an amendment to offer this early in the bill, does he?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I might have later on, Mr. Chairman, but not at this particular time.

Mr. VINSON. All right; go ahead.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wonder what authority this Commission would have to use the facilities and buildings of universities and junior colleges in the training of these boys from a military standpoint.

Mr. VINSON. If they include that in the plan, it would be up to the gentleman and 434 other Members to pass on it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But could they do that?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; they could do that.

Bear in mind that you create the Commission, qualify all your five men, and you create your corps.

Now you have to go one step further. What do you do? You must have a plan. This appears on page 37. It states that

the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a plan or plans for a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act. I will not take the time now to read it, but you read it in the bill.

This is what they have to submit to us. Then they bring it back to the Armed Services Committee. The Armed Services Committee under the law must send it here for you to approve within 45 days. If you do not approve it, that is the end of that plan. A new plan is set up, and they bring in a new plan.

Further, you do not have to have a constitutional majority of 218 men to disapprove it. Only a majority of a quorum is required. That means 110 men, because 218 is a quorum, and a majority of that quorum can disapprove it. So here it is for the Congress to say what kind of military-training program we shall have.

Strictly speaking, you do not get universal military training until the plan has been approved by Congress. All you are doing here is creating a commission. Then at a later date you step in here and provide the type of training. If it meets your approval and if it meets the approval of the American people, then the program goes into effect. In that way we are not buying a pig in a bag. We know what we are doing. We can keep control over it.

Now go one step further. Suppose you do not want to continue it more than 1 year. All you have to do is pass a concurrent resolution repealing a law that has been signed by the President. You do it by a concurrent resolution, something rarely ever done in the history of this Government.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the universal military training section of this bill will not go into effect until after the draft has expired?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I am coming to that.

One step further. Who is eligible for the training corps? The same qualifications and the same standards that apply to the draftee for service apply to those eligible for training, the same deferments and the same age requirements—18½ to 19 would be the age.

There are only about 500,000 who would be eligible this year for this training program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will admit, I think, that you are establishing a basic law here. No matter how thin you slice it, you are still establishing a basic law calling in fact for universal military training?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the gentleman intend to discuss, during the course of his address, whether item 13, which he mentioned with regard to segregation, squares with the policy of the President and the policy of the Defense Department to eliminate segregation?

Mr. VINSON. I will discuss that under the 5-minute rule. Let us go back again. I want to hammer this in your minds so that you will not forget it, because our country is at the crossroads. It costs $35,000,000,000 a year to maintain 3,500,000 men under arms. The total Federal revenue of this country last year was only $38,000,000,000. Think of it. The cost of maintaining 3,500,000 men under arms comes to within $3,000,000,000 of the Federal revenue. The armed services eat up the gross Federal revenue of the Government to within $3,000,000,000. That does not include equipment. That does not include the armament. That is the cost in normal times. Here it is. To you people who talk about economy we are showing you a way how to get economy. Let me quote from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense:

> The best estimate for the annual recurring cost of 3,500,000 men on a peacetime basis once they have been provided with modern equipment is $35,000,000,000.

That is approximately $10,000 per man per year.

Why do we want this training program? What is the reason? The reason is that it will enable the Government to reduce its large standing army. You cannot reduce the size of the Army unless you have somebody ready to step into the Army. If you do not have such a reserve then you have to keep 3,500,000 or 4,000,000 men under arms for an indefinite period of time. If you want to reduce the size of your armed force you have to have somebody behind them who are being trained to go into the Army. That is the purpose of the bill, and that is the reason for the bill. That is the long-range program. If you turn down this proposition today and say that you are going to defeat universal military training, then you are saddling on this Nation for an indefinite period of time an armed service of 3,500,000 or 4,000,000 men, and if you continue doing that with expenses as they are, and the revenue as it is, you are going to lead this country to economic chaos.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman have figures on what the cost of the training program will be every year?

Mr. VINSON. Here it is. You can figure it out in your head. It costs $90 a month for a man who is inducted in the armed service. It costs $30 a month when he is inducted into the training corps. Five hundred thousand men would come out of the Armed Forces and would be put into the training force at $30 a month instead of at $90 a month. And running through this whole proposition is the same idea.

Mr. JUDD. But the country will still have to have its regular Armed Forces?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes, but we would not have to have a 4,000,000-man force.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. That is the reason I asked the gentleman the question: Does he have any figures as to how much of an establishment we would have to maintain in addition to the trainees?

Mr. VINSON. Of course I can only guess, but I would say that in a year and a half or 2 years, if you adopt this plan and if Congress approves it, you could stop induction into the service and induct only for training. I think you would be safe, if world conditions grew no worse than they are today, in putting into effect the universal military training program within the next 24 months. That would enable us, in all probability, to reduce the strength of the standing Armed Forces.

Mr. JUDD. How much? From three and a half million down to what?

Mr. VINSON. I would say if you put 500,000 men in you might reduce the force down to 2,000,000 men. Now, I wish you would listen to this. Every one of those three and a half million men are consumers. They are not producing anything. They are eating off the substance of the Nation. We have got to feed them. But if you have these trainees, they stay there for 6 months and then they go home and produce wealth for the Nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the issue in this bill. That is the issue, clean cut. Remember, if you kill this universal military training, then you have forced on the Department of Defense the absolute necessity to maintain for an indefinite period of time an armed force of at least 4,000,000 men, because the minimum security of this Nation requires that we be ready to meet Russian aggression any time it may come. However, if you adopt this program of universal military training, after you and I and our successors have passed away, then you will enable the Department to reduce its armed service. In doing so you will save billions of dollars to the taxpayers of America.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand the chairman, he does not propose to put this universal military training program into effect for a period of 2 years. Then why the emergency that requires its passage at this time?

Mr. VINSON. How then can they make plans to reduce unless they have a reserve back here? How can you begin to make expansion on your farm unless you know that back in your bank you have got something to back it up? The Department would be foolish to talk about reducing its forces unless it knew it had behind that reduction a program for a well-trained Reserve force. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me continue my explanation of the proposed bill.

This bill makes available for induction some 608,000 men who heretofore have been deferred for physical and mental reasons as IV–F's. We have done this by specifically requiring that the mental and physical standards for acceptability shall be those that prevailed in January of 1945. Under the proposed bill there will be no more wholesale rejections of men for military service because they fail an examination which many of them are very anxious not to pass. If a man

can follow simple directions he will be mentally acceptable. Even if he cannot read or write, he will still be liable for induction. Too many men have been escaping the draft. This provision will put a stop to that method of avoiding military service.

We also have made another large group of persons eligible for induction who have heretofore been deferred—that is married men who have no dependents other than a wife. The committee did not think we should continue to defer a man merely because he was married. We were impressed by the rather obvious increase in the number of marriage licenses issued throughout the Nation since last June.

The Committee on Armed Services is convinced that the proper defense of the Nation requires the reduction of the present draft age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months.

Remember then that men will register at 18, will be classified before attaining 18 years and 6 months, and therefore will be ready for induction into the service at age 18 years and 6 months.

Under the bill, each person inducted into the Armed Forces must be given military training for a period of not less than 4 months. It should be noted that this applies not only to men under 19, but to all persons inducted. The bill requires 4 months of military training; and this does not include time spent in travel to a training camp or station.

During this 4 months' period, no inductee may be assigned for duty—and this includes training duty—at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions, including the Canal Zone.

Thus, no inductee, during his 4 months' training period can be assigned to duty in Asia, Europe, Africa, or South America.

Because of the necessity for ships and airplanes to cover large areas, even during training periods, and because they must, of necessity, go beyond the territorial limits of the United States and its Territories and possessions, the limitation prohibits only assignments to duty at installations located on land.

Of equal importance is the remainder of the provisions which prevents any person inducted from being assigned for duty in any combat area during the 6 months' period immediately following his induction.

This provision, thus guarantees that all persons inducted into the Armed Forces will, during their first 6 months of service, be kept out of land combat areas.

Under this provision, no person inducted under the age of 19 can be sent into a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions.

Now, let us take up the subject of educational deferments. We are all very much interested in this subject and the Nation will watch closely what we do in this respect. First, let us consider the high-school student.

Existing law provides for the postponement from induction of students satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of study in a high school until the student has attained his twentieth birthday. The proposed legislation provides that students in this category shall have a statutory deferment, rather than a postponement from induction, until they have attained their 20th birthday. This will permit high-school students to elect the branch of service of their choice following their graduation. In other words, we have liberalized the high-school deferment provision. We have given him a statutory deferment instead of a postponement.

It has been determined that, in 1950, 122,000 high-school boys became 19 years old while in high school and before graduation, which is more than one-fifth of the male seniors of that school year. It is readily apparent that, if the cut-off age for deferment were set at any age less than 20, many thousands of male high school seniors would be deprived of the opportunity to complete their high-school education. By establishing a statutory deferment for high-school students up to the age of 20, the committee has insured the graduation of approximately 95 percent of all male seniors from high school.

The action which the committee has taken in this respect has been widely endorsed by numerous responsible educators and representatives of educational groups and in no instance has the committee been criticized for having established provisions which were either unfair or too restrictive in the deferment of high-school students.

Now let us take a look at the college student.

Under existing law, the President is granted a broad general authority to defer from induction those students who are satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of study at a college, university, or similar institution. Under this provision the Director of Selective Service under authority delegated by the President has deferred approximately 570,000 students who are satisfactorily pursuing their courses of study in colleges, universities, and similar institutions.

In arriving at this number of educational deferments, the Director of Selective Service has had the benefit of the views of six committees on scientific, professional, and specialized personnel which he appointed in 1948. Since the Committee on Armed Services has received no complaints against the present system of educational deferments, it is assumed that the system is equitable both to the student and to the educational institutions.

We propose to continue the broad authority of the President to grant deferments for college students. But we also provide that college students, instead of having their inductions postponed as provided in present law, will have their induction deferred until they complete an academic year. However, after receiving one deferment, a college student will no longer receive a statutory deferment, but he will be entitled to qualify for deferment under regulations issued by the President.

In that respect, I invite your attention to the committee report which sets forth the proposed plan just approved by the President which will set up a college deferment program on a Nation-wide basis, based upon individual class standing and individual test results conducted on a Nation-wide basis.

To sum up, if a college student is called while in college the bill gives him a deferement for that academic year, regardless of his class standing. Thereafter, the President, under the proposed bill, can grant additional deferments for as long a period as is necessary for the national health, safety, and interest.

In addition to these deferments, let me call your attention to the additional deferments authorized for ROTC students.

Under the bill, a person selected for enrollment or continuance in a college ROTC or similar program, and who agrees in writing to accept a commission, if tendered, to serve not less than 2 years on active duty and to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the sixth anniversary of receipt of a commission—less the period of his active service—may be deferred from induction for training and service until after completion of the course of instruction.

At present there are 197,000 students participating in ROTC programs.

The bill also authorizes the establishment of officer candidate classes among the various services in order to give enlisted personnel on active duty an opportunity to qualify for commissions.

Let me call your attention to another outstanding feature of the bill. That is, the provision which requires the military departments to release to inactive duty, upon application, any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who is a veteran and has served on active duty since recall for a period of 12 months or more. We are strongly of the opinion that it is unfair to keep piling additional burdens upon the backs of our inactive and volunteer reservists. We sincerely hope that the departments will release other reservists, but we flatly require them to release the veteran inactive and volunteer reservists now on active duty who complete 12 months of service.

The bill requires all men under the age of 26 who are inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces subsequent to June 25, 1950, to serve on active duty, and in a reserve component for a total of 6 years, unless sooner released for personal hardship reasons under regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

I think I should also point out to you that the proposed bill permits young men to volunteer for induction at the age of 17, with their parents' consent, and at age 18 without consent.

To make sure that the Congress is kept fully aware of the entire program, the bill requires for the first time that the Director of Selective Service report annually to the Congress on the operation of the Selective Service System for the preceding year.

We liberalized the reemployment rights of servicemen and have guaranteed them, for all practical purposes, the same job upon return from service, and not just a similar job.

The bill provides that an alien who enters this country and declares his intention of becoming a citizen will be liable for military service. This change

will prevent many thousands of men who have declared their intention of becoming citizens from escaping military service.

We have granted to the President the authority to induct men by age group or groups. In effect, this means that the President may order the induction of older men first in order that they may not escape induction by passing the age of liability; or if he desires he can authorize the induction of men in any age group between 18½ and 26.

The thought will run through your mind—why did we reduce the age from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months? Well, this is the reason that prompted the committee to reduce the present draft age:

As of October 1, 1950, there were 2,100,000 men on active duty in our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, including 487,000 men from the National Guard and Reserves. Between October 1, 1950, and July 1, 1951, the armed services must obtain approximately 1,400,000 men. Of this amount, an additional 380,000 men will be furnished by the National Guard and the Reserve components; 862,000 will come from inductions and enlistments of men between the ages of 19 through 25; 120,000 will come from enlistments of 17- and 18-year-olds; 40,000 veterans will enlist; and it is anticipated that 127,000 men will reenlist.

It appears, therefore, that the rapid expansion during the present fiscal year will take 862,000 men out of the 19-26 age groups. Under present law, and under the prevailing standards of acceptability, there will only remain a net pool available on June 30, 1951 of 411,000 men. The proposed bill raises the net pool to 1,239,000 men, without reducing the present draft age. Of this number, however, at least 608,000 will be men who would otherwise be classified as IV–F except for the proposed lowered standards of acceptability.

Obviously, the increased number liable for induction, because of the reduced physical and mental standards, cannot be absorbed by the services in any large number during a short period of time, and particularly during a phase of rapid expansion. Such men must, of necessity, be inducted over an extended period, since we cannot expect to maintain the efficiency of our Armed Forces, and particularly the Army which is the recipient of the greatest number of inductees, with men who, for all intents and purposes, may be considered as substandard.

Let there be no misundertanding with regard to the proposed lowered standards. The January 1945 level of acceptability can properly be called the barrel-scraping period. The armed services cannot be expected to assume a disproportionate number of substandard men, and still be held responsible for the security of the Nation.

Thus what appears to be an excess pool of men 19 through 25 potentially available on July 1, 1951, under the provisions of the proposed legislation, must necessarily be analyzed in terms of net availability over a protracted period of time. The pool of 19-to-26 men who meet present standards is only 411,000. The net increase to the pool by inducting men who are nonveterans and have wives only to support is 220,000, under present standards of acceptability. From this group greater delays in reporting for induction can be anticipated because of hardship. Thus the anticipated net pool of available men who can meet present standards of acceptability, as of July 1, 1951, will be only 631,000, just slightly in excess of the number the Director of Selective Service considers must always be in the manpower pool to provide the necessary safety margin.

To maintain an armed strength of 3,500,000 men, from July 1, 1951, to July 1, 1952, will require, under the present Selective Service Act, an input of 641,000 men. However, by extending the period of service from 21 to 26 months, and by authorizing the involuntary extension of present voluntary enlistments for 1 year, as provided in the House amendment, this required input will be reduced, in fiscal 1952, to 428,000 men. However, this figure ijs based on the assumption that 135,000 men now in service will reenlist, and that 240,000 men will voluntarily enlist from outside the present group liable for induction.

Thus by—

First. Lowering physical and mental standards,

Second. Extending the period of service to 26 months,

Third. Inducting married nonveterans who are nonfathers, and

Fourth. By involuntarily extending enlistments for 1 year, there will be a sufficient pool of available men, without regard to physical and mental quality, between the ages of 19 through 25 to support an armed force of 3,500,000 men probably until the end of fiscal 1953.

However, as has already been pointed out, the induction of men under the proposed barrel-scraping standards must be extended over a protracted period of time.

But, of even greater significance is the fact that the contemplated input of men in fiscal 1952—641,000 under the present law; 428,000 under the House bill—does not take into consideration the release of the more than 800,000 National Guardsmen and reservists who will be on active duty by July 1, 1951, most of whom are veterans of World War II.

If these veterans of World War II are to be released, and the committee believes they are entitled to the earliest consideration consistent with national security, then the available pool of men who meet present standards must be increased.

By lowering the induction age to 18 years and 6 months, and taking into consideration all deferments authorized under the proposed bill, the net pool will be increased by 224,000 men who would qualify under present standards, and an additional 30,000 men who would qualify under the proposed lowered standards.

Such an addition to the pool of available men will—

First. Permit a rapid expansion to 4,000,000 men, if necessary.

Second. Permit the maintenance of an efficient armed force of 3,500,000 men, and

Third. Permit the earlier release of many hundreds of thousands of veteran National Guardsmen and Reservists now on active duty than would otherwise be possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far I have been talking about the drafting of men for service in the Armed Forces. But this bill provides not only for the induction of the youth of the Nation for service in the Armed Forces, it also provides for induction for training in the National Security Training Corps.

At this point I would like to discuss that phase of the bill which deals with the induction of men for training which is generally referred to as universal military training.

The bill authorizes the establishment of a National Security Training Commission and creates a National Security Training Corps. The Commission is to be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It will be a civilian-controlled Commission. Three members must be civilians, one member will be a Regular or retired member of the Armed Forces and the remaining member must come from a Reserve component. The Chairman must be a civilian. The Commission must consist of outstanding American citizens.

It will be the job of the Commission to direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps and that training must be basic military training. After the Commission has been appointed, it will prepare a plan for implementing this military training. The plan prepared by the Commission must be submitted to the Congress. If either House does not pass a resolution by a simple majority disapproving the plan, the plan will go into effect. The proposed bill also requires that the plan submitted to the Congress will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. To prevent the Committee on Armed Services from bottling up the proposed plan, the law will require each committee to report a resolution to its House within 45 days after the plan has been submitted, stating whether the committee favors or disapproves plan submitted. That resolution will be privileged and may be called up by any Member.

The bill requires that the plan provide for the basic type of military training to be given to members of the corps. The plan must set out measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the members, a code of conduct for the members, including penalties for violations, such other policies as the Commission may incorporate in the plan, and recommendations with regard to the disability, death, and other benefits to be granted to members of the corps, along with suggested duties, liabilities, obligations, and responsibilities to be imposed upon such members.

Now, let me explain to you how induction for training in the National Security Training Corps will take place:

It will be accomplished in one of two ways—either the President may issue an Executive order stopping the induction into the armed services of all men be-

low the age of 19 and calling for the induction into the training corps of all men then or thereafter liable for induction, or the Congress may inaugurate the training by a concurrent resolution stopping induction for service and initiating induction for training.

The age limit for induction into the National Security Training Corps, generally speaking, will be between the ages of 18½ and 19 years. Men inducted into the National Security Training Corps will be trained for a period of 6 months in the continental United States and then they will be required to join a Reserve component and serve satisfactorily as a member of that Reserve component for 5½ years after they have finished this training. There will be approximately 500,000 men per year who will be eligible for this training. They will be inducted through local selective service boards and the same mental and physical standards will apply to their induction as is now proposed for induction into the armed services. Men below the age of 18½ will be permitted to volunteer for induction at age 17 with parental consent, and at age 18 without parental consent.

The same deferment provisions will apply to men to be inducted into the National Security Training Corps as is now proposed for deferment from induction into the Armed Forces.

There will be one fundamental difference in the National Security Training Corps, and that is its members will not be members of the Armed Forces. After they have completed 6 months' training and have been assigned to a Reserve component they will then become Reserve members of the Armed Forces, but not until that transfer takes place.

In addition, the proposed law grants to members of the National Security Training Corps a monthly pay of $30 per month during this 6 months' training period. If the members have dependents, they will be entitled to the allowances now authorized for dependents.

No man can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until the Congress has had an opportunity to disapprove the plan submitted by the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, this is a healthy provision. This will give the Congress an opportunity to thoroughly examine the plan submitted by the Commission. In my opinion, it will assure a military training program. It is a wise provision because it will permit the Congress to closely examine every detail of the plan submitted. Congress would not be buying a pig in a bag. It will know the type of training the youth of our Nation will be given under this program.

In addition, the proposed legislation requires the Commission to report to the Congress semiannually on the entire operation of the National Security Training Corps program.

But even after the plan has been approved by the Congress, further action is necessary before induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized, because induction into the National Security Training Corps cannot be started until drafting for service of men below the age of 19 has ceased.

Bear in mind that the available manpower pool will not permit drafting for service and induction for training at the same time. It is obvious that when induction for training can be started, we will have to stop drafting for service. We have not enough people to operate both systems simultaneously because we do not have the necessary people to train two different groups.

Bear in mind, also, that under the proposed bill, the Congress can terminate induction into the National Security Training Corps any time it sees fit by merely passing a concurrent resolution stopping such inductions. However, the universal training features of the bill will be permanent, since it is the long-range planning part of the entire preparedness program.

That, in essence, is universal military training and the method by which it will be implemented, initiated, and supervised.

I said in the beginning that Congress is faced with a momentous decision. I said the Nation was at the crossroads.

The course we take today will determine for many, many years to come whether we will saddle on the American people, for an indefinite period, a large standing force, or whether we will travel down a road that will safely permit a reduction in our standing forces through the inauguration of a universal military training program.

It costs $35,000,000,000 a year to support an armed force of 3,500,000 men. The total income of the Federal Government last year was only $38,000,000,000. Just think of it—the cost of maintaining the Armed Forces, not including original equipment cost, is within $3,000,000,000 of the total income the Federal Government received last year.

Now we all know that this cannot go on indefinitely. The only sensible thing to do is to reduce the standing forces at the earliest opportunity.

But it is obvious that we cannot do this unless we have people who stand ready to take the place of the reduced standing forces. That is why we propose that the youth of the Nation, instead of being drafted into the regular standing forces, be given 6 months of basic military training and then be placed in the reserve components where they will be readily available for call to active duty in the event of an emergency.

The objective of the bill is to build up a strong, adequate, well-trained reserve and, at the same time, permit a substantial reduction in the size of our standing forces.

Bear this in mind. If you vote to strike out the universal military training features of this bill, you are forcing on the backs of the American people the necessity for maintaining for an indefinite period a large standing force, which you and I know will eventually jeopardize and possibly ruin the economic stability of this Nation. You can take your choice—saddle on the American people for an indefinite time a large standing force, or institute a system which will permit us to materially reduce this standing force and, at the same time, provide security through a reserve force that can meet any military necessity that may arise.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union listens only to a nation whose voice is backed by steel. Here is the steel; here is the sinew; here is the way to avoid economic chaos; here is the answer that will meet Russia's ambitions all wrapped up in this bill. It is yours to accept or deny. You may never be called upon to make a greater decision.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and to include as part of my remarks certain quotations, documents, and reports.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to renew that request in the House to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL. I will amend the request, then, simply to include my own remarks at the point indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, it is a rare privilege and a distinct honor to serve in the Congress of the United States, particularly as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a member of the Armed Services Committee. I hope the Members will bear with me, because one should not wait until his fellow Member has died to pay him honest and just tribute.

It is altogether superfluous and unnecessary for me to tell you that CARL VINSON is one of the greatest, ablest, and best men I have ever known. While he is here I want to say to his face that there is no Member of this House who has a more real or a finer affection for him than I have.

Now that my feelings have been truly expressed, there is no man who is foxier, more astute, or resourceful than the gentleman from Georgia. He has a barrel of tricks, and no one can tell when he will pull one from the bottom of the barrel to upset his opponent. This is not to indict him as a master of artifice or chicanery, but to prove that the gentleman from Georgia is always determined to win his point—and he usually does.

Mr. Chairman, as all Members know, practically every major bill out of our committee has been reported unanimously. But this bill is not. There is no minority report. Only three of us voted against the bill in committee, but several members of both political parties voted for it with their fingers crossed, with their tongue in their cheek, and with reservations.

With all of his virtues and accomplishments, the gentleman from Georgia, at whose side I have had the priv-

ilege and honor to sit, does not overwhelm me; nor do the generals or admirals with all their honors and glories sink me. For 36 years the gentleman from Georgia has sat under the spell of members of the Armed Forces. While he has strength of will and a powerful resistance, he is human and naturally would be subject to the ceaseless, incessant propaganda of the military. I have been here only half that number of years, but I do not succumb and I will not yield because of their exalted state, and I shall not be overcome by my admiration and love for my chairman.

Sir, I am no push-over, nor am I scared of the threats or efforts of this gigantic bureaucracy which would cut the throat of any man who dares oppose it. Nor am I led astray by paid propagandists who are interested in their own jobs and who do not speak for great masses of people they are supposed to represent.

The issue before us today, my fellow countrymen, is one that rises far above personalities. Little that we say here will be long remembered, but what we do here will never be forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at this hybrid mongrel bill and see just what its implications are. Perhaps I am in the minority and almost alone, but it is not the first time I have been all alone; and, certainly, I am not afraid. I care little what people might think of me today or tomorrow; what they will think 5, 10, or 20 years from now. I am compelled by my conscience and the deepest convictions of my soul to speak out.

It is wonderful to live in a land where one can speak his mind. The only time an American cannot speak out is when he is in the armed services. You can talk back in the college classroom, but you do not talk back in the Army, though you might have forgotten more in your sleep than your immediate superior ever dreamed of.

Are we going to keep this a free country? Or are we going to make it a slave country to goosestep to the commands and strutting of arrogant men who like to exercise power?

Mr. Chairman, let us look at this bill. I do not believe anyone could tell you anything about it that the able chairman has not comprehensively and accurately told you. But let us look at it and the philosophy back of it and beneath it. Let us think where it is going to lead us. It is not so important where you start or begin but where you end that counts.

I have no argument with any Member on either side of this aisle as to how he shall vote. Each man must search his own soul, trust his own judgment, and follow his own conscience—if he has any left.

This whole abortive scheme is to shoulder upon us a system which, in my opinion, is anti-American, totally foreign, and unworthy of the lovers of liberty throughout the world. The present world tension does not demand UMTS. The present Draft Act will supply any and all the numbers of men that are needed. The sponsors of this legislation think that the psychology of the time is ripe for passage. It is now or never. That is the only reason it is on this floor today.

Let it be thoroughly understood that those of us who are opposed to peacetime military conscription are not against adequate preparedness. We want to make this country strong. I say in freedom is our strength. We want to see this Nation strong on land, on the seas, and in the air to defend itself against all possible aggressors.

The pending bill, Mr. Chairman, proposes to combine with the Draft Act a permanent system of universal military training and service. The draft is a temporary piece of legislation in the face of an emergency. It is necessary and indispensable, and we all know that we must, under present conditions, continue the draft until such changes occur that will warrant the repeal of it. But peacetime universal military training and service is a permanent thing here, and that is what the sponsors want—to militarize the country. The time to subject men and boys to draft is in time of war or imminent war. When the war is over, is no time to build up a huge military machine in this country.

You can call this peacetime military training and service, but the essence is peacetime conscription with no termination date in the bill. It is compulsion and coercion. Naturally, it is repugnant to freemen. A rose smells the same by any name given it. So does a polecat. This bill to me smells more like a polecat than it does a rose.

Personally I am strongly opposed to this shotgun wedding of Selective Service and universal military training. Why mix the castor oil with the orange juice? Why sugar-coat the pill. This illicit and unholy marriage is a bold and brazen attempt to achieve by indirection that which the Defense Department could not achieve by direction. In time of hysteria we should not pass laws which in time of calm reflection could not be approved. In the 20 years that I have served in this body and even before I came here the armed services have tried to cram down our throats peacetime military conscription, but always they have failed. They failed in our old Committee on Military Affairs; they failed in the Special Postwar Policy Committee set up by Speaker Rayburn, with our late and lamented friend, Cliff Woodrum, as chairman. Why not separate the issues? Let each measure stand or fall on its own feet. If we are wise we will pass the substitute bill to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] that will continue the present draft law for 2 or 3 years and that will meet all of our requirements at the moment, and save universal military training to a later date when it can be considered as a separate measure. The sponsors of the bill know that it cannot go into effect immediately. We do not have enough men in this country to take care of our draft requirements and universal military training at the same time. This law cannot become effective until the future, perhaps the distant future.

All these 28 years the armed services have come back hammering year after year, and we have been deluged with telegrams from certain Legion leaders who are paid pretty good salaries, but I do not think they speak for the rank and file of our ex-service men any more than some of the labor leaders speak for the rank and file of labor. The sponsors of the bill are taking advantage of of the terrific pressure in this jittery age when many of our people have grown panicky due to the everlasting, tireless, and ceaseless propaganda waged by some of the brass and the braid who now want a permanent system under which they can command large bodies of men. No preacher ever had a congregation large enough and no general ever had an army big enough to command. Naturally they have a selfish interest. In time of peace the only thing the members of the armed services are interested in, particularly the high-ranking officers, is pay, promotion, retirement, and for their sons to succeed them in the Military or Naval Academies.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. How many men can the Army ever have under the universal military training program as suggested in the bill?

Mr. SHORT. No one in the world could tell you how big the Army would be.

Mr. DURHAM. The Army could not have more than three and one-half million men under any provisions.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes. As the distinguished gentleman from Georgia pointed out, you pay the soldiers $90 a month and you pay these trainees $30 a month. But, he failed to point out that every year you take in 800,000. There is not a man on our committee or on the floor of this House who has the slightest inkling as to the cost of this measure. I predict it will cost a minimum of $4,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 a year. Heaven only knows how much it will cost, but it will cost plenty.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman know that the only ones that are subject to universal military training are those between 18½ and 19 years of age? There are only about 500,000 in that age range each year. That is all that can ever be taken.

Mr. SHORT. You have a constant turn-over, and, naturally, it builds up. Their service is for 6 years.

Mr. VINSON. In the Reserves, yes.

Mr. SHORT. Surely, in the Reserves. They look forward to retirement benefits and longevity pay, and unemployment compensation, and compensation for injuries that will occur. Why, the amount will be in staggering proportions. Yet you are going to pass a bill, and you do not have the least conception of what the total cost will be, and you know it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman tell the House if any countries have been

spared the ravages of war, by compulsory military training?

Mr. SHORT. They have not. But I should like to say to the gentleman that it is interesting to remember the argument advanced by the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, that when his boy goes to war he wants him trained. Of course we all do. We do not want to send green men into combat, though they did take some, not only in World Wars I and II, but they have sent them to Korea.

The argument that every American youth should have 2 to 3 years of compulsory military service in order to reduce wartime casualties is false for four reasons.

The first is that the training of the individual for combat does not require any such long period, but takes only 17 weeks, according to the Army itself. General Christiansen, in answer to a question by our former colleague from Michigan, Mr. Engel, said:

> We found 17 weeks developed the man so that as an individual he could go into a combat organization and fight as a part of that combat organization effectively.

So you do not need all that long time.

You train these men and put them in the reserve, and they go out, but if war should break out they will have to be called back and given refresher courses. You cannot just take a man off the farm or out of an office or a profession and send him into battle overnight. I do not care how much training he has had, he has grown soft and flabby in the interim.

The second reason this argument does not hold water is that fighting a modern war—and how well so many of you who were in the last war know this—is done by combat teams that must be trained as units in time of war.

The third reason is that most of the men of a modern army never engage in combat. Only a few men actually get to the battle line. Most of them do housekeeping work. They are radiomen, mechanics, cooks, clerks, truck drivers, and so forth. Certainly, training for such work usually is part of civilian life, and does not require 2 or 3 years of conscripted service.

The fourth reason that their argument is fallacious is that heavy casualties do not occur because of lack of training, but because of disease, proximity to exploding shells or bombs, and blunders by superiors.

According to the Army's own reports, and more specifically in answer now to the direct question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], it is interesting to look at World War II casualties. Countries without universal military service suffered far less casualties than countries with universal military service. In World War II, the United States suffered 1,068,000 casualties with 392,000 killed. The British Empire suffered 980,000 casualties, with 353,000 killed. Britain and the United States each suffered less than 400,000 soldiers killed. Germany, with universal military service, suffered 9,500,000 casualties, with 2,100,000 killed. Russia, with universal military service, suffered 13,000,000 casualties, with 3,500,000 killed. Japan, with 5,750,000 casualties, suffered 1,200,000 deaths. China, with 3,178,000 casualties, had 1,300,000 killed.

Mr. DONDERO. What about France?

Mr. SHORT. France, of course, was principally occupied.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. The chairman admitted here a moment ago the waste of manpower in the armed services. Suppose you corrected that, would you need to reduce the age limit from 19 to 18½?

Mr. SHORT. If the armed services had carried out the plain intent of the Congress by building up our civilian components, the National Guard and the reservists who have been so shamefully treated, if they had employed the draft which they discontinued in January 1949, over 2 years ago—not only discontinued calling them under the draft but they discharged 30,000 of them—if they would lower the mental and physical standards and requirements to January 1945 and tighten up on the administration of the law—if they had observed those three things that I have mentioned, this legislation would not be here today.

That is a very perinent question which the gentleman has asked, and I will go into a little further discussion of that in a moment.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I was referring particularly to the waste of manpower in the noncombat service.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes; in the last war you could visit camp after camp and find a lot of doctors, M. D.'s, who were sorely needed back home in their communities. We had only one home-town doctor left in my county, traveling over the hills of Stone County, Mo., ministering to 12,000 people. We had only one old broken-down doctor, but you could go into the Army camps and find a lot of doctors sitting around punching a typewriter—round pegs in square holes. You have a lot of them over here in the Pentagon.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why did not the military submit to this committee estimated costs and comparable figures?

Mr. SHORT. They do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why do they expect us to swallow this argument?

Mr. SHORT. Because now is the only chance in the world for them to get this passed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The argument has been made that the real issue here is a question of budget figures. I do not swallow budget figures in that kind of an argument.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Michigan never swallows a figure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to see some figures. I would like to ask the gentleman another question, although he may touch on it later, suppose we create universal military service and develop this great force of men and they return to their homes. When they are out of the service for 2 or 4 or 5½ years, will not hundreds of thousands of these men at the time they are called back have wives and children, as well as other dependents perhaps, as is the case with the reservists who are now serving?

Mr. SHORT. Of course.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Nothing has been said about the expenses and about that part of the picture.

Mr. SHORT. Of course not—they do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There is one point that the chairman of the committee overlooked explaining a few moments ago, which I think is very pertinent to this legislation.

I am sure that the gentleman who is addressing the House now will be able to answer this question: Does the legislation before the House provide that the pool of men between 18½ and 19 will be thrown into the general pool with those between 19 and 26, or does it provide that the pool of men between 19 and 26 of eligible draftees must be exhausted before they reach the pool age of 19?

Mr. SHORT. No. They are all thrown together, according to my understanding.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The gentleman made some comment in connection with the amount of casualties which Great Britain had in the last world war. Will you give some consideration to the fact that the regimental commanders had something to do with the fewer number of casualties in our Army?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is quite correct. He was a great soldier.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. And they did not say that they did not have universal military training there.

Mr. SHORT. That is true.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I was rather interested in the waste of manpower in the Army. We do not consider the tremendous number of civilians who are now in the Pentagon and we are wasting their time, too. Since the Korean police action——

Mr. SHORT. Which has cost us about 60,000 casualties.

Mr. SHAFER. That is true; but since that time, since we took that step over there, we have averaged about 2,000 a week in civilian employees in our armed services, to the point that today I think our total employment in the entire Federal Government amounts to about 2,600,000. Is that not true?

Mr. SHORT. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHAFER. Have we any idea how many more civilians will be employed as a result of bringing in all these addi-

tional boys under universal military service, if that is adopted?

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman's figures are too high, but the senior Senator from Virginia says you can discharge a lot of those people and get much more work done.

Mr. SHAFER. I know that a week ago there were 2,000 additional jobs opened up, and they were all dispensed at the White House. They are all jobs drawing pay of around twelve to fifteen thousand dollars a year.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. It is my understanding that it was necessary to go down to the 18-year-olds to get sufficient manpower for the draft. Is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. The Senate bill provides for 18. We provide for 18½, with 6 months' training before going into combat.

Mr. O'HARA. Would the gentleman explain to me his own thinking of this recent "smart boy" announcement by the Selective Service that some 800,000 students in the categories between 19 and 26 would be deferred provided they passed this "smart boy" examination, and just what is going to happen if they are deferred? How much lower are we going to have to go to get sufficient manpower for the armed services?

Mr. SHORT. Not being a Delphinian oracle, I will have to refer the gentleman to General Hershey. I cannot answer that question.

I am worried about these 18-year-olds. Let us talk about that for a minute. General Marshall and General Collins, and "Lightning Joe" is a combat soldier, a real fighter, and ought to know what he is talking about. They both testified. I would rather take his opinion than a lot of desk generals. They both testified that 18-year-old boys are the best soldiers on earth. I just do not believe it.

Mr. TEAGUE. I just want to say that I agree with you a hundred percent.

Mr. SHORT. I would much prefer to take the judgment of OLIN TEAGUE, a man who fought and was wounded in Europe during World War II, or PAT SUTTON, or a score of men in this House on that particular point, than to take the advice or accept the opinion of even the Chiefs of Staff behind a desk in the Pentagon. I think if you will talk to combat leaders, I mean your lieutenants and captains and majors, talk to any man who has been under fire with troops and he will tell you that 18-year-old boys—of course, they are bold, they are daring, they are resilient, they have a quick comeback; they are not as courageous as they are foolhardy, just like hot-rod automobile drivers. They are darned fools at times, although I knew more at the age of 18 than I have ever known before or since. That is the reason they want 18-year old boys; they want to take them with fuzz on their chins at a tender age, when they are malleable, when they will obey commands, when they are impressionable; they want to indoctrinate them.

Oh! We will never become a militaristic Nation. No; because we hate war. It will be with us as with every nation; saddle peacetime conscription permanently on the American people—we are human beings; we are not so different from other peoples in other nations; it will not take long to make America over, and that is the dream of so many people of this country, like Dr. Tugwell "We will roll up our sleeves and make America over." Maybe we will make America over all right, if you pass this bill, and, brother, it will not be to your liking.

You cannot tell me that an 18-year-old boy has the stamina, the strength, the endurance, or the mature judgment of older men capable of marching under heavy pack over rough terrain. The march of the men in the hills of Korea proved that. I have talked to some of the soldiers back from Korea, I talked to one in my district who was shot in both legs, an officer in an infantry division. He was at Percy Jones Hospital. A graduate of the military academy; I named him to West Point.

"Why," he said "those poor kids in that bitter cold would break down and weep like a baby."

My God, it is awful. You are taking a boy immediately out of high school. That is sort of robbing the cradle. He cannot vote; he has scarcely begun to live, yet you are calling upon him to defend this country where men who are men should be willing, and able, and ready to fight to defend it in any emergency.

I know that some boys at 18 are more mature than others at 20. The undeniable fact is that under this proposed legislation we are going to draft men—listen to me—we are going to draft men at a younger age and compel them to serve longer than is done by any other country of the North Atlantic Pact nations. In France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Portugal they take young men at the age of 20, and in most of those countries they serve only 12 months and in none more than 18. In Italy they do not take them until they are 21 years of age, and they serve for 18 months. Now we propose to take the youth of this country at the tender age of 18 or 18½. I hope we can stand up in conference, but Senators have minds of their own. If we do the wise thing we will continue the present Draft Act as the Barden bill would, keep the age at 19. But no; we are going to take them at 18 or 18½ and compel them to serve not for 12 months or for 18 months, but for 26; and then they are going to be held in the Reserves, with the shameful, wicked, and inexcusable manner in which our active Reserves have been treated. They went out a year ago, or on June 25, at the outbreak of the Korean crisis. The Government reached out with its strong arm and yanked in this inactive Reserve, it yanked in the other one, most of the members of which were in their late twenties or early thirties. They are married, with one, two, or three children or other dependents. They have bought a farm, they are building a house, they have gone into a profession. Many of these men have had 1, 2, and 3 years of combat service. Their careers had already been suddenly and seriously interrupted in World War II. But the Government goes out and it yanks in these men indiscriminately from the inactive Reserve. They are in Korea at this moment. Many of them have been killed. Others are fighting there at this hour while the National Guard and the Organized Reserve units that have been taking training, receiving pay, and looking forward to longevity and retirement benefits have never been called. It is the most disgraceful thing that has ever happened in our history.

In spite of all the criticism of Madam Rosenberg, I want to say to you that she was more frank and forthright than any witness we had before us. I asked her to justify the treatment given these inactive Reserve men. She said: "Congressman SHORT, there is no justification. We have done a sorry job." It is an awful mess. She was honest and courageous enough to frankly admit it.

We are going to take these boys at 18 and 18½. They are going to serve 26 months. They will be in the Reserves, including their training period, for 6 years.

I want it clearly understood by the public just what our draft laws are. Under this pending bill we propose to draft men at an early age, compel them to serve a longer period than any other member of the Atlantic Pact. Their draft laws are milder than ours, or the ones we propose to enact. Even in Soviet Russia they are not called up as early as the Defense Department in this country proposes.

Are we going to keep this America? What good will it be for you to send your sons and brothers and husbands to fight and die 7,000 miles away on the hillsides of Korea for freedom when we are in danger of losing freedom here at home? I do not know how you feel about it, but I do not want to Prussianize America. If this bill passes we will conscript not only men into the Army but we will put all Americans into a strait-jacket, which the Senate hearings disclosed. They lifted the curtain in the Senate. They closed the shutters before our committee. Read the hearings over there. The real purpose back of this bill is to conscript even for non-defense purposes.

Let the camel get its nose under the tent and he will take over the circus. No Member here is so youthful or so naive as to doubt that. Indeed the authors and sponsors of the legislation frankly admit that the UMT phase of this wicked legislation is for the future, perhaps a considerable distance in the future.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have been receiving a number of letters from Legion organizations in the country encouraging me and other Members of Congress

to support UMT. Would the gentleman care to express himself on that?

Mr. SHORT. I will be very glad to. The gentleman was not here a while ago when I said that a lot of these leaders are paid pretty good salaries, but they do not speak for the rank and file.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have received a number of letters.

Mr. SHORT. Well, I have received them. They saw me at my home last week during the Easter recess. But let me tell you gentlemen this—and if any of you want to see them, you are welcome to come over to the office—since debating this issue with General Hershey over television on the American Forum of the Air a month ago I have received litterally hundreds upon hundreds of letters and telegrams not only from the Midwest, but along your seaboards, the Atlantic and the Pacific, and from the deep South, and I think I am safe in saying that not more than 50 of those letters and telegrams dissented from the position I took; not 50. The overwhelming sentiment of the American people is against this wicked, iniquitous thing.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Is it not true that this legislation we are talking about today, this UMS, has no relationship to the UMT program that the Legion sponsored? It has no comparison at all with it, has it?

Mr. SHORT. Well, the Legion is for it, or their leaders are.

Mr. SHAFER. Senator MALONE introduced the Legion bill in the Senate as S. 1. Senator MALONE, coauthor of this original UMT bill, called the Marshall substitute a monstrosity and voted against it. As a result of changes made in the Defense Department UMT draft bill, top American Legion officials have "gone along" with the proposal. But it is worth noting that on January 22, National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., told the Senate subcommittee:

> We want to make it clear that the plan before you is not universal military training of the type so long advocated by the American Legion, and supported by the people. The committee will want to consider this matter with great care.

Mr. SHORT. Well, I am glad the gentleman made that statement. It seems to me we have got the cart before the horse. We are enacting legislation that will not go into effect until some future date, and may never go into effect. Why not cross that bridge when we get to it?

I repeat, there are not enough Americans to carry on the draft and carry on UMT at the same time. How foolish for us to muddy the waters today and put on the statute books a law which cannot possibly be implemented for several years to come. Every student of government knows that one Congress cannot bind another, and that we cannot provide appropriations for our defense purposes for more than a 2-year period. Would it not be better for the Congress to wait until the real need for UMT arises to pass a law to that effect?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It has been said several times today, including in the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] when we were considering the rule, that the reason the UMT section is in this bill is that it probably would not pass if it were brought up any other time.

Mr. SHORT. He let the cat and a lot of little kittens out of the bag.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion on this: If this is a democratic nation, ought anything to pass if the people do not want it passed on the basis of its own merits? Why should anybody want to put something through which it is admitted could not go through when the people are living under normal conditions?

Mr. SHORT. This bill is infinitely better than the bill sent over by the Defense Department. I think the House bill is a much better bill than the Senate bill, with all credit to my able and distinguished chairman, but the conception of this thing was brooded and hatched and born over in the Pentagon. Mr. Marshall admitted he wrote the bill.

Who determines policy if not the elected Representatives of the pepole? The Armed Forces should carry out orders. The trouble is there are too many people in the Pentagon who are trying to play the role of diplomat and statesman. They are determining policy when they ought to be carrying out orders. The policy is established by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I call the attention of the gentleman to page 31, which provides for the continuation after the 26 months of anyone inducted unless he is appointed in the Reserve Corps, for a period of 6 years. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that you had thousands and thousands of the youth of this country at college and in high school who enlisted since the day provided here, June 25, 1950. They enlisted for 4 years in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, or 3 years in the Army.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA. Under this same section you are also taking the youth of draft age for 26 months. What is fair about keeping in the Reserve Corps for another 2 years the youth who left school because they were upset and off balance, and enlisted for 4 years? Can the gentleman answer that? Is it the intention of this bill to do that?

Mr. SHORT. I am afraid I cannot answer that point. Can the chairman answer it?

Mr. O'HARA. May I say to the chairman of the committee that on page 31, in section 3, line 13, it provides that everyone who went into the armed services by draft or enlistment after June 25, 1950, should serve for the period of enlistment, I suppose—it is not provided there—but 26 months, in effect; but then you provide that they continue in the Reserve Corps for a total period of 6 years. These youngsters who enlisted had to enlist for 4 years in some branches of the service and for 3 years in one. Then they have to serve two more years.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. If he has enlisted for 3 years after the twenty-fifth day of June 1950, the total service cannot exceed 6 years.

Mr. O'HARA. When that boy enlisted he made a contract with the Army which said nothing about the Reserve Corps. Is not that true? Why are you going back and changing it?

Mr. VINSON. We are not changing the terms of his contract. He enlisted for 4 years or for 3 years. We are not interfering with that. But Congress comes along after that and says, "When you have finished serving 3 years you will have to serve three additional years in the Reserves." That is consistent and does not interfere at all with his contract.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I consider this legislation not only dangerous but most untimely. It is easier to put on excess weight than it is to take it off. Those of us who are past 50 realize this. So it is with this legislation. It is easier now not to pass laws than it is to take them off the books once they are on.

To adopt this double-barreled program now would be a radical departure from our American system. It violates every tradition of our forefathers.

Certainly we do not want to employ the techniques, the methods, plans of the nations whose dictators we have fought to destroy. Germany, Italy, and Japan had peacetime military conscription and universal military training; but history is replete with instances where every major nation that has followed this scheme has inevitably been led down the road to war and eventually to ruin. Free men can still outproduce and outfight slaves.

In World War II this country raised an armed force of more than 12,000,000 men and women and won the greatest war in history—and we did it without peacetime conscription or universal military training. It must not be forgotten that the United States of America and Great Britain—the world's two great democracies—won against overwhelming odds because their heart was in the fight.

It is significant to note that since VE- and VJ-day our Navy and our Air Force have succeeded in getting, without any great effort, all the volunteers they needed.

It must also be remembered that the Army back in January 1949 stopped drafting men because they, no doubt, figured they had all they needed. They discharged 30,000. We also know that all branches of the armed services have done very little to help the Reserves and National Guard—and that there would be no need for a draft or UMT if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves and made a sincere and earnest effort to build them up.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman—and also the chairman of the committee, if he is on the floor—as to the policy of permitting Reserves who are now in service to go to the officers' candidate schools? If I may use a personal reference—yesterday evening Paul Hoffman, of the ECA, said that his boy was a sergeant in World War II and then went back to school and got his degree and applied for admission to the officers' candidate school and was told then that he was too old under the regulations to be an officer. Will the gentleman please tell me, for the Committee on Armed Services, what the policy is?

Mr. SHORT. That is the military mind speaking. That is the thing we want to guard against in this country.

Mr. FULTON. Could I ask the committee—is that a policy which the committee has set, that if a man has been in World War II and then goes and gets his degree and comes up for admission to the officers' training school, or makes application, he is told he is too old? What is wrong?

Mr. SHORT. No; the Congress or the committee has had nothing to do with such a policy.

Mr. Chairman, could it be possible that the draft law was not invoked and that the organized Reserves and the National Guard were shamefully and almost completely ignored in order to force a compulsory system of peacetime military training and service upon us? The Armed Services cannot escape this responsibility.

Under the pending bill, it is proposed that we in this country draft our young men at an earlier age and compel them to serve a longer period of time than any other member nation of the North Atlantic Pact. Their draft laws are milder than the one we propose to enact. Youths even in Soviet Russia are not called up as young as the United States defense department planners propose.

According to testimony of our own defense establishment the number of men needed for the period January 1951 through June 1952 is 1,382,000. This includes 800,000 able-bodied men in 1–A at the beginning of 1951 plus 200,000 college students to be drafted next summer, plus 851,000 able-bodied men to reach age 19 in this 18-month period. These figures clearly give us a margin of 460,000 men in reserve while the Defense Department considers a margin of only 400,000 in the draft pipe line as essential.

It is clear, I think, to most members of our committee that if the physical and mental standards of the IV–F's or rejectees are lowered; if married, childless men in the 19 to 25 age bracket who have never seen military service; and if administration of the present law is tightened, the required number of men can be secured without having to draft 18-year-olds or without having to take any veterans at all.

It is utterly foolish for us to spend billions of dollars to build up the Armed Forces, increase the numbers of men in the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps unless we furnish them the weapons of war with which to wage a conflict. Men do not like to train with broomsticks and stovepipes. We know that we are short of materials. There is nothing so destructive of morale; which will promote such dissension and griping as to have idle men sitting around without housing and without equipment. We are short of strategic and critical materials. Already in this proposed program we have had more men in the different branches of service than we can take care of; boys twiddling their thumbs with nothing to do—who are discouraged because they want effectively to serve their country.

We had 70,000 at Lackland Base. They do not have uniforms or the weapons, housing or sufficient instructors. It is stupid and selfish for us to rush men into the service until we have weapons and equipment for them.

If we spent one-tenth as much of our effort and money on the achievement of peace, as we do on the problems of war—if we had not demobilized so rapidly—we might have won the peace. Unfortunately, if the military gains control we shall never achieve that objective.

I still believe with Lincoln that right makes might and that all of our faith should not be put in material power. This is diametrically opposite the philosophy of Nietzsche who believed that might makes right. Let us therefore continue in the footsteps of our fathers in the Christian way of living, believing that an idea cannot be shot with a cannon and that ideals cannot be destroyed by an atomic bomb.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday we heard the President of the Republic of France. I want to quote briefly a significant statement that he made:

> For us, indeed, the effort for peace and the effort for defense are not contradictory; they complement each other. With the prudence and firmness dictated by our said experience, we shall never cease to answer negation, procedural obstructionism and popaganda in the langauge of right, of truth, and of sincerity.
>
> Let us not fail to speak clearly, frankly, and firmly. Let us put at the service of peace and freedom, side by side with our material forces as long as those are needed, the invincible moral forces which always animate free people aware of the righteousness of their cause.

Mr. Chairman, on this floor last year, on July 25, 1950, I said:

> There is another quality which is necessary for any country to win in any armed conflict. That is a spiritual quality and a moral force which dictators often overlook or underestimate.
>
> The love of liberty, the devotion to a great and righteous cause, the indomitable spirit of men which believes in the dignity of the human soul and the love of a just and lasting peace. These ethical principles cannot be conquered by the might of materialism. In the beginning of a conflict, brute force may triumph for a while, but the undying faith, the resolute will, the indomitable courage born of Christian idealism will utlimately triumph. These virtues which belong to the United States and western civilization will eventually triumph over the ruthless instincts and barbarous tactics of a godless atheistic communism. We will give Russia and the whole world to understand that much as we might differ among ourselves in a country of free men on domestic issues, we shall ever rise as a united nation and a united people to fight and die to preserve our Republic against all ruthless aggressors.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the gentleman has consumed 1 hour, I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. I will close very shortly.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Some question has arisen in the minds of some as to the attitude of the American Legion with reference to this legislation. I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri the testimony of Commander Cocke at page 395 of the hearings, especially this statement in conclusion of the commander's able remarks regarding this legislation. He said:

> Gentlemen, your committee has stood shoulder to shoulder with the American Legion during our long fight for adoption of UMT. We believe that fight can and must be won this year.

Mr. SHORT. We shall repel all encroachments upon our liberty with all the might we have, but at the same time we shall attempt to prove to the rest of the world that America with her humble spirit and generous heart will do everything to convince all mankind that we are a nation without ambition or desire for territory or indemnity; to win and grant to other people all the blessings of liberty and opportunity that we now possess.

I plead with you Members of this House that we keep America free, because our freedom is our strength. Let us not follow a discredited foreign philosophy that has been tried and failed every time it has been tried; let us make and keep America a land of freemen where every citizen can walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of the magic spell, the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 64 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

(Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, more than 10 years ago I stood in the well of this House and tried to describe the emotional experience of an American liberal who was confronted with the unhappy conviction that conscription of the manhood of America was essential for the national defense. I made public confession then that throughout my thinking life I had feared and distrusted the intrusion of military institutions into the fabric of our democratic society because it seemed to me that the two things were fundamentally incompatible and that if they were forced to endure side by side the military influence might destroy the processes of democracy. In my early life—and, indeed, until very recently—I have opposed and denounced

every suggestion that compulsory military service—outside of wartime—should ever be permitted to exist in my beloved America. I once fondly imagined that peace on earth could be achieved by a resolute application of the doctrines of disarmament and universal friendship to our national and international policies. I was persuaded that the psychology of peace could overwhelm the forces of war in world relationships. The idea that the youth of America could or should be transformed into warriors was utterly abhorrent to me.

But I was confronted then, as I am confronted now, with a spectacle of stark realism in far-away areas of this blood-stained world—a hideous spectacle of ruthless depredation which could only be resisted by military force. So I decided then, as I have decided now, to set aside, temporarily, at least, some of my earlier idealism for the purpose of preserving what is to me the dearest thing on earth—the freedom of the American way of life—and to reestablish throughout the world peace and good will among men.

At that time I voted for the Selective Service Act of 1940, and subsequent world events convinced me that the momentous step which I took on that occasion was necessary and right.

After the surrender of Germany and Japan, I again indulged the hope, which I shared with many millions of people throughout the world, that a just and enduring peace could be established and that war might be avoided in the future, and so I opposed and voted against the Selective Service Act in 1948. But these fond dreams of world tranquillity were soon rudely shattered. Our erstwhile allies in Russia—or rather the little group of cruel men who have seized political control of the Russian people—embarked upon a deliberate program of promoting wars—cold and hot—in widely scattered sections of the world—wars which the Russian Communists cunningly contrived to have fought by the peoples of other nations, while they artfully preserved their own manpower and military resources.

While these diabolical intrigues were in progress, the American people, deluded by political programs of economy, permitted our national defenses to sink to a low level, which encouraged our new-found enemies to plot the overthrow of the American Government. Then come the aggression against South Korea, and the sudden realization by the American people that the policies of disarmament and defenselessness, into which they had been led by political siren songs, could only lead to national disaster and possibly to the extinction of the American way of life.

At this point I think it is appropriate to review the history of our fluctuating national defense policies, during the present century, for the purpose of illustrating how I have arrived at my reluctant conclusion that a program of sustained military strength will be necessary in the future for the protection of the American way of life and the maintenance of world peace.

It has been said that our defenses have been mounted on a political roller coaster which shifted abruptly from peaks of jittery mobilization in periods of national crisis to depths of dangerous weakness in times of fancied calm. Shortly before the outbreak of World War I, in June 1916, we had a total of 179,000 men in our Armed Forces. Under the spur of war this number skyrocketed upward until, by Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, the total had reached 4,282,000. Then the pendulum swung into reverse at a dizzying pace. In less than 2 years after the end of World War I the number of men under arms was back down to 344,000.

The downward trend continued for another 2 years. Then the size of our Armed Forces reached a point of stability which was maintained from 1922 to 1935. The number of men on duty during those years ranged between 243,845 and 270,027. By June 30, 1939, shortly before Hitler invaded Poland, the total climbed to 334,473. When France fell, a year later, our strength was still short of half a million. The exact figure was 458,297 on June 30, 1940.

It was not until the Selective Service Act was passed, on September 16, 1940, that rapid mobilization of military manpower got under way. Even then our progress was far from assured. Continuation of selective service squeezed through by the margin of a single vote the following year, only a few months before Pearl Harbor. When we passed into actual conflict, under conditions of total war, all restraints were dropped. We reached a peak strength of 12,124,418 on May 31, 1945.

After VJ-day we began the familiar process of casting away our strength with breakneck speed. By March 31, 1948, despite the evidences of Soviet duplicity in the United Nations, our strength had sunk to a postwar low of 1,398,726.

The facts of Soviet imperialism forced a new upswing. Selective Service was reactivated and our strength climbed to 1,668,492 on January 31, 1949. Emphasis on budget economies again reversed the trend. The number of men in service slipped off to 1,460,261 on June 30, 1950. Again an acute crisis forced us to swift action. The outbreak of hostilities in Korea started us on the road to a force adequate to provide genuine security. On March 21, of this year General Marshall was able to inform the President that we had more than doubled the force we had when the Communists made their unprovoked attack across the thirty-eighth parallel on June 25, 1950. Our present strength is more than 2,900,000, and our immediate goal is a total of 3,462,000, to be attained as soon as possible after June 30.

The feast-or-famine concept of defense which has marked our past record has been extremely wasteful. It has provided no real security. It has invited disregard by other nations of our peaceful purposes. It encourages the belief among those who conspire to destroy us that we will again relax our vigilance if they delay any overt attack long enough. What is more, the acceptance of the theory that our primary defense must always be our troops actually under arms involves military expenditures of such great magnitude that they might eventually bankrupt our country. Our enemies have openly predicted that our democratic institutions would crumble under the combined impact of a huge standing Military Establishment, with its strong pull toward a militaristic spirit, and the tearing down of our living standards by excessive military costs.

This bill authorizes the creation of a permanent and stable reserve of trained manpower in America through a system of universal military training. I repeat that it was with extreme reluctance that I reached the conclusion that such a drastic departure from the antimilitaristic traditions of our peace-loving America is now necessary. But I am convinced that the present danger to the existence of democratic institutions in every part of the world makes this step imperative.

And I wish to emphasize again my conviction that the future safety of our Nation and of human freedom here and elsewhere in the world depends upon our creation and maintenance of a stable military reserve force of sufficient strength to discourage any enemy attack. This means, of course, the permanent abandonment of the policy of vacillation between extremes of strength and weakness which has characterized our defense programs in the past.

Of great incidental importance is the fact that the estimated cost of the huge reserve force which would be created by the proposed system of universal military training would be far less than the cost of maintaining a much smaller standing army in active regular service. The professional staff of the Armed Services Committee has informed me that the cost of maintaining each man in our Regular Armed Forces is approximately $10,000 per year. They have also informed me that for approximately one-quarter of that per capita cost an equivalent reserve force could be trained and maintained through a system of universal military training.

However, I serve notice here that when the time comes to set up the National Security Training Corps I shall support amendments to this bill, if it is enacted into law, which will insure the continuation without interruption of the education of every youth who is inducted into the corps.

I am confident that overwhelming public sentiment throughout the Nation will compel the adoption of such amendments. The chief and most valid objection to this measure from a social standpoint, aside from the basic opposition to compulsory military service, is that its present provisions would take our American youths out of school during the period of training. In my opinion the American people will not permit this to be done, and I feel sure that before universal military training is put into effect the Congress will adopt legislative provisions to prevent it.

The chairman and other members of the Armed Services Committee will discuss the selective-service provisions of this bill in detail and I shall not consume any time in a repetition of the information which they have placed in the RECORD. We devoted many days to pains-

taking and exhaustive hearings on the whole subject of conscription of manpower, and the bill now under consideration has passed through the crucible of searching inspection by the entire committee.

Mr. Chairman, the dearest thing on earth to me is the freedom of the American way of life. My forefathers and yours fought and died to create the Magna Carta of personal liberties which is the Bill of Rights in the American Constitution. In my humble way, I have always fought to protect civil liberties in America against every threat of impairment or destruction. Sometimes my devotion to the Bill of Rights has made me a target for bitter criticism and denunciation. There have been occasions when the ugly eye of suspicion was directed at me because I did not submit to outbursts of mass hysteria which sought to set aside some of our constitutional guaranties of the rights of individuals. But I shall continue, so long as I live, to fight for the dignity of the individual, for civil liberties, and for the preservation of the American way of life.

It is precisely because I hold these things so dear that I am now persuaded to relinquish for awhile my objections to compulsory military training in America. I am convinced that today America is in danger, perhaps even greater danger than in the days when Lincoln made the world resound with his heroic resolution that the American way of life should not perish from this earth. I am sure that if he were with us today he would exhort us to mobilize all of our resources, material and human, to protect the America we love so well against threats of attack by the foes of democracy.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to compliment the gentleman on a very informative and constructive discussion. I have gone through the same evolution in my thinking as he has gone through in his. I think the world is too explosive, it is too small, for us not today to write into the law of the land a permanent military policy that will give us some security. That is why I am going to vote for this bill exactly as it came out of our committee.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Could the committee tomorrow explain what the provision on segregation, at the bottom of page 53 of the bill, actually means, so that some of us will know what we are voting on?

Mr. VINSON. Before the debate is ended we will endeavor to do that. I doubt whether we can do it tomorrow because the program for addresses has already been set up. However, we will try to give the Committee full information as to what it means.

Mr. FULTON. You will explain the procedure fully so that we can tell as to promotion, training, service, and so forth?

Mr. VINSON. We will try to explain it as best we can. I do not know that I understand it myself, having voted against it. Nevertheless, we will try to advise you as best we can.

Mr. FULTON. I, too, am opposed to segregation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In the committee consideration of universal military training did the committee go into the question of whether or not it will be possible to obtain a sufficiently trained number of men through training facilities in colleges and other schools of various kinds, rather than interrupting their schooling?

Mr. HAVENNER. We have discussed that. In my opinion, it would be possible.

Mr. VINSON. I will say that in the plans that are to be submitted by the commission they can incorporate that type of training, at universities instead of in training camps. In other words, they will lay the whole plan of training before the Congress. Then the Congress passes on it, as to whether or not it meets its views.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The statement has been frequently made that the best time for a boy to get his service usually is when he finishes high school. If the age of induction were set at 18½ years and he finished high school at 18 and he wanted to go in then and get it over with, could he be inducted ahead of 18½, or would he have to enlist and then serve for 3 or 4 years?

Mr. VINSON. The bill permits a boy under universal military training to go in at the age of 17 years with his parents' consent and 18 without his parents' consent; but he will have to go in at 18½ if he is drafted for that purpose.

Mr. JUDD. And if he is inducted ahead of time, it is for the same length of time?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly—6 months.

Mr. JUDD. And it is not for a regular 3- or 4-year enlistment period?

Mr. VINSON. One of the basic differences is that when he is in training he is not in the armed services.

Mr. JUDD. That is right; he is not in the Army.

Mr. VINSON. He is not in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have given considerable thought to that particular provision of the bill. It is my thought that since the boy goes into school at a certain regular age, he may come out of high school at that same relative age and that a great many of them will want to go in at 18 years of age and will not want to wait until they are 18½ years of age, and in that event they will get the obligation out of the way and behind them and be able to go about the regular business of life.

Mr. JUDD. I approve of that in cases where the boy desires to start earlier. But I do not like to take all at 18 years because there are some at the age of 18 years who are not mature enough to go through this kind of experience without a certain amount of character or psychological damage from which they do not always completely recover.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Will the chairman supply us later in the debate with information on extra pay for combat areas? I understand that certain people are being paid extra for combat areas on the World War II basis when this is really Korea.

Mr. VINSON. There is a bill before the committee which was sent up by the Department, but we have not had a chance to get around to it yet. The Department is asking in that bill that extra compensation be given for actual combat service. But that is a separate matter from this altogether.

Mr. FULTON. So that you are including the paying of combat pay for areas that are World War II areas, where there is no actual risk involved? Are you doing that?

Mr. VINSON. The question of combat pay is all embodied in a bill which is pending in the committee, which was sent up by the office of the Secretary of Defense a few weeks ago.

Mr. FULTON. But it will be separate from this?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; that is entirely separate legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Why was the maximum high school age placed at 20 years? Is that both for military service and for the purpose of universal military training. Why was it set at 20 years?

Mr. VINSON. In the law today it is 19 years. A high school student is given a postponement up to his 19th year. The evidence disclosed that a large percentage were in high school after they reached their nineteenth birthday. Therefore we gave them a statutory deferment up to 20 years of age.

Mr. GROSS. What is the average age of graduation from high school?

Mr. VINSON. It is below 20.

Mr. GROSS. At what point below 20?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. It is under 17 at the present. These figures will give you the percentage of the 500,000 that graduate from the high schools. At 17 you have 16.5 percent. At 18 to 19, 32.9 percent; and at 19 to 20, 14 percent; and above 20, around 4 percent. So you get all of them graduating from high school, except 4 percent, up to 20 years of age. The total is 500,000.

Mr. GROSS. Does that not put a premium on the boy who flunks in high school and does not that defer him an-

other year because a heavier percentage graduates between 18 and 19 years of age?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I think it might be stated to the gentleman from Iowa that the principal reason for raising that age limit to 20 is that some boys may have been held back in school for physical disabilities or for other reasons, and it was to take care of those boys principally that there was a change in the age.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think there has been some misinformation given to the committee. The present law provides for the deferment of high school students up to the age of 20 years. This bill does not change the treatment of high school students in any respect whatsoever.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to clear up for the record a reply made a moment ago by the chairman of the committee in answer to my inquiry. He said that those taken in for universal military training at their own choice at the age of 17 or 18 or before they reached 18½ years of age could serve their 6 months and discharge the obligation. I should like to know whether that same provision applies to those who would be called up under the draft portion of this bill for 26 months of military service.

Mr. BROOKS. Subsection 2 describes specifically that any person between the ages of 18 and 26 shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction in the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service, prescribed in subsection (b).

Mr. JUDD. That also applies down to 17, if he has the consent of his parents?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, for the service.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you.

[Mr. COLE of New York addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am going to address myself to one particular phase of this legislation and try to bring out that particular point.

This bill, of course, concerns universal military service and training. Of course the draft law, which must be extended, in my opinion, is only one phase of this bill, as has been so fully discussed. I am concerned basically, however, with universal military training. I am most concerned because, having gone through all of the hearings in the Senate and the House and then going back to the Compton report, I have been amazed to find that nowhere has there been a discussion of what universal military training consists of. I wanted to know what the curriculum was. I wanted to know just what the military had in mind as far as what this training consisted of.

In this particular bill it is very interesting to note that none of us is actually deciding on my program of universal military training. We are actually discussing the structure that will be set up. No more.

I am reading from page 15 of the committee report where this statement is made:

> In order to assure the establishment of a truly military training program for the members of the National Security Training Corps the Commission must submit its plan for such a program to the Congress, to be referred to the Armed Services Committee of both Houses.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that it is going to be all right. The bill stipulates specifically a truly military program which was endorsed by the committee. Of course a training program of a military nature will change and will develop from time to time and year to year. The training program which we had, for instance, in World War I was considerably different from the training program in World War II; and I would suppose, naturally, that any training program would be modernized from time to time. But regardless of that fact the program is going to be presented to the Congress for its approval and its endorsement under the provisions of the bill, and I think will give the gentleman in total what he had in mind.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that, I may say to the gentleman from Louisiana, but I think it is quite important that the committee should have gone into a consideration and a study of what has been the military training programs for a period of years and in particular they should have considered what the military might have in mind as far as training programs are concerned. In going back to the Compton report I would hardly think that the system advocated there which is little more than national education with maybe a little bit of military training, is what we are interested in; and as I proceed with my discussion here I am going to try to point out why I think it is particularly important that the committee should have gone into the actual technical phases of military training, because a lot of these problems I am convinced that face us or seem to face us might be solved if a real analysis had been made of what military training consists of.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was somewhat disturbed by the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] when he said that one reason for the need for universal military training as provided in this bill was due to the fact that the Army took these draftees raw and sent them into combat duty. If that be the case we certainly need some change in the policies of the Army. I understand this bill seeks to correct that by requiring at least 4 months of training by the Army of the draftees under the Draft Act. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is my understanding. But there is no understanding of what that training is, nor did the committee go into that phase of it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has it been the policy of the Army right along to send men in raw without any training?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They certainly did it in World War II, with practically none; and we saw this example at this Lackland Base—of course, that was the Air Force down in Texas—where they got no training at all under that so-called training program.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I think it is fair to say that the bill stipulates that they shall not be sent into combat service for 6 months, not 4.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; but nowhere, Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the hearings is there any discussion of what universal military training is. That is the point, and I would like to get on with my discussion so I can emphasize the importance of it, having considered that phase of this legislation.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, the universal military training program does not begin until after the universal service program is completed.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. ELSTON. So there is not any universal military program and there will not be until this emergency is over and there is no longer any need of these men 18½ to 19. Only then will they begin the universal military training program.

I think the argument the gentleman from Missouri is making is an exceptionally good one, stressing the need for separating training from service. When the time comes to vote on universal military training then the Congress would be in much better position to determine whether or not it was advisable than they are at this time when they do not know what the situation will be when they set it up.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with him exactly. That is a point I want to bring out.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wonder if the gentleman would mind telling us whether he favors a program of universal military training or not? If he does, it is simply a question of the type of program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; it is not, and I think I will be able to bring that out as I go along. I favor a type of program.

Mr. COLE of New York. My question is whether the gentleman favors the principle of universal military training?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is the whole crux of the matter. What is military training? I think I can bring this out if the gentleman will bear with me. My talk will bring out exactly what he is referring to. May I go ahead a while, and then I will be glad to yield.

My interest in this particular subject of what universal military training consists of, and it is sometimes referred to as basic military training, led me to quite a bit of research. I went to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to find out what had been written on the subject of universal military training, or what I refer to as military training or basic training, and I was surprised to get the answer back that there was no particular article on the subject nor was there any specific information on the subject. So I went back to them again and asked them to send me what pieces of information they had. Among other things I received an unpublished report in regard to the training program set up at Fort Knox. I was quite interested in that report, particularly as it was unpublished, and the unfavorable aspects of that particular program that were brought out. But essentially I did get some information from the Air Force, the Navy, and the Army.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. They do not draft in those three services. Would the gentleman tell the committee how long he thinks a man ought to train so that he would have fundamental knowledge sufficient to take care of himself, whether it be 1 month, 6 months, or 12 at the most?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I say, sir, that although I served approximately 4 years in our armed forces I am not qualified on that subject. But I will say that when you have combat troops, obviously any man going into combat must have training. I am going to get to that point and in order to forestall some of these interruptions perhaps I best make the remark that the distinction I am trying to draw is between combat and noncombat duty in uniform.

We are talking essentially about combat training, yet 90 percent, some even say 95 percent although others say as low as 80 percent, of the people in uniform in the Armed Forces are in noncombat work. They are technicians. The crux is this: Is a military organization the one best suited to train men in these techniques, the civilian technical fields, because all those particular military subjects have their civilian counterparts? When you talk about universal military training, let us separate the two types of training. One is combat training, which is only a relatively small portion of the boys in uniform and actually the problem of training men for combat is relatively simple. The handling of the combat question is relatively simple when we compare it with the bigger portion of those who are in uniform, those who have been in our technical services. I particularly want to bring out, as was brought out in one of these reports, the situation in regard to the Seabees, for example.

The Seabees are a technical corps. It is very interesting to me to note that they did not follow the usual system of draft selection, nor were those men just brought in under the usual Navy system of everybody coming in as an apprentice seaman, then working their way up the ladder. Those men were given ratings and ranks based upon their experience in civilian life. You found many of those men who worked there were not physically suited under military standards to serve in the Armed Forces. A man would come out of civilian life and if he operated a bulldozer he would be given a second-class rating in the Seabees and would go right to work.

You do not need this sort of training if you talk about basic military training for the men who are going into the technical services. As a matter of fact, the burden of my argument is the best way to train those men would be through our civilian enterprises under a system, if you please, of reserve forces such as former Secretary Forrestal suggested.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. What would the gentleman think about this, that in order to maintain discipline for men who are going to be billeted together, and so forth, it is a good thing that they have some sort of basic training in the manual of arms and all the rest of it, even though what they do from then on is going to be a civilian job for the most part, like driving a tractor or pounding a typewriter?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Well, I do not agree with that; I do not think it is necessary, and I think I will again refer to the Seabees as an example. Of course, I was in a maintenance unit myself, and men worked together like they work in any garage or factory. Of course, mine was aviation, but in a hangar, where there are technicians, they do not need that. As a matter of fact, that sort of interferes with their work, I might add. They will have plenty of discipline from one angle, the same discipline you have in any plant in the United States, and that is the desire of the American men to do the job, and a good job.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Would the gentleman put the civilians who would do the seabee work in the same category as the seabees?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTE. And would they go to the places where the seabees are used?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, and you had that same condition in this last war where you had men from the aviation companies right out on the front lines.

Mr. CLEMENTE. They went there of their own volition, did they not?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Well, I am not going into that phase of it. Of course, there is some distinction. This is not a new idea. Germany operated on a system of classifying their men as one, two or three men—I do not know how many classifications they had. I am talking from a physical standpoint, which has no relation to a job analysis of what those men did in the armed forces.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The Germans had about 12 classifications, but they were almost entirely based on physical fitness and physical ability.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But they were also based on this. Once you had physical fitness, they were put in billets or jobs that they could properly function in and they did not have to know the manual of arms or the military basic training. As a matter of fact, the men would do better if you trained them in what you wanted them trained in.

Mr. BROOKS. They proceeded on the theory that everyone owed an obligation to the country.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly, and I agree with that.

Mr. BROOKS. I fully agree with that, too, but as I understand the gentleman's perplexity is not in favoring the bill. He favors the bill, but he is uncertain as to the type of training, satisfactory training, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I do not favor the bill because I do not believe the bill has been properly considered. The committee did not even go into the subject I am discussing; in other words, a job analysis of what the people in the Armed Forces do.

Now, let us take the four categories we have in our own society when we have a war or an emergency. We have people in defense industries, and they are civilians. We have people in the civil service who are hired by the Armed Forces. They are civilians and they are not in uniform. Then we have the people who are doing technical work, very similar, I might add, to the first two categories, who, for some reason or other, are put in uniform. They are the noncombatants that I am referring to. And finally, you have your combatant troops.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I do not recall in my experience—and I have been on the committee for more than 12 years—the Congress ever attempting to write a training program for the Armed Forces. That is what puzzles me.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not advocating that. I am saying that the Congress should study what is in the military mind, and the Congress should make a job analysis of what these people are doing because only then can they write an intelligent training or educational program and set it up.

Mr. DURHAM. To my knowledge the old Committee on Military Affairs traveled for months and from camp to camp to analyze all of the training programs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But it does not show in these reports, sir. All I am going on is the hearings and the reports.

Mr. DURHAM. You can find all types of reports of the training programs in the early days, even in the Louisiana maneuvers of 1939 and 1940.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that. In closing I make my basing point, and that is this, that there is a real distinction between your combat troops and your noncombat troops, and the same problem we are faced with when it comes to the physical standards of the combat troops and the physical standards now set up by the Armed Forces is brought up in that particular manner. If you have a different classification for physical standards on the basis of what a man was going to do, you would solve a great deal of this IV–F problem.

Further, in getting into your training, and here is the crux of the matter, is it better for the civilian schools, the various trade schools, the formal schools, the schools operated by our factories, and the school of hard knocks, to be training our technicians for the jobs they might be called upon to do if we were at war, or is it better for the Armed Forces to train those technicians? I might add, another problem that would be solved, because this is thrown up every time we talk about lowering physical standards, is that it might well be if we did this job analysis that when we came to consider veterans' problems we would not be confronted with the problems we are, because if veteran privileges and the medals and the honors went to the combat troops, where they belong, and nowhere else, you would not have this mass of veterans on your shoulders.

I think there is another point where this same analysis that I am trying to make bears fruit. That is why I say that I am against this present bill, in joining together the service and the training, because the service is an immediate thing, and we have to do something about it, and the training is another matter that I do not believe has been gone into fully. I think we should give a great deal more consideration to it, and we should decide one basic matter: Is the military organization best set up to train our combat troops, which I believe it is, or is it best set up to train our noncombat troops, which I believe it is not? I think that if you have a joining of the two you will end up without having combat troops properly trained and you will not have the noncombat troops properly trained, either.

I urge that the bill be separated. I know there will be a bill proposed along that line. I urge that the training features of the bill be referred back to the committee for further and thorough study.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman the sincerity of his position, but in absolute fairness to his proposal I want to point out to him that there is no proposal, I think, that has been studied more carefully, more thoroughly, and over a longer period of time than has been the universal military training proposal.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that, and I compliment the committee.

Mr. BROOKS. I have sat in committees over periods of months, and I have read tens of thousands of pages of hearings on this subject covering all types of proposals for training and other phases of this program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that. I want to say here and now that I have high respect for the work done by this committee. All I am trying to do is point out some thinking that I do not believe has been considered. It certainly has not been in the hearings, and there are some 800 pages of them that I have read. But that has not been considered, and that is what I am urging.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

(Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, as an advocate of universal military training for many years past, I am delighted to know we now have the privilege of voting for a measure embodying this much needed and too long delayed type of service. The bill now before the House, S. 1 as amended, has been referred to as a one-package bill. In view of the present emergency, this type of legislation seems desirable. Of course, the universal military training provisions of the bill will not be effective now. The most-needed feature of the pending bill is the one relating to extension of the Selective Service Act so as to include younger men. I am in favor of the enactment of the pending measure as is; but, of course, I am anxious to hear the debates in full so that I may determine what needed and helpful amendments may be desirable.

It is my purpose to offer an amendmen to the bill. On page 36 thereof at line 17 after the word "Corps" and before the word "Subject", change the period to a comma and insert "including the suppression of vice, gambling, and the sale, furnishing or possession of alcolholic beverages containing over one-half of one percent of alcohol by volume upon or in close proximity to any place or institution to which members of the National Security Training Corps may be assigned for training."

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that this amendment or something similar thereto be written into the measure, for we will be entrusting to the care of the National Security Training Commission thousands of our young American sons. It is, of course, of great concern to all of us here that these boys be given proper care. In this respect, Mr. Chairman, I feel that, unless we write into this bill the specific provisions of the amendment I am proposing, the members of the Commission will have great difficulty in curbing vice, gambling, and drinking in places close to stations and institutions engaged in training members of the National Security Training Corps. It is with a deep sense of urgency that I now appeal to the distinguished Members of this House to take advantage of this opportunity to insure the well-being of the young men about to be called to defend us all. Just as it is their duty to answer the call to arms in order to protect the freedom of this great Nation, it is in like manner our duty to see to it that every precaution is taken to protect them. That there is need for protecting the freedoms of this Nation cannot be denied; neither can it be denied that there is need for protecting the character of the young men who will protect those freedoms.

Mr. Chairman, today one can hardly glance at a newspaper or magazine without seeing full-page advertisements of alcoholic beverages. Television, radio, billboards, and almost every other medium of advertising color the various types of alcoholic beverages with great attractiveness and appeal, constantly seeking to expand the market of alcohol consumers. Under the provisions of this bill large numbers of our youth will be brought together as concentrated targets for those who would corrupt them with alcohol, gambling, and vice.

Young men taken away from the influence and guidance of their parents and projected into military service deserve a wholesome environment in which to live and train. Without the restraint of their parents there will be a tendency for these young men to escape from their routine of regimentation by succumbing to the temptations put before them by money-hungry vendors of vice.

It has long been recognized that men of this particular age are highly impressionable, Mr. Chairman. Their surroundings during these few years will play a great part in shaping their moral character; their entire lives will be influenced by the conditions which confront them during this vital period of their lives. If we allow gambling, vice, and liquor to contaminate the areas in which our young men live, a large number of them will suffer irreparable damage spiritually and morally. We owe the parents of these young men the tangible assurance that this amendment will offer; they should know that every effort is being made to give their sons the proper atmosphere in which to develop.

Conscious of the vice and corruption that has inevitably grown up around armed services installations in the past, the parents of the boys who will be affected by this bill want to know that gambling, vice, and the use of strong alcoholic beverages in and around military training installations will not be tolerated. Experiences of World War II are too fresh in the minds of many Americans to warrant anything less than the provisions of this amendment.

Today drinking has been made to look highly attractive to the youth of our country, Mr. Chairman. Every day large numbers of the youth of America are taking that first drink, and for many of them this is only the first step toward broken, shameful lives of alcoholism. It is well known that there is a direct connection between alcoholism and crimes of nearly every sort. The noted Dr. David B. Rotman, director of the Psy-

chiatric Institute, Municipal Court of Chicago, has stated that for the 10-year period of from 1936–46, of all cases referred to his laboratory, alcoholism led all others as a diagnostic group. Specifically, 7,184 out of 29,756 cases fell into the category of alcoholism. Think of it; nearly 24 percent of all cases fell into the category of alcoholism. The tragedy of it all is the fact that every year more and more young people start down this road of degradation, hardly aware of the serious consequences that face them.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the distinguished Members of this House share with me the hope that the young men who serve in the National Security Training Corps will return from their service as good, responsible citizens, ready to take their rightful places in civilian life. If any change in their character takes place while they are in training, we certainly do not want it to be for the worse. We do not want any of these boys to return as alcoholics and criminals destined to spend much of their lives in mental and penal institutions, suffering the heartaches of broken homes.

The court records of this country attest to the close tie-in between alcoholic beverages and vice, gambling, and all other forms of corruption and crime, Mr. Chairman. It is my contention that one of the best ways in which to further the moral and spiritual growth of the young men affected by this bill is to reduce the accessibility of alcoholic beverages in areas surrounding them. By doing this, it naturally follows that their chances of falling into the ways of vice and gambling will be reduced automatically, and we will have a stronger, healthier, more effective fighting force made up of wholesome young men who will be proud to return to their homes just as good and just as clean as they were when they left.

If we fail to provide every possible means of promoting better moral surroundings for these boys, we will be responsible for the degradation into which many of them will fall. Mr. Chairman, I say that if we fail to enact the provisions of this amendment into law we will be guilty of criminal neglect. It is our moral obligation to provide for the suppression of vice, gambling, and the use of alcoholic beverages in places which will be frequented by the young men of the National Security Training Corps.

I maintain that the very forces making the adoption of this bill necessary make it imperative that we try to build as strong a force as possible within the limits of our ability; and any measure which will foster the development and preservation of character and the moral and spiritual growth of the young men we propose to train will contribute greatly to the strength and effectiveness of our military forces. Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere belief that such will be the effect of this amendment; therefore, I urge that it be considered and adopted by this House.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time this afternoon. Therefore, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

## INFLATION

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today the American wage earner and every other individual who must live upon a fixed income is caught in the cruel vise of relentless inflationary forces. The American taxpayer is a victim of the same circumstances. He is being called on to pay rearmament costs that have risen more than 50 percent since the beginning of our immediate mobilization effort.

It has become common custom in the past few years to seek a scapegoat for every hardship, for every discomfort which we are called upon to bear. The elected victim at this moment of high prices appears to be the American farmer. A large segment of our national press, particularly that with little rural circulation, is in the midst of an apparently concentrated attack on American farm prosperity. This irresponsible thinking has been echoed too often even in the Halls of Congress.

It is true that many food prices have recently risen out of proportion to other price increases. Naturally these disproportionate prices should be curtailed if we are to have any price stabilization. We cannot destroy a fair price system for farm products, however, if we are to preserve and to continue to develop a prosperous farm economy.

At a time when corporation profits have mounted to an all-time record, when the national income is at its highest level, farm income in the country has been dropping regularly since 1946. According to the Bureau of Agriculture Economics, the net national farm income was seventeen and eight-tenths billion in 1947; sixteen and five-tenths billion in 1948; fourteen and one-tenth billion in 1949; and thirteen billion in 1950. With total national income ranging upward well beyond $200,000,000,000, the farmers' share has been regularly decreasing. The farm population is about 18 percent of our national population. Last year initial estimates indicate that farmers received only 6 percent of our total national income.

In 1949 the average income for the worker in American industry was $2,900. During the same year the income of the average farm worker was $1,600. Income per person on American farms was 61 percent of the nonfarm average in 1947, 58 percent in 1948, and, as I indicated above, barely more than 50 percent in 1949. When the 1950 figures are available, it is likely that the ratio will drop well below 50 percent.

The immediate target of this antifarm element raising its voice so loudly today appears to be the system of parity price supports, which stands as a landmark in American farm progress. Parity is in actuality the farmers' equivalent of a minimum wage. It should not be taken as an indication of what a fair price for farm products should be, any more than 75 cents per hour should be accepted as a fair figure for the wage of labor.

Many arguments are being renewed in opposition to parity, while new ones are being devised.

One of the most illogical which has been recently raised is that which asserts that parity should be down-graded to allow for the increased productivity of our farms as contrasted with the 1910–14 historic base period for parity. This is a vicious argument, completely contrary to every American concept of higher returns and better standards as a reward for increased efficiency in any type of business. The cornerstone of our free-enterprise system is the incentive to better reward through more efficient methods of production and distribution. Shall we deny any laborer the reward for increasing his individual productivity? Such a step would be the rankest kind of regimentation.

In the period 1910–14 the national average for corn production was 26 bushels. Today the average is 37.6 bushels. The average price of corn in the base period was 65 cents a bushel. The parity price today is $1.71. Parity is determined by the comparison of the cost of what the farmer buys now with what he paid in the base period. The current parity index is 266 percent of the base period.

In that base period a man employed in common labor worked from 60 to 72 hours a week and made from $1 to $2 a day, while skilled laborers—carpenters, bricklayers, and other artisans—earned as much as $4 and $5 a day.

Since that time productivity of labor has increased with the advent of devices and machines permitting greater output per man-hour, with greater skill on the part of the worker himself. Work hours have been shortened. Wage scales have gone up as the workers shared the benefits of more efficient production.

That is as it should be. By the same reasoning, the farmer who increases his mechanical know-how, who finds better seed and grows greater crops, should profit. If a farmer who gets 266 percent of his 1910–14 price is getting too much, what of the laborer who worked 10 hours to earn $2 in that period, but who now, by Federal mandate, gets a minimum of 75 cents an hour for the first 8 hours and time and a half for overtime? Should he be cut back to 266 percent of the 20 cents an hour which was the scale in 1910–14? This would be 53 cents an hour.

On the same basis, the skilled workers who made 40 to 50 cents an hour in the 1910–14 period would be held to $1.06 to $1.33 an hour, instead of present pay

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 5, 1951
For actions of Apr. 4, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 60

CONTENTS

Dairy industry.....8
Foreign affairs, aid....10
Grain.....10
Inflation.....13
Labor, farm.....3
Lands, reclamation.....5
Livestock and meats.....6
Machinery, farm.....7
Military training.....2
Minerals.....12
Natural resources.....9
Peanuts.....1
Prices, farm.....4
Taxation.....6,12,13
Trade, foreign.....12
Water, utilization.....11

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to Senate amendment to peanut-quota bill. Ready for President. Senate committee voted to report farm-labor bill. House debated military-training bill. Sen. Langer submitted resolution to investigate farm-machinery situation.

## HOUSE

1. PEANUTS. Agreed to the Senate amendment to H. R. 2615, to amend the law regarding acreage allotments and marketing quotas for peanuts (pp. 3396-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Rep. Cooley said: "The effect of the amendment is to decrease by about 50 percent the peanut-acreage allotment which had been authorized in the House bill...the bill had two purposes: First, to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to liberalize acreage in the Virginia-North Carolina area where the edible peanut is grown, so that the acreage might be increased as much as might be necessary to meet the consumer demands; and, second, to correct an inequity in Alabama and Texas which resulted from a bill which we passed in 1949." Rep. Rankin said he would not object, since the bill "is a little improvement over the hideous law we now have."

2. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military training and service bill (pp. 3397-420).

## SENATE

3. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 984, to authorize the Government to carry out its part of the agreement reached with Mexico with respect to importation of foreign agricultural labor (p. D247).

4. FARM PRICES. Sen. Langer inserted a letter from P. T. Beardsley defending the parity principle in connection with farm prices (p. 3352).

5. RECLAMATION. Sen. Bennett commended the work of Sen. Watkins in fostering the irrigation and reclamation program in Utah (pp. 3352-3).

6. MEAT TAXES. Sen. Butler, Nebr., criticized a recent proposal that meat be taxed as a luxury item, saying that meat is a necessity and that taxing it would be "nonsense" (p. 3394).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

7. FARM MACHINERY. S. Res. 122, by Sen. Langer, to direct the Agriculture and Forestry Committee to investigate "the present high cost of farm machinery, tools, and equipment and the causes therefor"; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Sen. Langer inserted a letter on this subject from a farmer in N. Dak. (pp. 3351-2.)

8. ICE CREAM DAY. H. R. 3517, by Rep. Fallon, Md., designating June 15, 1951, as National Ice Cream Day; to Judiciary Committee (p. 3425).

## ITEMS IN APPENDIX

9. NATURAL RESOURCES. Rep. Hope, Kans., inserted E. H. Taylor's (associate editor, Country Gentleman) speech discussing "our lack of a sound national policy for the conservation of our renewable natural resources" (pp. A1852-3).

10. INDIA AID. Rep. Celler, N. Y., inserted a New Leader magazine article favoring shipment of wheat to India (pp. A1859-60).

11. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Rep. Van Zandt, Pa., inserted his radio address opposing this project (pp. A1839-40).

Sen. Green inserted a Christian Science Monitor editorial favoring the project (pp. A1842-3).

12. COPPER IMPORTS. Rep. Patterson, Conn., inserted a Mining Association of Mont. news letter favoring repeal of the import tax on copper (p. A1841).

13. INFLATION. Rep. Patterson inserted a Harper's magazine article discussing the effect of taxation on inflation (pp. A1843-4).

Rep. Lanham, Ga., inserted a Christian Science Monitor editorial, "Free-wheeling Down Inflation Hill" (p. A1859).

oOo

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for Apr. 5: Jt. Committee on Defense Production (Harrison to testify); Agriculture-Interior-Commerce subcommittee, weather control; S. Finance, trade agreements; S. Small Business, rubber situation; S. Appropriations, independent offices (ex.); S. Appropriations, Treasury-Post Office and Labor-Federal Security (ex.); H. Appropriations, civil functions and Commerce (ex.); H. Foreign Affairs, deny aid to countries exporting materials to Russia (ex.); H. Post Office, to adjust postal rates; H. Public Works, St. Lawrence seaway; H. Ways and Means, revenue revision (ex.).

oOo

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105 Adm.

- oOo -

acreage allotment for 1952 and any subsequent year among the counties in the State on the basis of the past acreage of peanuts harvested for nuts (excluding acreage in excess of farm allotments) in the county during the 5 years immediately preceding the year in which such apportionment is made, with such adjustments as are deemed necessary for abnormal conditions affecting acreage, for trends in acreage, and for additional allotments for types of peanuts in short supply under the provisions of subsection (c). The county acreage allotment shall be apportioned among farms on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (d) of this section.

"'(f) Not more than 1 percent of the national acreage allotment shall be apportioned among farms on which peanuts are to be produced during the calendar year for which the allotment is made but on which peanuts were not produced during any one of the past 3 years, on the basis of the following: Past peanut-producing experience by the producers; land, labor, and equipment available for the production of peanuts; crop-rotation practices; and soil and other physical factors affecting the production of peanuts.

"'(g) Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms under the provisions of this section on which peanuts will not be produced and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments, in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of peanuts, crop-rotation practices, and soil and other physical factors affecting the production of peanuts. Any transfer of allotments under this provision shall not operate to reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is transferred, except as the farm becomes ineligible for an allotment by failure to produce peanuts during a 3-year period, and any such transfer shall not operate to increase the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm to which the acreage is transferred: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, any part of any farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein.

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the allotment determined or which would have been determined for any land which is removed from agricultural production in 1950 or any subsequent year for any purpose because of acquisition by any Federal, State, or other agency having a right of eminent domain shall be placed in a pool and shall be available for use in providing equitable allotments for farms owned or acquired by owners displaced because of acquisition of their farms by such agencies. Upon application to the county committee, within 5 years from the date of such acquisition of the farm, any owner so displaced shall be entitled to have an allotment for any other farm owned or acquired by him equal to an allotment which would have been determined for such other farm plus the allotment which would have been determined for the farm so acquired: *Provided*, That such allotment shall not exceed 50 percent of the acreage of cropland on the farm.

"'The provisions of this section shall not be applicable if (a) there is any marketing quota penalty due with respect to the marketing of peanuts from the farm acquired by the Federal, State, or other agency or by the owner of the farm; (b) any peanuts produced on such farm have not been accounted for as required by the Secretary; or (c) the allotment next established for the farm acquired by the Federal, State, or other agency would have been reduced because of false or improper identification of peanuts produced on or marketed from such farm.'

"SEC. 2. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"1. Subsection (a) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no refund of any penalty shall be made because of peanuts kept on the farm for seed or for home consumption.'

"2. Subsection (g) is amended by (1) adding after '1947' in the first sentence the words 'or 1948, if no peanuts were harvested on the farm in 1947,' (2) striking out after the word 'That,' where it first appears in the proviso, the following words: 'for the 1950 crop,' and (3) by inserting the following new sentences after the fifth sentence: 'As an alternative to designated agencies paying the prevailing oil value for such excess peanuts of any type in insufficient supply and the subsequent distribution of sales proceeds therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may also authorize peanut buyers approved pursuant to regulations of the Secretary to purchase such peanuts from producers at prices not less than those at which such peanuts may be sold for cleaning and shelling by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In the event of such authorization by the Secretary, producers shall have the option of either delivering such peanuts to designated agencies or selling such peanuts to approved peanut buyers, and such sales to approved buyers shall have the same effect, with respect to avoidance of the marketing penalty and classification of producers as cooperators, as deliveries to designated agencies.'

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 363 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'Any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm marketing quota may, within 15 days after mailing to him of notice as provided in section 362, have such quota reviewed by a local review committee composed of three farmers from the same or nearby counties appointed by the Secretary.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain what the amendment is?

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of the amendment is to decrease by about 50 percent the peanut-acreage allotment which had been authorized in the House bill. I am sure the gentleman will recall that the bill had two purposes: First, to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to liberalize acreage in the Virginia-North Carolina area where the edible peanut is grown, so that the acreage might be increased as much as might be necessary to meet the consumer demands; and, second, to correct an inequity in Alabama and Texas which resulted from a bill which we passed in 1949.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand there is general agreement among the committee members and that this is acceptable.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to this request, for the simple reason that the bill as now presented to us is a little improvement over the hideous law we now have. But it all goes in the wrong direction. This regimentation of the American farmers is heading toward the same kind of regimentation suffered by the people behind the iron curtain. I sincerely hope that the committee will soon bring out a bill to repeal this whole program and restore the freedom of the American farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

(Mr. BARDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very kind and generous consideration given me by my good friend, Chairman VINSON of Georgia. I do not have to state here my affection, and respect for and my confidence in that gentleman. I like to deal with him. Occasionally I am indiscreet enough to disagree with him.

You know, my good friend occupies the same position in this legislative body that the Sherman tank occupies in Army ordnance—he just comes through the door, cranks up and rolls on. That is the result of years of fine service and the confidence of the House in his actions. But, as I say, I find myself at this time in disagreement with him concerning the pending bill.

There is a little matter that my friend referred to on yesterday. I would not accuse him of attempting to leave the wrong impression. But the manner in which he dealt with it, I fear, might have left the wrong impression. I interrupted the gentleman on the floor, and as soon as I had said as much as he thought I should have said, he brushed me off by saying, "Yes, I heard the gentleman in 1948, and he is of the same opinion." What the gentleman intended to convey was that my normal position is opposed to draft acts.

In 1940 the gentleman brought a draft bill to the floor. My vote was "yea." In 1941 the gentleman brought a draft

bill to the floor. My vote was "yea." In 1945 the gentleman brought another bill to the floor and my vote was "yea."

In 1948 the next bill came to the floor. In 1948 the gentleman brought a bill to the floor and my vote was "Nay." My vote was based on the ground that it was not necessary, and immediately following the passage of that bill the War Department suspended inductions and never used it any more, which absolutely justified my vote. In 1950 the gentleman brought a bill to the floor and my vote was "yea." So I am afraid the gentleman unintentionally intended to leave the impression that probably I had wavered in my support of measures that dealt with the safety and protection of this Nation.

I do not pose as an arm-chair general or admiral. That is the nickname that is applied generally to any man who dares to differ with those in military authority. I am perfectly willing for the military to conduct their campaigns, to run the military. That is their business. That is what we pay them for. I do not know how to run a campaign. I do not know how to operate an army. But, I have been in civil government for over 30 years, and this is the second legislative body that I have served in, and in that department I do not bow to generals or to admirals, and I have no hesitancy in saying that I know more about the civil government than they will ever know. I do not distrust them so long as the legislative body is performing their proper function, but remember this, gentlemen, men that are worth anything, men that get anywhere, are ambitious men, and a general would not be a general if he were not an ambitious man; he would probably be a private. So, we have our Government divided into the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. For what purpose? To keep our ship of state in balance, and we know how we shudder when any two of those departments begin to get close to merging. So I only fear the military chiefs when we ourselves permit them to invade and go into a field in which they are not well-versed and not qualified to be trusted with the internal workings of the Government.

I went before the Committee on Armed Services. I spent approximatey an hour and a quarter there—I do not know, some lengthy time. The chairman was very kind to me. I went there because I was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I did not know of anything that made any greater contribution to America and to America's way of life, to its productivity and to making it the greatest nation on the face of this earth, than our colleges, junior colleges, and our school system. I thought there was where the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor should be, and I did my best.

I attacked the first bill the War Department sent over here. If I have ever seen a horrible bill, of which they themselves should be ashamed, it was that bill. I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and his great committee on literally tearing it to smithereens. You put some very fine improvements in the bill that you have up for consideration now, because up until that moment the War Department had said, "Away with the colleges and the schools and the institutions of this country; the military is what we are concerned with."

I say to you today that when America should begin to shudder is when you begin to subordinate your economic, your educational, and your social life in America to the military. We have fortunately always been able to coordinate and carry the military along with our civil government. However, as ambitious men, as generals so often are, they are not content with going along. They want to lead. They want you to follow.

I do not want to be unkind to a single one of them. I have some very fine friends, very close personal friends, that are high military officials. I know them, I respect them, I have associated with them. There is not a man in this House who, if you had been exposed to the same environment and in command of the same type of camps, and in absolute command, if you please, would not before long begin to arrive at the point where you would believe that you were very properly in absolute command, and that the only thing necessary would be to extend the jurisdiction so you could run the whole works. That is confidence in one's self, and self-confidence is a necessary ingredient of a successful and respectable man, be he general or private citizen.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. How many of the gentleman's friends of the military could be elected to Congress?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know, I will say to the gentleman. There are probably some of them that are better qualified than I, but they would have to change some of their ways of politicking. They are probably very capable, but I am afraid the first order they would issue might not be fully obeyed.

Where are we at this time? We are in a horrible war. You can call it a police action, you can call it what you please, but when 60,000 American boys are being killed and wounded it is no police action, in my book. It is a war.

I have no hesitancy in making this statement, that a war of that proportions is not properly in existence unless the United States Congress has declared war.

If you do not believe the American people think that way, go down and have a little chat with them. I listen to the radio. I know the responsibility which rests on my shoulders, and that responsibility rests equally upon every one of you. Here we sit today and the American people feel that the responsibility is on our shoulders for the conduct of this war. What do we know about it? You are as ignorant of the whole operation as I am. You do not know where they are going and where they are going to stop. You do not even know who is commander in chief, whether it is Dean Acheson or General MacArthur. So far as I am concerned, as long as I am dealing with legislation which affects the American people and my constituency, to the extent that this legislation affects them, for in effect we are measuring out their blood by the gallon, I am not going to flinch from an expression of my honest and sincere opinion on this matter. I do not care whether they put my name in some kind of a black book, or what they do, but I know one thing, my people will welcome me back home if it gets too hot for me here, and after all they are the ones I am most concerned about.

Now we are fixing to pass some legislation to deal with this war. And what do we do? In the midst of war with everything geared so that the atmosphere is tense, we are not thinking along peaceful lines as we normally would if this world and this country were at peace, but we are presented with a Draft Act. I must say that it is necessary to continue the Draft Act. It is perfectly proper, and every man and woman in the House of Representatives knows that it is necessary to continue the Draft Act. Everyone knows it is necessary to have it now and everyone in the House knows that to tie in this UMT bill will not help the present situation for it will not go into operation for from 1 to 3 years from now. They cannot put it into effect for a year or two, or perhaps 3 years. The chairman kindly skipped over that yesterday and he was very indefinite as to when it could be put into effect.

Who are we? Have we lost confidence in our democratic form of government? Are we unwilling to trust to future Congresses to pass upon such momentous matters when they present themselves, or are we at this time to assume that we are the best Congress that will ever be here, and the only group of men capable of passing a universal military training bill. The issue here is not whether you are opposed to a universal military training bill or not. As a matter of fact I can easily visualize a universal military training bill which I could go along with. If our educational program is coordinated with it in such a way that our American way of life will not be subordinated to the military. But for heaven's sake why should we attempt to write it in with an emergency wartime draft bill at this time and then in a kind of halfway measure?

The universal military training bill, which we have for consideration here is not a complete bill. I do not know what is going to happen when that board or commission is appointed. I do not know what arrangements they are going to make. You do not know what distribution of soldiers or of the marines or Navy men will be made, and what will happen to the Marine Corps I do not know. I know one thing, however, if that bill had been in effect when Louis Johnson was Secretary of Defense, I am afraid the Marine Corps would now be a has-been. That is just an honest statement. In my book there is no finer group of trained men, there is not a better group of fighting men, there is not a finer outfit on earth when it comes to defending this country, than the United States

Marine Corps. You can write that down. They know how to use manpower. In the last war 97 percent of their officer personnel saw combat, and 90 percent of their enlisted personnel. You cannot beat that record for using manpower. And they used it effectively.

I am not going to say anything about some of the other percentages because somebody would say I was talking about them. And I am sure every American boy in uniform has used and is now using what training he has had to the best of his ability.

Now, I have introduced H. R. 3364. I did not introduce that bill as an expert on military affairs. I am perfectly aware of my limited knowledge in that department. I have learned more about it since I started this study than I had known for some time. So I took the exact draft bill prepared by the Armed Services Committee, with these exceptions:

No. 1: I changed the period of service from 26 to 24 months. That is exactly the number of months provided in the Senate bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. SHORT. Three more than we now have?

Mr. BARDEN. That is right. I then increased the age over the bill as proposed by the Armed Services Committee, from 18½ years to 19 years, the very exact and same age provided in the existing draft bill that is in operation now.

Then I cut out the universal military training.

Those were the changes.

The draft bill has only been regarded by the American people as a piece of legislation to be tolerated in time of national emergency, in time of war, or in time of threat of war. That is what has justified it, and they will go along with it. We are not only at war now but we are in a declared national emergency; and if we are to believe what we hear and see every day, then we are confronting a threat of war, and that does not require any mild type of legislation.

I sincerely believe that the thing which confronts this Congress today is to pass legislation necessary to deal with the emergency, and the problems that we have confronting us now. When you go into a universal military training bill and begin to set up a commission and give to that commission that all-inclusive power of writing out what your universal military training bill will be, without any authority to amend it, simply send it up here to you and if you do not do anything at all it becomes law, you can approve it or disapprove it; if you do not do anything, then you have given to that commission the power and authority to write more law than we have ever given authority to any group. That is a correct statement.

I want to tell you this: Right at this particular time the American people are not interested in our passing out any overdoses of authority. They have been awakened a little bit lately about the use of authority. But you pass this bill, you pass a draft bill coupling with it the makeshift, skeleton UMT bill, which 2 or 3 years from now will slide into being and begin to operate, and then put a 5-star general in the White House, and, brother, you can hold onto your hat then for you could be in for a ride.

And do not think that is beyond the realm of possibility. The thing for us to do is to write a law that would be safe in any kind of storm or with any kind of person that may take a particular whim about a particular service. I have seen the time, and you have too, when some branches of the service would not be in existence today if some of the other branches had had their way.

Now, I want to say a little bit about the administration of the present draft act by the Department of Defense, who determines policy. I am going to make this definite outright charge, that in my opinion the Defense Department has intentionally and designedly attempted to whittle down, if you please, the number of people taken in under this draft bill, trying to prepare the way that would grease the skids to where you could tie on this makeshift UMT bill to a draft bill at this particular time.

You say: "All right, you made that statement, now prove it"; and I am going to do a little bit of proving. I just went to the headquarters in North Carolina and I found that out of 35,707 men examined 11,085 were turned down because they failed to pass the mental examination; and in that group, mind you, were college students, high-school students, 3-year high-school students, if you please, that had made anywhere from 1 to 6 on an examination where they could have made a possible 100. Do you say that was not brought to their attention? It was brought to their attention by myself, and it was brought to their attention by some of the heads of the State departments of the various States of the Union. Did that have any effect? Why, Mr. Chairman, let me read you something here. On April 1, 1951, appeared an article headed "High rejection reported for Wayne," the highest they had ever seen:

> Out of 125 men from here examined last week, 69 failed the mental test.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, that was Fool's Day.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I do not know who was qualifying, that is what disturbs me; I do not know who was qualifying. But I know that out of the last quota that went from my home town some of the boys that failed the mental test at Fort Bragg came back and said: "Well, I am going in anyway," went down and joined the National Guard, and they were delighted to have them. Let me say, by the way, that that is not a dumb outfit.

I have a whole pile of figures that will back up that very thing. I have accused and I have made the statement to their own officials and nobody yet has denied it, and I do not believe the chairman of this distinguished committee will deny that they have turned down thousands, and thousands, and thousands of them who would have filled that manpower pool about which the distinguished gentleman was talking yesterday.

Now, that is kind of rough talk. I do not know who is responsible. You can find out almost anything better than you can find out who did what in the Pentagon Building; it just does not show up when you go to look for it.

Yesterday I listened to the flag waving and the drum beating about how Russia is going to come over here and chew us up into sausage meat and all that. There has been too much of that talk about what Russia can do. At this time I think we should recall a statement made by President Roosevelt, and that was: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." I am not a defeatist, I am not afraid of Russia; I have never seen or heard of any two Russians yet that could not be handled by one of our boys if our boy is given proper equipment and training. But, they say, they will tear us up. No, that is not so. Our boys are free men, and free men have more to fight for.

The only thing we must fear about that is that in all their glory they must not go to sleep again as they did at Pearl Harbor, else someone might get hurt. We are not proud of the operation that took place there.

Mr. Chairman, this United States Congress is not responsible for many of the things that are brought down on our heads. The United States Congress was not responsible for setting up Berlin with a hundred-mile circle around it and giving it to the Russians.

I am not attempting to make any ugly charges here. Whoever they were they used their best judgment, they did the best they knew how, and I am not questioning that at all. You and I will make mistakes as far as that is concerned. That is why you and I do not put ourselves up as being perfect men and you and I having that knowledge had better be careful when we set up other men as being perfect. I have learned a lot in the last few years. I have learned a lot about men. I have seen men get a lot of publicity, I have seen their pictures in the paper a lot of times, I have read a lot about them, then when I began to scratch around a little bit, and when I saw them they did not look that good to me. That is exactly the way I am about those things.

But when men in high positions in the Pentagon come over here and begin to exercise influence in reference to legislation that is going to invade every single branch of our economy and our Government—our civil, social, and educational life—I think those gentlemen are getting a little ambitious. I do not blame them particularly. But I warn this body it is our responsibility to see that that does not happen. So the gentleman's indignation was probably a little bit premature because it was not in the nature of a charge. It is simply a statement of fact that those men will do it. I do not know whether the thirty-eighth parallel decision was right or wrong. They tell me it was made in the field. I do not know which field. I do not know what it is going to take to establish it and I do not know where we are going to wind up, and I do not think this House does. But, I do know this one thing, that at this time it is the responsibility of this Congress to pass the type of legislation

that will best defend this Nation in the emergency which confronts us now, and I think the draft bill will do it. It has always carried us through. It will carry us through now, and there is not a man in this House that could tell you right now that it would be even safe, sane, or wise to put even the type of UMT they have proposed into operation, at once. You cannot do it. It has no business being coupled onto a draft bill. One, the draft bill, is a wartime emergency bill; the other, UMT, is a long-range peacetime defense measure.

Now we come to this question of manpower. I do not know how many men they need. I know the Army is talking in terms of millions and in numbers. They do not talk about use. They talk in terms of millions, and they started off with 3,200,000. Is that not right? That is what the record says. Then the first thing you know, it jumped up, I think, to 3,500,000. But, what was the explanation for the additional 300,000? I do not know. I think the explanation was that if they did not keep building it up, the first thing they knew they would have as many men as they needed, and they could not get the skeleton UMT bill through. And then what happens? On yesterday the distinguished chairman talked most of the time about 4,000,000 men. Now I do not know where the 4,000,000 came from. I do not know whether they have gotten almost all of their men or not, and they were afraid they would not get them, and then somebody talked about 4,000,000 to carry it on a little bit further.

Now I heard some of the discussion before the Committee on Armed Services, and I frankly think that Mrs. Rosenberg was trying to be frank with the committee, and I noticed how disturbed at times she got when the information was not at hand. Frankly, she kind of bawled out one colonel that was around there. I reckon they got their trouble straightened out, but she struck me as trying to be fair and frank with the committee. In talking about this three and four million, I do not know how many it will take to defend this country. But I am in favor of defending this country and whatever the number is we should raise it. I am still not an arm-chair general or an admiral so far as that is concerned, but I know one thing, before I will have much confidence in the man who furnishes these figures I would pin his ears down a little bit and get definite information on it, and let us know what we need, and then act. We should deal with this emergency quickly and adequately.

Yesterday there was considerable discussion about how expensive the draft bill was and how inexpensive the UMT bill would be. Well now, I do not know much about that either, but I know one thing, I found a report here, A Program for National Security, May 29, 1949, a report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. Among the list of signers of that report is Anna M. Rosenberg. Now what does that report say?

On page 37 appears this statement:

Universal training should not be undertaken at all unless the citizens of this country understand that it has value only as part of a program that will demand the expenditure of a much larger proportion of our national income than we have ever allocated for national defense in time of peace.

On page 38 this appears:

It is perfectly apparent that the over-all cost of an adequate program is staggering. We have no desire to sugar-coat this fact.

All right; of course it is. You cannot make it inexpensive. But it does not make any difference how expensive it is. If the dollars this Congress appropriates are honestly and wisely spent for the national defense of this country, then the American people are perfectly willing to pay the premium on that insurance policy of protection. I do not think anybody would challenge that.

Now we come to something else on this so-called universal military training bill. One of the things that it is said are going to make universal military training cheap is that you are going to pay the trainees $30 a month. I do not like that. I do not have an 18-year-old boy. The only boy I have is 27 years of age and in uniform today. I want this war won, and I want him home, his wife wants him home, just like the rest of you, if you have a son in uniform. But I do not like this business of taking these boys, if you please, the 18½-year-old boys, and paying them $30 a month. Why, they say, they are the best soldiers on earth, so they are going to take the best soldiers on earth and pay them boys' pay, $30 a month. That is not right or fair—and in my opinion will not work.

It is not right. The American people do not demand it. I say to you that the American people are willing to pay those boys, if they are soldiering, just what they are willing to pay the rest of the soldiers, whatever amount may be established. They are willing to pay the premium on that insurance policy.

We come now to the 18½ year olds. I do not like it. You talk about drafting 18-year-old boys. I just do not like it. I never have. When a man tells me that an 18-year-old kid makes the best soldier, I tell him I do not believe he is telling the truth. All you have to do is read some of the statements made by some of the men who are in action, not division chiefs, but those who are in action with the men. They can tell you something about that which might be interesting. This colonel made this statement before the committee. He told about the troubles he had with the 18-year-old kids and how they had to fall out and how he would take care of them, and so on. It is a bad thing to read so far as that is concerned. They talk about the educators being in favor of that at this time. This comes from the record and this comes from Dr. Fuller who testified:

The survey of the NEA Department of Higher Education shows that 964, 81.25 percent, of the 1,187 colleges and university administrators and professors are opposed to the drafting of 18-year-olds.

The 18-year-old draft is not a bit different from the 18½-year-old draft. Virtually every State in the Union has the provision that a child cannot enter the elementary grades until he is 6 years of age. At least half of them cannot get in because they are a few months too young. Therefore they have to wait until the next school term starts. Then the rest of them are delayed, either through sickness or changing their residence and so forth. And the result is, as you know, that when they finish they are 18 and 18½ years old. Some of the brighter ones, who have apparently been provided for, will get in earlier. To prove that, I understand the freshman class in college is of lower average age than the graduates from high school. Of course the older ones in high school take a long time to graduate. Many of them do not go to college, so far as that is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield—may I state that he, being chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am sure would be interested to know that in January of this year Gordon Gray, former Secretary of War, now president of the University of North Carolina, the gentleman's State, and I had the honor to address the Association of American Colleges and Universities at Atlantic City. I think I am safe in saying that at least 100 of the 800 men who were there representing institutions all over the country briefly discussed this subject with me and heartily approved the position that the gentleman from North Carolina is taking. I heard only two or three dissenting.

Mr. BARDEN. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Is it the gentleman's opinion that if the armed services use the manpower they have and use it judiciously, and also reduce the physical standards of those who are assigned to noncombat service, that they would still have plenty of manpower from the 19-year-old group?

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely—and may I say to the gentleman that they do not have to reduce anything. They just have to use a little common sense and real integrity in administering what they already have.

When a sergeant—and I have affidavits to prove this—when a sergeant comes into a big room crowded with draftees, who have assembled there for their examination, and tells them, "New, listen, if you fail this examination which I am fixing to give you, it does not mean that you will get out of the Army, but it just determines how deep in the ditch you will go." And then he gives them the examination. They play dumb, like they do not think those boys know what is going on. The result of it is that the only grade that a lot of them make is when they think they are answering the questions wrong and they guess right. And they know it—they know it. Why, heavens above, I saw one class, or one group going off and virtually all of the men in that one group passed, and the other group had failed. The next time

the other group that had failed got wise, and almost all in both groups failed that time.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Can the gentleman tell us why, in World War II, they inducted the men and then gave them an examination and then placed them, and now they want to give them an examination first and then determine whether or not they are going to take them in?

Mr. BARDEN. I will let the gentleman draw his own conclusion. I do not know what is behind all this because I am just as satisfied and convinced of the fact as I am that I am living that whoever is managing and operating that job has better sense than to run an examination the way he is running it, unless he is using good sense to realize an objective which he seeks.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have seen figures from some of the hospitals where the Korean boys are being returned, showing that a much greater percentage of the fellows who are being returned are in the age bracket 16 to 18½ than those older. What significance does the gentleman attach to that kind of a study?

Mr. BARDEN. I am a little reluctant to pass upon just what takes place over there. I do know that at first the casualty lists carried their ages, 17, 18, 19. Then they cut that out and gave only their names. I have to rely upon information that comes to me. However, I am going to say I have always felt that defending this fair land of ours was the responsibility of men and not children. I do not know where this attitude comes from to pass the responsibility down to the 18-year-olds. They have not lived. They are not responsible for anything that has happened, and God knows they are not responsible for the condition of this world. The poor kids have not even lived, and they walk out of high school and here they come, and from there on the military say, "Hey, Bub, your mom and pop are old-timey. We can train you better than they can." I do not subscribe to it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. We were told yesterday by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and by other members of that committee, speaking here about the situation with reference to the Reserves, with which I fully agree. I think it has been a very shameful situation. We were told, however, that if we did not go down into the 18½-year-old group it would be absolutely necessary to continue those boys in service who are active reservists and who served anywhere from 2 to 6 and 7 years in World War II. Does the gentleman have any definite information as to that particular situation; and if that is true, where would we get the pool of men?

Mr. BARDEN. Whoever said that had better go back and rub out a lot of figures.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I will yield with fear and trembling in my heart.

Mr. VINSON. You need not have any fear and trembling in your heart, but I just want to get the facts in your head. I want to say this, and I will yield you five additional minutes in order to make a statement.

Mr. BARDEN. You have already promised me 10 minutes if I needed it.

Mr. VINSON. All right. I want to say this to the House, that under the statement submitted in the report, if you maintain the armed services at 3,500,000 men, and reduce the educational and physical requirements, you could raise a pool sufficient between 19 and 26 to take care of an armed force of 3,500,000 men. That is exactly what we said here, not to mislead the House. But when they raise the question which was raised by the gentleman from Arkansas, if you are going to be of any benefit to the veteran reservists in the active reserves, you have got to go to the 18½-year-olds.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman cannot quite fit that with the rest of his figures. The gentleman cannot fit that with his statement that if you lower the physical and mental tests you will get all of the thousands, and the gentleman says he is going to raise three and a half million.

Mr. VINSON. You will have a pool——

Mr. BARDEN. What you do is stop the clock and say you are not going to get any more.

Mr. VINSON. No. Let us get this straight. You will have a pool of 1,200,000 between 19 and 26.

Mr. BARDEN. Where do you get that information?

Mr. VINSON. We know it from Mrs. Rosenberg's testimony and our own figures.

Mr. BARDEN. I am sure she being a lady was approximately accurate, but definitely an interested witness.

Mr. VINSON. The figures are absolutely accurate, and the correctness of them is proven by General Hershey that by taking all of these people that we have been exempting between 19 and 26, you will have a pool of 1,200,000 men.

There must be deducted from that 800,000 men who must go in, giving a net total of some 400,000. Now, 800,000 reservists have been called who have served 5 or 6 years, and if you are going to get them out in accordance with the bill then we have got to go down to 18½. So where is the error of saying at 19? Because if we want to keep them in you can justify 19, but if you want to be of any benefit to these reservists, then you have got to drop the age to 18½.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. Just a minute; let me say this to the gentleman from Georgia: What do you expect me to believe when the War Department, the people over there in the Defense Department, come along and exempt more men than they have ever exempted? And here they are right now cutting their draft call by 50 percent for the next month. Then to come here and tell me it is so desperate that they have got to have those young men. They started out wanting 3,200,000.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Let me give you the figures here. The net pool they will have on June 30, 1951, under the present law and with present standards—now listen to this, I will give the gentleman plenty of time—is 410,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes, or 15, if he wishes them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can do that only by unanimous consent. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed an hour.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia be permitted to yield an additional 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. I want to yield to the gentleman, because I know him always to be very fair.

The net increase available on June 30, 1951, between the ages 19 and 26 under our bill is 822,000.

The net pool by lowering the draft age to 18½ is 254,000. That, therefore, gives you a net pool under our bill of 1,493,000 men.

There must be added to that figure the men reaching 18½ years in 1952, which is 530,000. Add also students no longer deferrable, 200,000. This makes a total pool in 1952 of 2,230,000.

There must be taken from that pool 1,631,000 men, and that takes care of the 800,000 reservists. But do what the gentleman says, hold the age limit at 19 years of age, and not a single reservist can come out of the armed service. That is the only justification that caused the committee to lower the age to 18½.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, the gentleman expects us to take that bait when the Defense Department has just exempted and deferred around 800,000.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I shall be pleased to.

Mr. SHORT. The chairman of our committee, and every member of the committee and of the House should know that if you lower the mental and physical standards to the January 1945 figure, if you will call in married and childless men between the ages of 19 and 26, and tighten this law, you will get all the men required without drafting any 18-year-olds or without taking any veteran. Now the Chairman knows that.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. SHORT. Sure, I am.

Mr. VINSON. But what becomes of the 828,000 reservists that we want to get out after 12 months?

The issue is clean-cut: You can keep the reservists in, if you keep the age at 19 years. But if you turn the reservists out, you will have to reduce the age to 18½. That is the justification for it.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia this, and he knows it, that a part of the reservists are in there of their own will and wish. I do not say all of them. Some of the reservists are in their as volunteers, because I have had trouble trying to get them to be taken in.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman would see the hundreds and thousands of letters that the Members of Congress are receiving about the injustice that has been done the veteran reservists in the volunteer and inactive group, who served 5 or 6 years and now being called back, the gentleman would conclude that they were not in by their own wish.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; and the gentlemen knows the Defense Department could have gotten just as many as they have right now and never touch a one of those if it had wanted to. The thing that the War Department needs is a good going over, Mr. Chairman; that is what it needs, and I think the safety of this country demands it. I know we have some wonderful men over there; I know we have some good men over there, so far as that is concerned, but they have been kicking everybody in the teeth long enough.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it not true that in the 1940 Selective Service Act the Congress said that all men would stay in the Reserves and if the War Department had carried out that mandate, or the Defense Department, we would have had plenty of men in the Reserves?

Mr. BARDEN. The War Department has never been interested in the Reserves. They want active men to support Commissions. We had a big fight on this floor when they not only did not pay any attention to the Reserves but virtually destroyed them, and so they did the same thing with the National Guard. They did it in both instances and they know they were not fair to either. Now, this Congress cannot be saddled with the responsibility of dropping their guard on our defense. Who was it that stopped the construction of the Navy ships and airplane carriers? Who was it that cut down the 70-group Air Force, thereby destroying our Air Force? Who was it that cut down the size of our Army when the volunteers were coming in? Do not pass that on to the Congress. I will not accept that responsibility on my shoulders.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. This Congress has a responsibility of doing something to that Reserve program and this particular bill will help in that responsibility.

Mr. BARDEN. All right. I hope the gentleman will also accept his responsibility by seeing that the Draft Act we have already passed is properly administered and carried through. That is the gentleman's responsibility along with this other matter.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I say in all sincerity, and weighing every word, that if this House adopts the gentleman's suggestion of keeping the draft age at 19 years, not a single one of the 828,000 reservists can be relieved from active duty.

Mr. BARDEN. I will say to the gentleman in reply that I disagree with him very, very stoutly in that statement.

Mr. VINSON. Well, that is the fact.

Mr. BARDEN. If that is true, why did they cut off the draft for the next month?

Mr. VINSON. I will tell the gentleman why, and it is commendable on the part of the Department.

Mr. BARDEN. It may be commendable, but let them not blow hot and cold at the same time.

Mr. VINSON. It is not the intention of the Department to draft any men unless they are necessary.

Mr. BARDEN. Now we are getting somewhere. If they are not necessary, of course they should not draft them, but does not the department take them if they are necessary, if they feel these men should be taken? Of course, they do. That is no answer.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina why it is that we have so many letters asking the Navy Department or the Department of the Air Force to allow these people who want to enlist and work for their country to go in, and why they are not taken in?

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I cannot answer that question. I do not know why. I do not understand it. I do not understand why they took a fine young doctor, a 6-year medical student down in my district, and sent him over to Belvoir digging ditches. I do not understand why they do a lot of things, but that is what has happened.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe the gentleman, as the rest of us, has criticized the Armed Forces for having taken men faster than they could equip them and train them, has he not?

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, well, now, wait a minute. Go ahead and ask whatever you want in one question and then I will answer the gentleman. I am not a good lawyer, but I have sense enough not to be led to slaughter. Now go ahead.

Mr. KILDAY. The point I want to make is that we have all been critical and resentful about the Air Force for sending 70,000 recruits to my town where they did not have barracks and equipment for them. It was brought out by the gentleman from Missouri that that was contrary to proper procedure. Now I pose the question: Should the Army take in April 80,000 when it can only utilize 60,000, and take 80,000 in May when it could only utilize 40,000, or should they not come in in the orderly manner in which they can equip, utilize, and train them?

Mr. BARDEN. All right, let some of those 40,000 and 60,000 take the place of some of those reserves that ought to come out, if they are too crowded. That is the way I would let them go. Listen. Do not come here telling me that the War Department has not had enough money to build camps and construct camps and other facilities for those men, because they have all the darn money we have and then some, and they have had all the money they need, and they got every darn cent they asked for.

Mr. KILDAY. Can we not have any more light than heat?

Mr. BARDEN. Maybe the gentleman could turn on some. They are spending my tax money.

Mr. KILDAY. Very well. The gentleman says "Why not use some of them." I am sure the gentleman agrees with the provision in the bill that a man should be trained 6 months before he is sent into combat, and if the training facilities are not available, no matter whose fault it is, they must be trained before they are sent into combat, and I take it that the question is not how that man got to Korea, but how in the hell we are going to get him out.

Mr. BARDEN. That is good, but I thought the gentleman would get some religion a little earlier so that we would not have these boys killed over there. They can give them good training, and they ought not to send a kid or grown man into battle that is not well trained, and when they have done it, it has been their fault and a lack of their own bookkeeping. They did not have to do that, because their duty is to train men.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If you want an example of the type of peacetime training given our boys, just recall about a year ago when the peacetime-trained men went into Korea and were pushed all over the lot, and it took the reserves and the trained marines to get them down to the point of fighting.

Mr. BARDEN. Of course, they ought to have training, and we have given them the money, and if they had not all been sitting on rubber cushions over there in the Pentagon Building they could have trained these men and they know it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I am afraid somebody is thinking I am too critical of the army, and I do not have a single gun.

Mr. SHORT. But the Eightieth Congress passed a $75,000,000 appropriation for the Air Force and they never spent a dime of it and they did not build up the reserves. They dallied in order to cram this thing down our throats.

Mr. BARDEN. We know the responsibility for the cutting down is not this

Congress, and I am not going to accept responsibility for it. The gentleman from Texas can if he wants to, but I am not.

Mr. KILDAY. When my time comes I can be more critical of the Department than the gentleman can because I know more about it.

Mr. BARDEN. I am satisfied the gentleman does. But, I am not trying to be destructively critical. I am trying to offer constructive criticism. I am concerned over these things, and they affect every man in this country, and what I want to do is to simply reiterate and impress upon you this fact that we are in an emergency, a dangerous emergency. The draft bill is an emergency bill, and that is what I think we should give our attention to and not try to stuff in and tie onto a so-called skeleton UMT bill of this kind something to give effect—the gentleman would not say it would be 1, 2, or 3 years, but we are going to pass something because we have allocated to ourselves all the wisdom. That piece of legislation is the type of long-range peacetime legislation that should be given consideration by this body when our minds are quiet and when we can take care of and give consideration to our educational and our economic and all the other ingredients that make up our American way of life. Let us not give them sulfa, penicillin, all at the same time. There is no telling what would happen to the patient.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. When the gentleman directed a question a moment ago as to why this draft quota could not be increased back to its full quota next month and let these 50 percent that they claim they cannot use take the place of some of these reservists, I wonder if the gentleman was satisfied with the answer he got.

Mr. BARDEN. When a man begins smothering me with figures I cannot keep up with him. I served in the State legislature one time when we passed a resolution against the revenue collector of the State, that he had to give a detailed accounting of everything, all the revenue and all, and it had to be read in the House verbatim. He took 2 months to prepare it and wore out three reading clerks, and the second day of reading there was not a soul in there but the reading clerk. I learned then not to get tangled up with too many figures.

Mr. WHEELER. Frankly, I was not satisfied with the answer.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not satisfied with a lot that is in this bill. I believe I am fairly honest, and I believe I try to be fair-minded, but I just do not believe that anybody would deny the fact that we have had a little bit of slanted information, I mean, kind of on the tinted side, preparing the way to tie the so-called skeleton type universal military training to the draft bill, at a time when the smoke of battle is in the air, at a time when they say—and they said this until somebody clipped them on it—that if we do not get it tied to it now we will never get it passed. If that is true, it never should pass. If it cannot pass this Congress in time of peace on its merit and cool, calm deliberation, it never should pass and become a law.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to make a correction. I said the Eightieth Congress passed an appropriation for the Reserves and the Air Force of $75,000,000. I meant $750,000,000. To be exact, I think it was $788,000,000.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman wants to be correct, it was $822,000,000.

Mr. SHORT. I want to be conservative. It was $822,000,000, and no one fought harder for that appropriation than the chairman of our committee, CARL VINSON. We voted $822,000,000, and they did not spend anything. They neglected shamefully and ignored the Reserves. You can draw your own conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is probably the most important measure to come before this Congress. It must be remembered that we are here dealing with individual lives. We are here deciding who shall be obliged by the force of law to give up their normal pursuits as free men to don a military uniform and to obey without question all military commands. Such decisions should give us pause. Nothing is more sacred or more precious than man's God-given right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

As a peace-loving people, militarism in any form is abhorrent to our thinking. As a people who love liberty even more than peace, we are basically opposed to conscription of any kind. It is only when we are convinced that our country's security is at stake, and there is no alternative, that we accept compulsory military service.

I am convinced that our country's security is at stake, and it is imperative that we build up our defense. I am convinced that the international situation is presently such that we have no alternative but to increase the size of our armed services. To do this we must have some kind of draft or compulsory military service law. We have no alternative but to find ways and means to raise additional men for the respective services in order that we may have a national defense prepared for any emergency.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I accordingly voted to report this bill. But when I voted to report this bill, I did so with several strong reservations, which I expressed in committee and which I expressed before the Committee on Rules in an appeal for this liberal rule the committee has given us.

I am indeed pleased that when we read this bill for amendment the House membership as a whole, speaking for all the people, will have an opportunity to weigh carefully and decide upon the fundamental issues which the bill before us presents. My differences with the committee bill are not on matters of detail but on certain basic issues. It is to these basic issues that I should like at this time to direct your attention.

In voting to report this bill I have accepted the thesis, to which I believe every member agrees, that we are faced with a defense emergency situation. I have also accepted the contention of our military leaders that for a sound defense we should have a military force of 3,467,000 men.

The problem then arises as to the best way to raise a military force of this size with a minimum of individual hardship and with a minimum of impact on our economic and social life. The Committee on Armed Services has diligently explored all aspects of this difficult problem. We have earnestly sought to amend the Selective Service Act in such particulars as to have a system that will be as sound, as fair, and as equitable as can possibly be devised.

I do not believe that anyone, however much he may try, can possibly devise a perfect system for taking men into the military service. There are honest differences of opinion as to what should be the age groups subject to induction, what should be the required length of service, and what persons should be deferred. These differences found vigorous expression in the committee, and they will doubtless find similar expression here on the floor.

Personally, I have been, and continue to be, opposed to the drafting of 18-year-old boys into the armed services in the absence of clear and convincing evidence that such a step is necessary for the safety of our country. While the administration has recommended that we reduce the draft age from 19 to 18, the officials who appeared before our committee were unconvincing in attempting to show us why this was necessary to fill their stated manpower requirements.

I am inclined to the view that we can probably raise the projected military force of 3,467,000 men without lowering the present draft age minimum of 19. But in order to provide the military with a margin of safety, that they may have a pool of available men from which to draw, I can support our committee in its recommendation that the draft age be lowered to 18½ with the definite stipulation and prohibition in the law that no inductee may be assigned to duty in a combat area until he has had at least 6 months' training or before reaching the age of 19.

Without entering into the pros and cons, and all the details with respect to the proposed changes in the Selective Service Act, suffice it to say that, in general, on this feature of the bill, I can support the committee's recommendation. That is evidenced by the fact that I voted to report the bill. I recognize the necessity for certain changes in the Selective Service Act and the necessity of relieving reservists from extended active duty.

But in the bill before us the Committee on Armed Services has not confined its

recommendation solely to amendments to the Selective Service Act, which is a temporary emergency measure. It has embodied in the same bill a permanent long-range universal military training program. That part of the bill which amends the Selective Service Act to supply our immediate military manpower needs has been tied in with that part which sets up a universal military training program for the distant future. To this procedure I earnestly object. Whatever the merits of this or any other proposed universal military training program, it is my firm conviction that such a program should be considered separate and apart from our present emergency needs.

The issue is not whether we should or should not have universal military training. I am not now arguing the case for or against such a program. I am simply insisting, as I urged in committee, that we consider such a program on its own merits and not endeavor to force it on the country by tying it in with an obviously emergency need.

As I have said, conscription of any kind is repugnant to the thinking of the free people of this great free country of ours. Our people do not like the Selective Service Act, but they accept it because they appreciate its necessity for their own security in an unsettled world where liberty is seriously threatened.

They accept it because it is a presently inescapable emergency need and because it is temporary. They look forward to the day when such a law will no longer be on the statute books.

The bill before us provides for the expiration of the Selective Service Act by operation of law in 1954. A fixed termination date in any emergency legislation is a highly important provision. It preserves the temporary character of the legislation and forces a periodic review of the law by Congress.

But there is no such termination-date provision in the universal-training-program features of this bill. The reason is obvious. It lacks such a provision because the program is deliberately designed to become permanent policy. This part of the bill is not supposed to be temporary. And yet it is made part of a bill which comes before us only because we are confronted with an emergency situation.

It is one thing to amend and extend the Selective Service Act and quite another to set up a long-range universal-military-training program. There is no justification whatever for wrapping in one tight package, as this bill does, both a short-range emergency program and a long-range permanent program.

It may be that many of the Members feel that it is both desirable and necessary that the country enter upon a long-range universal-military-training program. With that view I am not now debating the pros or cons. However an ardent advocate one may be for such a program, I cannot understand why any objection should be raised to the House facing the issue fairly and squarely. I am, therefore, appealing to the House to separate the selective-service features from the universal-military-training-program features, with each to be considered on its own merits separate and apart from each other.

We will have such an opportunity when we begin to read this bill for amendment. We will have this opportunity when a substitute bill, which itself will be subject to amendment, is presented to the House.

It has been said that those of us who seek to separate the draft questions from the UMT features of the pending bill are really seeking to defeat UMT. That may be the objective of some, but it is certainly not mine. They contend that by thus dividing the bill so that each program is considered separately the House will reject UMT. To make this contention is to say that the American people do not want UMT, but will nevertheless force the program upon them by tying it in with an emergency program they know the country must adopt. I, for one, will not be a party to such a scheme, plan, method, device—or whatever you wish to call it—which is tantamount to deceiving the people we represent.

The argument has also been made that the terms of the pending bill itself will provide Congress with an opportunity to pass on the proposed universal training program. They stress the fact that the bill sets up a national security commission of five members to prepare a universal training plan to be submitted to Congress to be accepted or rejected within 60 days. Let us not be deceived by this suggested way of legislating. The decision to be made at that time will not be, as they apparently would have us believe, whether we will enter upon a universal military training program. Not at all. That decision will simply be as to the kind of training program, for the bill by its terms will have already established a national security training corps, and once such a corps is established by law we are certain to have some kind of a training plan.

As I said at the time I testified before the Committee on Rules, it is like going to a doctor to see if you need an operation. He operates and advises that you do not need the operation. You get it whether you want it or need it.

If the House should decide to adopt this or some other universal military training program, I think there should be a definite cut-off date as in the instance of the selective service. The Congress can always repeal the law, but we know from experience that once a law gets on the statute books and a program gets under way, it is likely to continue forever. Vested interests develop and new and additional reasons are found for its continuance. A provision in the law which fixes a time certain that it will expire automatically forces a periodic review by the Congress and automatically raises the question before the people as to the wisdom or advisability of the program.

There is a third basic issue which I earnestly believe this bill presents to us for decision. I shall refer to it briefly, as I may avail myself of the privilege of discussing it when a contemplated amendment is offered.

The bill we have before us does not provide for a definite ceiling on the number of men who are to be in our armed services. The military leaders have told us that our present defense needs call for 3,467,000 men. If we thus wrote into the bill a manpower ceiling of 3,500,000 we would be authorizing more than contemplated and leave a sizable pool from which they can draw.

It has been contended that fixing a ceiling would tie the hands of our military leaders, that the developments may be such that we will need a larger Army, Navy, and Air Force than presently contemplated. That argument is not persuasive with me. It is the typical argument advanced whenever it is sought to have Congress abdicate its legislative responsibilities so that the executive branch may have power without limitation.

To be sure, there is the possibility that the international developments may be such that we will be obliged to raise an even larger military force than presently planned. No one of us can foresee the future. If such a necessity should unfortunately develop, Congress can always raise the ceiling, just as we can always extend the date that a law will continue in operation. The Congress is a continuing institution. It is always available and ready to act to meet a national need. And, after all, the primary responsibility for our country's defense is vested in the Congress. We are specifically charged with this responsibility by the Constitution itself.

It has also been said that fixing a ceiling would adversely affect the morale of the people in Europe who are allied with us in opposition to communism. That argument is even less persuasive with me. In fact, I have too often heard the argument about the effect of what we do here in the United States on people's morale abroad that I sometimes wonder whether we are being asked to legislate in the interest of our own people or solely in the interest of people of other nations.

I think it is long since time when we should begin to think of the morale of our own people whose boys will compose this military force and whose taxes defray the great costs. I think we owe it to ourselves and to the people we represent to say definitely how large this military establishment shall be. To do so is our duty and responsibility under the Constitution.

This brings me to the fourth basic issue which this pending bill presents. I believe a provision should be written into the bill to provide that the manpower authorized by the bill cannot be committed to a continental army under the Atlantic Pact without authorization by Congress.

In asking that such a provision be written into this bill to raise our military forces to 3,467,000 men, I am not asking that we pass upon the question whether our troops should be sent to Europe for integration into an international peacetime army. That is not the question at issue. Nor is the question at issue with respect to how many divisions are to be sent.

The proposed prohibition in this bill raises one fundamental question and only one: That is whether the Congress, which represents the people and which is charged under the Constitution with primary responsibility for our military forces, shall have a voice in whether the troops are sent. This is a proposal which should be supported by both proponents and opponents of the plan to make American ground troops a part of an integrated European army. Even the most ardent advocates of this proposed program under the North Atlantic Pact should support the right of the people, through their representatives in Congress, to have a voice in this momentous decision.

I am not a lawyer. And I do not intend to engage in any legalistic argument over whether or not the President has authority under our Constitution to take such action without authorization from Congress. The President claims he has such authority as Commander in Chief. On the other hand, section 8 of article I of the Constitution very clearly sets forth in several successive paragraphs that it is the Congress which has the power "to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy" and "to make the rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

At the very best, the authority asserted by the President is questionable, and it is in direct conflict with the powers that are vested in the people's Congress. One might well ask, "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he is grown so great."—that he arrogates to himself all authority over our Armed Forces, to send them wherever he wishes, as many as he wishes, whenever he wishes, and almost for any purpose he may wish. One might again ask, "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed" that he is not willing to let the Congress so much as participate with him in this historic decision; but, on the contrary, deliberately seeks to bypass the Congress. "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed" that he callously disregards his assurances to the Senate when it ratified the North Atlantic Pact that the Congress would participate in the decision whether any American troops would be sent to Europe to implement the Pact.

How can the American people have confidence in the President when he is unwilling to take the people themselves into confidence? How can we possibly achieve national unity in meeting this threat to our security, and in solving the grave problems confronting us, if the President refuses to allow the people any voice whatever in a momentous decision of this character? How can we expect the people to give their support and make the sacrifices involved in a program in which they are deliberately denied a voice?

That is all we seek by proposing that there be written into this bill a specific prohibition against using the American troops as a part of an integrated army in Europe until authorized by Congress. We do not seek to prevent the use of our troops in this manner. We do not seek to prevent the implementation of the Atlantic Pact. We simply seek by this proposed amendment to give the people, through their Congress, a voice in the decision as to whether the troops are to be sent and, if so, in what number.

Permit me to remind you that in the 1940 Selective Service Act we wrote a prohibition against sending troops outside the Western Hemisphere. Permit me also to remind you that in this bill itself there is a prohibition against sending inductees to other countries without first having had a stipulated amount of training. There is a firm legislative basis for this proposed prohibition.

There are a number of other features of the bill that I should like to discuss. I have confined my remarks to four basic issues involved in this pending bill. I have sought to direct your attention to four principal points which I advocated in committee and which I hope will be adopted by the House: First, divide the bill between the selective-service part and that pertaining to universal military training; second, a definite cut-off date; third, a fixed ceiling of 3,500,000; and fourth, a prohibition against sending our troops for service in the Atlantic Pact continental army without authorization from Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, they have mixed the orange juice with the castor oil and they have sugarcoated the pill. The only reason on earth for this illicit, unholy clandestine marriage is because now is the time to push UMT over.

Mr. ARENDS. I so stated in my remarks, but in much less colorful language.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that he voted to report out this bill in its present form.

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; with definite reservations. As I explained, our defense needs require us to take some action on the selective-service law so as to raise additional men.

Mr. JONAS. Has there been a minority report filed?

Mr. ARENDS. No.

Mr. JONAS. Not by any member of the committee?

Mr. ARENDS. No member of the committee filed a minority report.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. No minority report has been filed, but the members of the committee have made their positions rather clear and unmistakable.

Mr. JONAS. I do not think there is any question about that, but I do believe the custom is to file a minority report.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Simply to say that I subscribe to the gentleman's viewpoint that the two features of this program should not have been interwoven in a bill that it might be difficult for the Members to separate one from the other. I subscribe to his position that there should be a phase of the bill dealing with the draft for service and a phase with respect to the training program.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I notice the gentleman referred to an estimate based on the defense needs of this country as conceived by the military. I have been sitting here for the better part of two afternoons listening to estimates of 3,000,000, 3,100,000, 3,500,000, and the 4,000,000 that the chairman suggested.

I wish to ask the gentleman whether before the Armed Services Committee there came any explanation of what the actual military need of this country is? Or are we voting from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 indefinitely in what seems to many of us in this country to be a blank check in human lives to carry out a policy and a program not yet defined?

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois that my understanding is, the figure of 3,462,000 was the requirement. They started out with 3,200,000; then the figure was 3,600,000; and now there has lately been some discussion of needing 4,000,000 men.

Mrs. CHURCH. For what purpose are we raising this Army?

Mr. ARENDS. To provide our people with security against the existing international threat. Of course, those in control would much prefer that we place no ceiling at all on the number of men so that they can do just as they please, permitting the ceilings to be fixed only through appropriations, which is an ineffective and unsatisfactory method to control the size of our Armed Forces.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The question the gentlewoman from Illinois asked, as I got it, was: Why this three to four million men to implement what policy? A policy that has never been determined or enunciated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the inquiry made by the gentlewoman from Illinois, may I say the reason why we have to have a force of three, three and a half or four million is for the minimum security of the country. The gentleman's address raises the point that there should be a limit of three million or three and a half or four million, or whatever is. Of course, the gentleman cannot tell, the Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot tell, the Congress cannot tell, what probably may be required tomorrow, the next day or the following day. World conditions are so uncertain it would be a most dangerous thing.

The gentleman says he cannot tell how large it has got to be but for the time being we will put a limit on it.

Mr. ARENDS. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. And, if necessary, we will remove it tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. That is right, in the same manner as we extend the draft act. We have a termination date for the draft in this bill. We can extend it if necessary, and we can likewise raise the ceiling, if necessary.

Mr. VINSON. The draft act is for a period of three years.

Mr. ARENDS. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman says that you may have for the months of April, May or June an army of 3,500,000, but that world conditions in July, August and September may require Congress to say you shall have 4,000,000.

Mr. ARENDS. Then we will meet the emergency at that time.

Mr. VINSON. How, then, can they make their plans and preparations if they are held down in such a straightjacket as that?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. What was the number that they wanted, that they first sent up to us?

Mr. VINSON. I think when the bill first came in nearly three months ago it was approximately 3,200,000.

Mr. ARENDS. Three million two is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. Then after we heard the witnesses and by their own figures we proved we could get that number, they raised the figure?

Mr. VINSON. That is true.

Mr. SHORT. Sure they did.

Mr. VINSON. I do not deny that.

Mr. SHORT. They raised it. Now they have it at three million four, and General Marshall then started to talking about four million. The gentleman referred to that yesterday.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. If we can raise that without UMT they will boost it to five million. The gentleman from North Carolina pointed that out.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has used the word "emergency." That word has been used repeatedly here as if there were some emergency period during which we were going to have to have a force of 3,500,000 men, then we would not need those men and we could consider UMT. I have been somewhat familiar with the thinking and plans and knowledge of the military and our diplomats, and the best information I have been able to obtain from the optimists is that ex-President Hoover says this period of build-up will last for 10 years.

He hopes we will not have war. General Eisenhower said 10, 20, or 30 years, during which we are armed to the teeth and face a determined and resourceful foe. The pessimists that I know of think the emergency is going to break possibly this year or next year and require a whole lot more than 3,500,000 men in our defense forces, but certainly you would not be planning UMT for use for a world war. I am trying to obtain from the gentleman or any member of the committee whether they got any information as to whether this emergency period was less than 10, 20, or 30 years.

If the period is to be 10 years or so, I think we ought to leave UMT to the next generation. Can the gentleman inform us about that?

Mr. ARENDS. As a member of the committee, I had no such information. I do not think our chairman did, or anybody else.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I would like to say this, except for 2 years since 1938 I have been voting on all these measures, most of the time on the minority side; that is, I have been in the minority, but the minority has not prevailed, the majority has prevailed, and the majority has always emphasized the point that if the particular issue that we had before us failed to carry, that we would be in an awful mess, and here we are in this mess even though the majority prevailed. Well, when are we going to win, and what is the matter with this whole business and why, when we win, do we lose?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The whole objective of this bill and all defense bills is to get strong enough so that we can maintain peace, because Russia only respects force, and if you follow the recommendations coming out from the Department of Defense and from the Committee on Armed Services to create the might of America in steel and armed forces, you will then be on the road to peace and then the emergency will pass away.

Mr. BENDER. It seems to me that whenever the Democrats are in power we have war.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sure if we went back and looked at the record, in reply to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of this committee, we would find this same argument was used when we voted on the repeal of the Neutrality Act, lend-lease, and all these other measures. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Was there any testimony before his committee as to where this pool of men was going to be used?

Mr. ARENDS. None.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Was it in Europe or all over the world?

Mr. ARENDS. No testimony to that effect.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the gentleman's statement let me say this: I sat here in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917. I saw the unpreparedness of America again involve us in Europe. I sat here during the World War and I saw the failure of America to take a positive stand on its own defense contribute more to involve us in the recent war than any other one factor, and if we do not take lessons from World War I and World War II, you are on your way for the third world war, and if we can avert it and America can stay at peace, if Congress will meet the challenge of the time and be prepared, we should do it, because, I repeat, that is the only thing. Russia does not listen to the oratory of my distinguished friend from Missouri or my distinguished friend from North Carolina or to my learned friend from Illinois addressing the committee now. But Russia does listen to acts and deeds when they are spelled out in the armed might of America.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. However, there is less peace today than there has been in this country for 40 years.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; and it will continue until America gets strong.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a member of the committee.

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill is not and should not be a political issue. It is the type of measure which should be considered in a very calm and dispassionate fashion. Unfortunately we have heard a number of violent and explosive speeches made with reference to this bill. More unfortunately, perhaps, every prejudice to which man is subject has been brought into the discussion. We have heard the denunciation of the brass—always a good prejudicial issue because, of course, there are a great many more enlisted men in the country than there are generals.

I guess no one knows more generals than I do. I appreciate them for their qualities and I certainly know their limitations. We have had every major political issue now current before the country brought into the discussion. I do not believe that to be the atmosphere in which this bill should be considered. We all agree—we all know that the world is in a violent state. It might explode at any minute. No one can deny that. We know that we are in a critical position. We know that we have hundreds of thousands of troops committed in bloody combat. The question is not whether they should have been committed. The fact is that they are committed. The question is not how they got to Korea, but how we are going to get them out of Korea. It is a situation in which we find ourselves, and from which we must extricate ourselves, no matter how we got into the situation or who is responsible for it. We should approach this bill with that attitude.

I have no quarrel with my friend, the gentleman from Missouri. I hope the gentleman is in the Chamber because I want to refer to his remarks and I would not like to do so in his absence. The gentleman and I are friends of long standing. I knew his position on this matter before the bill was ever offered. My friend, Mr. SHORT, of Missouri, is opposed to all legislation of this type. Ever since 1940 on the floor of the House

he has opposed all legislation of this type.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I certainly am not opposed to any defense measures. I opposed peacetime military conscription.

Mr. KILDAY. I said "of this type."

Mr. SHORT. Yes. I was, I am, and I will be tomorrow.

Mr. KILDAY. That is what I am about to say, that the gentleman from Missouri is perfectly honest and perfectly sincere in the position he takes. I admire him for his position. While I do not agree with him, I certainly grant him the right to take that position, and I would defend his right to take that position.

However, this is not a question of which came first, the egg or the hen, because the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] was opposed to this type of legislation from the beginning, and being opposed to it, he then went back to fill in the reasons why he was opposed to it.

I recall one day, it was August 8, 1941. On that day I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] speak against extension of the period of service of the men then in our Armed Forces under the Selective Training and Service Act. I have it here on the table in case anyone desires to examine it. I think you will find that the gentleman from Missouri on August 8, 1941, made practically the identical points which he made here yesterday. I think you will find that I am slightly incorrect in that position. He did say at that time that no matter how flat a pancake might be, it had two sides. On yesterday he said that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, and so would a skunk.

Mr. SHORT. You do not disagree with that, do you?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not disagree with it, but I wanted to be fair and point out the difference between the speech which you made on August 8, 1941, and the one that you made here on April 3, 1951.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Just to make it a matter of record, August 8, 1941, was 4 months before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. KILDAY. You stole my thunder.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sorry.

Mr. SHORT. Is the gentleman trying DEWEY SHORT or are you discussing this act? I will follow you.

Mr. KILDAY. I am trying to point out that the gentleman from Missouri has not in the past been a very good prophet, and I do not believe he should be trusted as a prophet on this occasion.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Texas is scared.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think you ever saw me scared. I am attempting to point out that when on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] attempted to lull us into security, and that we should be wary because of the prophet who tried to lull us into security back in 1941.

So I think we should examine the matter further. Here is what that advice to the House almost caused us: Exactly 4 months and 1 day before Pearl Harbor, those of us who were in the House at that time will never forget it, we recall so vividly when that roll call came late in the evening, on the first tabulation that we had kept of the vote, the extension of the period of service had carried by three votes. Then, before the result of the vote had been announced, a Democratic Member from the State of New York who is no longer here, who is now deceased, rose and changed his vote from "yea" to "nay," leaving the extension of service carrying by only one vote. That was 4 months, less 1 day, before Pearl Harbor. Had we agreed to the advice of the gentleman from Missouri then, when Pearl Harbor came there would not have been an effective military organization in the United States because those men had been integrated into every organization that we had, and when Pearl Harbor came we would have been in the process of demobilization. That is the type of legislation we are considering here, and I think we should consider it very carefully, very quietly, and very calmly.

It is not a question of who put a circle around Berlin, who may have been responsible at Yalta, and things of that kind. Instead it is hoped that we can go forward and take some action here that will prevent in the future what has happened in the past. I may say to my friends on the left that I can think of many things the administration has done in the more than 12 years that I have been here that I did not support.

The first phase of this bill—and right there while we are talking about the two phases, when General Marshall came to open the hearings on this debate, the first day he was there, I had studied the bill, I had been assigned by our chairman to prepare the hearings on the bill to be presented; I had kept up with the daily revisions which had come from the Department, and I found the bill to be too intermingled and intertwined between an extension of the so-called draft and universal military training. So when General Marshall was testifying, and the hearings will so show, I was the first to raise the question that it should be divided into two titles; and I persisted in that view and in that insistence until the committee rewrote the bill and placed it in such condition that you could separate the two and have a separate vote if desired by the House. That we were successful is evidenced by the fact that as the gentleman from North Carolina has said here, he has taken from our bill the provisions with reference to the draft and eliminated the other provisions. Therefore this question that has been raised here as to separating the bill has passed out of the picture. It was very important when the Pentagon bill, we will call it, was sent up to the House.

On the first phase of it there are only two major differences between the pending bill and the present law. We reduced the present minimum age of 19 to 18½; we increased the period of service from 21 months to 26. I will speak on that subject first because I think it is very short and very simple.

I think that the impact on a young man comes when he is separated from his home, his surroundings, his work, his studies, or whatever he is doing. Once he is parted from civilian life and civilian pursuits, 6 months one way or the other, is not of anywhere near the importance that the parting is, the time when he is taken away from his customary pursuits and sent into others. As our chairman stated on yesterday, the difference between 21 months and 26 months is 5 percent in dollars. That is all I will say about that, now.

The Department requested that we reduce the draft age from 19 to 18. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that in the fall of 1942 I spoke on the floor of this House advocating that the draft age be reduced from 20 to 18, and we did so. The RECORD of April 1943 will show that on the floor of this House I stated that when we did so we made a very serious mistake, and I still think so. I think that in 1942 we made a very serious mistake when we reduced the draft age to 18. I firmly resolved that I would never again vote for an unlimited draft of 18-year-olds, and I never propose to do so. There are many reasons that brought me to that conclusion. If you could get the figures separated as to casualties in the Battle of the Bulge as to the 18-year-olds I think you would find them to be out of all proportion. My firm conviction since that time has been that I would not vote to send any young man or boy under 19 years of age into combat. Under this bill we have assured that no one under 19 can be sent into combat. We will take him at 18½. We insist that he secure 6 months of training. That was one of the things involved in the unlimited 18-year-old draft. There was no fixed period of training So we have now assured here that we are not going to have anyone under 19 in combat and you can be assured he will be 19 plus or a little more before he will get into combat because you have what the military calls the logistics problem. You are going to have to move him around back and forth before you get him into combat.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Under this bill can he be sent outside of the United States before he is 19?

Mr. KILDAY. For 4 months he will have to be retained in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, including the Panama Canal. He cannot be sent into a combat area until he has had 6 months of training. So that is why I say we have assured that he cannot be sent into combat until after he is 19 years of age.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the Senate bill there is a proviso that if the local draft board has exhausted the 19-to-26 pool in

that particular area it can then call on the 18-year-olds. What is the provision in this bill on that matter?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill has no such provision because it does not permit 18-year-olds to be taken at all. Eighteen years and 6 months is the minimum. That sounds good to the person who has never had any experience, but it is a gimmick and it is a gimmick that will not work. We had that sort of thing during the war in the Draft Act of taking the lower category in one board when the other board still had higher categories. We had them drafting fathers on one side of the street, for instance, while single men were still on the other side of the street.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a troublemaker?

Mr. KILDAY. It is a troublemaker for Congressmen; you can be sure of that. It will not work unless you put it on a State-wide basis and prohibit the State from inducting anyone in a lower category and it will not work then unless you make it so mandatory that anybody called within his category, called before the higher categories, would have the right to discharge under writ of habeas corpus. The Selective Service System would obey that completely, but unless you have it in that form it will be regarded as directory only and it will be disregarded.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Does my friend from Texas agree with the amalgamation here of UMT and extension of the Draft Act?

Mr. KILDAY. Please let me make my speech. I am going to put that in its proper place.

Mr. O'HARA. That is just a simple question.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman tell us how many more would be needed if you raised the service from 21 months to 26 months? How many more would be needed if you used 21 months?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot furnish that answer.

Mr. VINSON. One hundred and forty-nine thousand more.

Mr. VORYS. Per year?

Mr. VINSON. In fiscal year 1952, 149,000 to be drawn out of the pool.

Mr. KILDAY. In reference to the question of going from 19 to 18½, I did that reluctantly and I did it only after we had in our committee very carefully considered the available manpower. I think in one respect I will have to agree with my friend from North Carolina. That is, you cannot discuss figures of this kind on the floor of the House. This is no place to audit books. It cannot be done. That is why we have committees. This bill was sent to the committee to work that sort of thing out. Just as the gentleman from North Carolina said, when they were attempting to question the State auditor, they wore out three reading clerks. You are going to have to have some confidence in your committee. The committee received information from every source available, from the official statistics of the Government, the census, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Department as well. I should say that we have probably the ablest staff ever assembled on Capitol Hill. It was assembled in the Eightieth Republican Congress by the Republican majority of our committee, and has been retained under the Democratic administration; an able staff, qualified in all fields.

Our chairman assured the gentleman from North Carolina that our figures are totally accurate, and I was amazed when he said bluntly that he simply did not believe them. But all we can do is to assure you that our figures are accurate, and if you want to examine them, if you are of that mind, you are welcome. But, you are going to have to trust your committee somewhere. On the basis of the necessity for going down to 18½, I agreed to it, because we have got a serious problem in Korea that has probably not occurred to those as strongly as it has to those of us who are concerned constantly with military matters, even though we be civilians and have always been. We have men in combat over there who have been there since June 1950, without relief and a good many of them without ever having been in a rest area. The problem with them is this: The Marines have started rotating, and unless we can get some soldiers to send over there to relieve these soldiers who have been in combat all these months, who see the Marines in line with them being rotated back to the United States and taken from combat, what is going to happen to your Army? So we have got to get enough men to provide replacements.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Why can they rotate the Marines if they cannot rotate the Army?

Mr. KILDAY. Very simple, because these men, subject to the draft, and not wanting to be in the Army, volunteered by the thousands in the Marine Corps, and they are constantly volunteering in the Marine Corps. The Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force are profiting by the draft bill, and while taking nobody in the draft, they are getting more volunteers than they are able to use. But the Army, with its troops committed, cannot rotate its men, and they see the Marines going home. The Air Force will soon be rotating. The Army is left, and what is going to happen to your Army? You are not going to have any Army in the line up there.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Am I incorrect in my understanding that the Senate bill S. 1, as written in the Senate, would have permitted the drafting of both men and women, whereas the House bill is confined to the drafting of men? Is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. If it permitted the drafting of women, I am not familiar with it. I am not familiar with it to that extent.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Senate bill says that every citizen has this obligation whereas the House bill mentions male citizens only.

Mr. KILDAY. I think perhaps the gentleman's construction is correct. I did not know that was in there.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, maybe others understood it, but I did not understand that was the reason that the Marines could rotate their men and the Army could not. They are still in the Army the same as the Marines. If they are both in the Army, why should one boy be pulled out of the line and the other boy not?

Mr. KILDAY. That is why, I may say, we have to increase our pool.

Mr. TEAGUE. The marines are staying in the service; they are going back.

Mr. KILDAY. Certainly, but they are being rotated. The gentleman can quote figures possibly better than I can, and they run into the thousands that volunteer in the Air Force, the Navy and the Marine Corps. You remember what happened in San Antonio, where they had 74,000 recruits in Lackland Field. Where did they get them? They were getting away from the Army. They did not want to serve in the Army. They went into the Air Force. With the Marine Corps it is the same way. They are getting more volunteers than they can take, and having that great pool of volunteers they are able to rotate their men, and we have to do the same thing for the Army. We have to get the men to rotate the soldiers who are over there in that mud and muck.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The reasons the marines are rotated is because the marines have only one division committed in Korea while the Army has committed considerably more.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Could the gentleman tell me whether or not he feels that the provision in this bill of 4 months training in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and 2 months additional training before they go into combat, is binding upon the President as Commander in Chief?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not believe he would violate it. I do not think he would dare violate it.

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. KILDAY. I think it is a very, very technical question. I do not know which position the gentleman takes on troops to Europe, but it is involved in that, as to the power of the President as Commander in Chief to deploy his troops.

Mr. NELSON. In other words, if this restriction in this bill is good, an additional restriction forbidding the President to send troops to Europe would also be good; is that true?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I think this provision is probably of debatable validity without more. It should be followed up in the appropriation bill with a restriction against the use of the funds. We have that power.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. I think it is a very difficult question, and nobody on the committee to my knowledge agrees with me.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The knowledge of the problems and all of the problems involved in the pending bill displayed by the gentleman now having the floor and by his chairman [Mr. VINSON], and their fair and forceful presentation of their arguments, begets confidence that should give a feeling of security and comfort to people interested in the security of the country in following them in the position they now take.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. It is surprising to me that here, at a time when we virtually are living under the muzzle of Russian guns, we should be fiddling over the drafting of boys of 18 or the adoption of universal military training.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. He embarrasses me, but I like it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. In connection with this rotation of marines, is it not a fact that a good share of the marines being sent as replacements are reservists who have been called up?

Mr. KILDAY. My Reserve outfit has been over in Korea for months, and I think that practically all of the original Marine Reserve organizations were committed.

I was amused with the gentleman from North Carolina's defense of the Marine Corps, because sitting next to me was a very distinguished combat Marine Corps major, of our professional staff, who wrote every word in this bill after we had agreed on the provisions which we wanted. So I take his information as a Marine Reservist, and I think all the committee does.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman mentioned the flight to the Marines since this crisis began. They are not being trained or sent as replacements any faster than the Army draftees, are they?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know whether it is any faster or not, but the numbers are greater.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The point I am trying to get to is that the marines were able to send replacements sooner because they had an effective reserve, while the Army has had to train draftees some months before they could send them as replacements.

Mr. KILDAY. I will agree thoroughly with the gentleman on that. It is a fact that every phase of the naval-reserve program has been in far better condition than that of either the Army or the Air Force.

Let us go a little further: When the Pentagon bill came here I studied it quite thoroughly, and I found myself to be in violent disagreement with it. I disagreed on many things.

I have mentioned the fact of the intermingling of the two phases of the bill and the 18-year-old draft. Our committee has some information about universal military training. In 1945 the former Committee on Military Affairs held long and exhaustive hearings on the question of universal military training. Later a special committee appointed by the Speaker under Hon. Clifton Woodrum, formerly a Member of the House from Virginia and now deceased, held months of hearings and took volumes of testimony on the subject. Later the President appointed the commission headed by Dr. Carl T. Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a number of others, including Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who signed the report and repudiated it when she came before the committee. That committee reported favorably. Thereafter the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] offered a bill and our committee held exhaustive hearings on universal military training and reported the Towe bill during the Eightieth Congress. So we felt we knew a little something about this subject and that we should inquire carefully into it. One thing to which I objected in this bill most strongly was the fact that it provided for no civilian commission. It placed the entire program under the control of the military. That was not in accordance with any proposal for universal military training that had ever been made in the past. None of the programs advocated by the American Legion or the Reserve Officers Association nor the Compton commission had ever contemplated that the trainees under UMT should be completely controlled by the military, but that there should be, as the Compton commission suggested, a commission composed of three civilians and two military men. So I was certainly opposed to a complete military control of the 18-year-old boys of the country.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Speaking of this commission, does the present legislation provide for that commission to report to the Congress or to the military authorities? That question has been raised.

Mr. KILDAY. It reports to the Congress. The bill requires a report as to the program and the number under training and the conditions and all about it.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the distinguished gentleman from Texas explain to the members of the committee how that commission is selected and other details concerning it?

Mr. KILDAY. It is appointed by the President with the confirmation of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. And it reports to the Congress?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; the commission has to report to the Congress.

The bill provides that the Commission is intended to be a part-time commission. In other words it provides a $50 per diem while members of the Commission are engaged in their duties. I am probably somewhat responsible for that. I took the position that the Commission should not be a full-time commission because I wanted men of the caliber of Dr. Karl T. Compton to serve on it, and I wanted men of the type who would not resign their civilian and private pursuits to become members of the Commission, but who would be sincerely interested, such as educators of the highest type, and perhaps religious leaders and others interested from a civilian standpoint in the military.

I understand now that some feel that is not a proper provision and that it should be a full-time commission. Compared to the major issues that we have here, in my opinion that is a very small question. I will accept either provision. It is a toss-up whether I was right or wrong on that question of the $50 per diem. I think a commission appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate would necessarily be of a caliber so much higher than if they were appointed by an administrative agency. You would not have difficulties with such a commission as you may have experienced with civilian agencies where appointments were made without senatorial approval.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Another thing which was proposed in the Pentagon bill was that there should be no separate corps, but that these boys would be integrated into the regular military forces of the United States. How anyone could believe that the American people would accept that is beyond me. Every program suggested has indicated that there should be a separate corps; that these boys should be segregated; that their morals should be protected; that they should not be subject to martial law; that they be retained as trainees and not members of the Armed Forces. The military heretofore had always agreed to that. At Camp Knox, Ky., they provided for a code of conduct. This bill provides for a code of conduct and relieves them from court martial.

So I found myself in disagreement with the Pentagon bill.

This bill takes care of that by creating a national security code. These boys will be segregated. They will be trained among themselves. Perhaps the most dangerous provisions of that bill were the two following, that for the next 3 years 75,000 annually should be chosen by an agency of government, and exempt from service in order that they might study the sciences, the healing arts, and the humanities. In other words, for 3 years 75,000 boys would be chosen by some agency of the Government—and the way our Government operates, that agency, whatever it was, would probably have originated with the present military program—so that after 6 or 7 years from now we would

have found that every doctor in the United States was someone foreordained by the Government to practice medicine. I say that that is totally contrary to everything we have ever believed in the American system—that some agency of government is going to determine who our doctors and our scientists are going to be. But that was contained in the Pentagon bill.

There was another provision by which an unnamed number could be selected by the military to be assigned to colleges, to take ROTC training, and suggested that they be subsidized in so doing; in exchange for 2 years of service if educated without subsidy, and 3 years of training if educated with subsidy. It was indicated that under that provision approximately 175,000 would be selected.

So there you would have 225,000 Government and military chosen men going to your colleges, while the intake in colleges now is a little higher than normal; in normal times about 375,000 boys go to college each year. So that out of your 375,000, 225,000 of all of the college students in the United States would be chosen by the Government before they ever began their courses of study. I certainly could not accept that part of the proposal with respect to the handpicked 75,000 men.

Within the last few days there has been set up a system of examinations to be given to persons in colleges, and on the basis of that examination they are going to be retained in college or they are going to be sent into the Armed Forces.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Did the committee take into consideration how the number of students to these various junior colleges and universities would be affected by this program? How many junior colleges would have to go out of business?

Mr. KILDAY. There is where my 18½ comes in. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said, the average age for admission to the freshman year in college is lower than the average for graduation from high school. Oddly enough, that is the fact. It runs something around 18 years in graduating from high school and it runs somewhere between 17 years and 1 month and 17 years and 4 months in the freshman year in college. That is a fact. Probably the boys who acquire education easier in the high school go into college younger. I suppose I have seen every college president of the United States within the last 90 days; some of them in committees, some of them by representatives and what not. All that I have talked to agree that at 18½ the average college student will be able to complete his sophomore year, and that will take care of your junior colleges completely.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Could the program be worked so as to utilize the facilities, the buildings, the plants of the junior colleges, and of the universities so that they would not have to close them down?

Mr. KILDAY. Certainly, it can; in the plan to be submitted by this commission that can be done. Now, let me go ahead. I have a whole lot more important things. The gentleman is very well taken care of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question in that regard?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would the 24 months' service required be counted in on the training that is set up in this National Security Training Corps if it went to a college? Or must we depend upon a plan that may be submitted by this commission?

Mr. KILDAY. The 24 months in college would not be counted as military service.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the commission came in with a plan, would they be compelled to submit the plan for a 24 months' period for selective service as required in the first part of the act?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; it is 26, not 24.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then let us say 26.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will pardon an interruption. I think he has been misled by the statement. It is 6 months' training under the UMT program; that is all the plan would call for, a 6 months' training program.

Mr. KILDAY. I thought he was talking about the university now.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did you make any study as to the length of time it would require to train men and prepare them for combat? You have provided in the bill that they should not go into combat for a period of 6 months.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is the committee of the opinion that that is sufficient time in which to train them?

Mr. KILDAY. I never knew an Army commander who felt that a man ever had enough training. Every one of them was always training, training, training his men.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But we do provide that at the conclusion of 6 months' training period they could be sent out of the United States.

Mr. KILDAY. We were sending them with less training than that, but we have increased it by 2 months as a margin of safety.

Now I want to go back to the question that was raised yesterday about the announcement made on yesterday or Sunday, at least, within the last few days, that men now in college may have the right to apply for an examination and on the basis of that examination it would be determined by the Selective Service System—the papers to be graded by somebody; I do not know whom—and if they received a score of 70, they would be deferred. It is, of course, contemplated, as the bill requires, that one deferred for that purpose must eventually do his service, and it could take him up until the time he was 35 years of age.

The objection has been made to this announced program that it prefers the man capable of sending his boy to college over the one who is incapable of sending his boy to college. I agree thoroughly; that is a grave disparity; it is not a uniform service required in this emergency and during a shooting war, and it would permit one capable of going to college to get into college, take the examination, and stay out with the hope that within the time that he had to do his 6 monhs, as compared to the present 26 months, there would be no shooting; that if there was still shooting he would have to do his 26. But things are going to get so much better or so much worse that they are willing to gamble—and there are such people in certain parts of the country—he would delay his service, perhaps reduce it by 20 months if the war was over. That, of course, is a very valid objection to the program announced; I disagree with that program thoroughly and completely. And I have another disagreement with it which is equally fundamental, in my opinion, and it is the same objection I voiced in permitting an agency of Government to select the 75,000 to study the sciences, the healing arts, and the humanities. At the proper time I propose to offer an amendment substantially as follows—it will appear on page 46, line 13, immediately following the word "board":

Strike out the quotation marks and insert the following sentence: "Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no person shall have his induction postponed or deferred by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the result of, or on the basis of, any test, examination, selection system, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by any agency or department of the Federal Government."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman, in my judgment, strengthens his bill very materially by inserting that amendment in the bill; however, they should not have made necessary the offering of the amendment. This announcement should never have been made.

Mr. KILDAY. They should not have made necessary many things in the last 10 days.

Mr. COX. It should not have been made because in the future there might be justification for making some deferments.

Mr. KILDAY. Let me explain the amendment. The amendment leaves the law as it at present stands.

Mr. COX. That is all right.

Mr. KILDAY. The boy in college will be deferred on the basis of the subject he is taking just as it has been ever since 1948 act was adopted, just as it always has been under the 1940 act; and the law will remain exactly the same as it is. Our educational system will be free from selection or domination by an agency of the Federal Government. Whether a boy goes to college will depend on the ability of the parents to send him, as

has always been the traditional American system.

Another provision—and this would be amusing if it were not so serious—provided that the Federal Government, at its expense, should undertake the rehabilitation, mentally and physically, of every boy subject to this service found to be substandard, either mentally or physically. That is probably the greatest social-service program ever proposed to the Government of the United States. Of course, I will argue that no further because it is not in this bill.

Mr. COX. The question is, Who is making those proposals?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, there was a provision in the bill which our committee considered that would have set up this kind of a program and our committee rejected it.

Mr. KILDAY. Why, certainly, and we rejected it. We rejected every one of these objectionable features I have referred to. You may be sure this is one bill coming before the House that has been written by a committee of the House and not by an agency of the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell us who sponsored those proposals before the committee?

Mr. KILDAY. By the time they got through we had so expressed ourselves that they ran out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Somebody must have been before the committee sponsoring such proposals and social changes. I think it would be very interesting to know who.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not recall any particular witness.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it in the hearings?

Mr. VINSON. The bill sent up by the Pentagon in the first instance was supported by the Defense Department. It was supported by the Madam Secretary.

Mr. COX. Do not try to defeat your bill.

Mr. VINSON. Let the country know it. There is no secret about it. We rejected it all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it in the hearings?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, it is in the hearings.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It will be interesting to read it.

Mr. KILDAY. Frankly I do not recall. Mrs. Rosenberg testified for it, as I understand.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. She testified for it?

Mr. KILDAY. But this bill does not depend on the testimony of Anna Rosenberg or I would not be here defending it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the committee had gone over this bill and rejected many of these provisions, then provisions, then proceeded to write a bill. ceeded to write a bill. All of us who have served so closely with the military and who have watched this committee perform know the make-up of the chairman and the various individual members. The question naturally arises, in view of the work that has been done and the extent to which the committee went, why it did not go a little bit further and in connection with UMT write it in the bill itself instead of proposing that a commission bring the provisions to us. I do not know who is going to be on the commission. I know who the members of this committee are, and knowing them as I do, I feel that they could probably have done a pretty good job of setting up a very precise program.

Mr. KILDAY. I am coming to that point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testify before the committee?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right. I think they were all there.

Mr. GROSS. What was the effective age stated, 18 or 19?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, they all said 18.

Mr. GROSS. All said 18?

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, sure they did. Of course, General Hershey said 18. General Hershey loves 18-year-olds. At that age they estimated 450,000 soldiers, when you got down to 19, 750,000, and at 21 years of age it fell down to 500,000 soldiers, and General Marshall said, referring to the figures presented in the Senate by the Assistant Secretary, he took no stock in the numbers racket; he wanted 18 year olds, because they were good soldiers.

Now I have shown you the things proposed and which we have eliminated from the bill. Any similarity between this bill and the Pentagon bill is purely coincidental. We wrote this bill ourselves. I think that we all agree on the extension of the draft phase of it. The question then arises of adopting the UMT program at this time. Some Members have spoken here as if, for some reason which has not existed during my service in this House, there is going to be a termination of the present tense situation in the world and we are going to have calmness and peace throughout the world. I have not seen that happen in the past and I do not know why we should expect it in the future. We must be in a position, after Korea—and this is not based necessarily on Korea—after Korea I think any reasonable man is going to have to suppose that the tense situation will continue in the world probably for an indefinite period of time. The gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, mentioned various periods of time that different ones had proclaimed. I believe he quoted General Eisenhower as saying 30 years or more. But, I do not think you have to be an expert in Foreign Affairs to realize that the condition now existing will continue for a long and indefinite period of time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say, too, that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs seem to question many features of this bill. I note that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have not been so alert about the Korean situation and the policies and a lot of matters that have given this Nation and our people a great deal of concern. They certainly have not been on the ball to bring to the attention of the Congress the conditions that have been existing, so I do not see any particular reason why they should charge into the affairs of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KILDAY. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, maybe some of them will vote with us.

Mr. GAVIN. They have plenty to do to look after their own affairs and let us handle the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KILDAY. We must all assume that it is going to be a long and indefinite period of time. We cannot continue to maintain under arms 3,462,000 men, if you want to go into figures of that kind. The 4,000,000 figure was mentioned here and I might say in passing that it got into the debate because the Senate bill happened to contain that limitation. So in that respect it is before the House. It is in the stricken out portion of the bill. We cannot continue to maintain such large numbers of men under arms in this country. It has never been our traditional policy. The traditional policy that has existed since George Washington's army has been to maintain a very small Regular Establishment capable of rapid expansion by the use of the militia and the civilian population. We must get back to that system or bankrupt the Nation. We cannot continue to withdraw from civilian pursuits this tremendous number of men. And we have to do it in an orderly fashion. There is not going to be a period of months and years within which we can formulate a system and get going.

Remember, now, that this provision for the National Security Training Corps can come into effect by Executive order of the President or a concurrent resolution of the Congress, either of which would find that the draft is no longer necessary for service, but you will still have that number of men in the Army who were the last taken in, and you will have that period of time in which to get your corps started and your reserves coming out.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have never in my long service in this House said a thing or done a thing that might have a tendency to deceive the Members of the

House. Since even yesterday, with 30 enemy planes coming over in Korea, with the massing of troops in Korea and Manchuria, and not all of them Communist Chinese by a great extent, I say to this House in all earnestness and in all seriousness that it is my firm belief that we are in greater danger of an expanded war today than we have been at any time since the close of the World War in 1945.

Before this debate is over, especially under the 5-minute rule, I am going to claim the attention of the Members to tell them some things that I know that they in all probability do not know yet. But this complacency—this winning of a little battle in Korea—had better not lull the American people to sleep because I think that we stand in the face of terrible danger and maybe the beginning of world war III.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I applaud, of course, what the Speaker says, but, in my judgment, the worst sin that we can possibly commit against the public security is to lull the people into a sense of false security.

Mr. KILDAY. We have seen that happen many times in the past. The gentleman and I in our service in this body have seen that happen. This is the time, in an orderly fashion, to set up a permanent defense system for this country. No longer can you do as Washington did and call in the civilians from their blacksmith shops and their plowshares. They are going to have to be prepared, and you do not have 2 years to get ready any longer. You have to do it on the spur of the moment. It has to be done without any delay.

We have all seen in our lifetimes, except some of you younger men, two world wars where we had as much as 2 years to get ready. We can never hope for that in the future. We have to get our citizens prepared to fight wherever it is necessary—maybe in our own streets.

So I say this is the time to set up this system; this is the time to pass both of these in an integrated bill which can be started by Congress and stopped by Congress, and which remains within the complete control of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hope during the remainder of this debate we will find a calm, deliberate, and prayerful consideration of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I simply cannot understand it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] always and invariably takes great delight in taking a dig at me. Always on the floor of the House, in public and in private I have said only nice and kind things about him. But anything complimentary I have ever said about him, I now publicly retract totally and completely.

He does not have to hunt for trouble to find it. I should thank the gentleman for complimenting me. Why, I am so powerful and mighty that I am responsible for World War II, because I opposed the draft before Pearl Harbor. I voted against it. It was passed by only 1 vote, at a time when you had an overwhelming Democratic majority. I would do it again under the same circumstances. You said then that if you were given this draft measure for peace it would prevent war. You said, "Repeal the neutrality law." Who passed the neutrality law? President Roosevelt recommended it and the Democratic Congress passed it, and I voted for it. I can now hear JOHN MCCORMACK shouting and shaking his finger, saying, "Repeal this neutrality law and it will bring peace." You did repeal it. Then you came and said, "Repeal the arms embargo." Some of us did not want to send weapons made in America to destroy people all over Europe. You said that we should repeal the arms embargo and that it was a measure for peace. You did repeal it. I voted against it, as I did against the repeal of the neutrality law. Then Great Britain said, "Give us the weapons and we will do the job." First it was cash on the barrel head. Britain was going to pay for them. Then they ran out of money and they said, "Repeal the Hiram Johnson Act and give us credit. Sell it to us on credit because we do not have the cash to pay for it." We did. You Democrats demanded repeal of the Neutrality Act and repeal of the Arms Embargo Act and give Britain munitions. So we sold to them on credit and we furnished them the money. We made munition millionaires and piled up a back-breaking debt. They were not satisfied with that, so they said, "We do not want you to just give them to us in New York but to deliver them to us on the docks in Europe." You remember that.

Of course the gentleman from Texas wants to forget Yalta and Potsdam. I do not blame him. You remember my vote in opposition to the draft, but you want to forget Yalta and Potsdam. You would forget Yalta when the President of the United States, broken in mind and shattered in body, incapacitated and irresponsible, with that great adviser, Alger Hiss, a convicted perjurer and traitor—yes, maybe you can forget that but a lot of Americans will not forget. We can never forget. You repealed the Neutrality Act. You repealed the arms embargo. You sold not for cash on the barrel head, but you sold on credit and then you started delivering the goods by armed merchant ships. We armed our merchant ships and we were in the war before Pearl Harbor, but a man on horseback with a faltering memory cannot remember. We were shooting in the Atlantic before Pearl Harbor ever took place. We know that now. That is why Winston Churchill said, "All that I hope and pray for is to get America into this war."

In 1916 your party kept us out of war, and returned to power by the women in California, the first in the Nation to vote, believing the slogan, and yielding to emotional pressure, "He kept us out of war." Then, within a month after his second inauguration Woodrow Wilson had us in it.

In 1940, defying third-term tradition, because the fathers and mothers of America were promised "again and again and again" that their sons would not have to fight on foreign soil, another Democratic Administration was returned to power. Now we are in a police action in Korea. I hope our beloved Speaker, when he takes 5 minutes under the 5-minute rule, will tell us just how we got into it and when we are going to get out of it. We have overrun Korea three times and blasted it to bits. Surely the Koreans, with all the missionaries we have sent carrying the Christian religion to them, are going to love us, are they not? Do not forget we already have suffered nearly 60,000 casualities; more than in the War of 1812, Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War combined.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] knows as well as any man in this House that not only I, but every Republican, voted for every single appropriation on this floor after we got into the conflict, and voted for them since World War II ended. It was the Eightieth Congress that passed the unification bill. It was the Eightieth, "do-nothing, good-for-nothing," Republican-controlled Congress that set up the National Security Council and the National Resources and Development Board. It was the Eightieth Congress that passed a law for the 70-group Air Force, that was cut back by Louis Johnson and Harry Truman. It was the Eightieth Congress that voted for the construction of a supercarrier, which you canceled. We voted for a ceiling of more than 2,000,000 men but we were 600,000 short at the Korean crisis.

Now, I am getting a belly full of this stuff. When you jump on me, sir, you jump on the wrong man. I want to read what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said in our committee when General Marshall appeared the first day, after I whispered to a colleague that it was a shot-gun wedding, tying Selective Service and universal military training together. This was on January 23, this year, and you will find it on page 25 of the hearings on universal military training. This is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said then. Oh, he was bold and brave that day. He was a courageous Texan. He said:

> General, as you know, I have from the beginning supported universal military training and I feel that we could have gotten it in 1945 had the Department under your direction gone along with something similar to what you have here of a period of service, 4 to 6 months, rather than your insistence at that time that it be no less than 1 year. That is where we lost our bill.

This is PAUL talking. This is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]:

> But I have never felt that we could get universal military training in the back door or under the table. You have to get it straight across the table, openly, frankly, sincerely. And I think it is absolutely essential to our well-being, but I think the people are going to have to support it and you are not going to be able to tie it to an emergency and get it that way. You are going to have to have to get it as an open, above-the-table matter, and not go in through the back door.

He talks one way in committee; he talks another way on this floor. He

blows hot and cold in the same breath. He goes up the hill today and down it tomorrow. I do not know when to believe him. But at least we agree on one thing. I am glad he said it in his speech, because on September 17, 1945, when I stood in the well of this House—and there were only two or three of us with guts enough to speak our minds against quick demobilization—read the whole speech. We were in danger of losing the fruits of victory after the expenditure of so much money and so many men. On September 17, 1945—it will soon be 6 years—I said this among other things:

I do not like to see 18- and 19-year-old boys drafted; in fact, I think that is one of the mistakes we made in this war. I never did think they were essential and I think we could have won the war without them. We were told they were needed because of their boldness, their daring, their resiliency. I know they were good in combat; but the casualties were high, they were enormous and terrific.

Now, you are not trying DEWEY SHORT when you vote on this bill. Forget personalities. Listen to logic and follow reason.

What I have said has been very unpleasant and distasteful to me, but when I have tried to be nice, and kind, and gentle, to have someone try to give me a dirty dig—well, I think you all know how I feel and where I stand.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is very unfortunate that my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has made the emotional speech that he has just made. The gentleman has made some statements about history which are inconsistent with the true facts.

The gentleman refers to the Neutrality Act that this Congress put through during the Spanish conflict. Those of us who were here in those days knew what we were doing; we all knew of the terrific situation and fighting that took place in Spain some years ago when, under the so-called Loyalist banner, the Communists were trying to take over that country and make it another Communist nation. We then put through the neutrality law of those days because the so-called Loyalist forces in that conflict were the only ones who controlled the seas. Those who were fighting communism in the Spanish conflict had no ships; they did not have access to the Atlantic to come to our shores to buy munitions, clothing, and food. The only ones in that conflict who could have got the benefit of purchases in America would have been the Loyalists or the Communists, and we deliberately passed the Neutrality Act in those days so that the Communist forces in the Spanish conflict could not have the benefit of our markets. Later on, when Hitler came across the horizon, that Neutrality Act was harmful to those nations that were fighting Hitler and were beneficial to the destructive forces in the days preceding World War II and during World War II, and cash-and-carry and other provisions that were approved in the Spanish conflict then became adverse to our national interests with Hitler in the saddle.

The fact that no foreign ship could come in here and make purchases, no foreign ships could come in here to transport goods, was harmful to our national interest. So the Neutrality Act was to our interest in the Spanish conflict but it was inconsistent with our national interest in the days preceding World War II when Hitler was on the march. That is the reason we were trying to repeal those harmful pieces of the Neutrality Act. They were inconsistent with our national interest.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make that explanation because Members who were here in those days know that those of us who voted for the Neutrality Act in the Spanish conflict did so deliberately so that destructive forces in that conflict would not have the benefit and the advantage of purchases in the United States. When we voted to repeal that act, it was on the same basic proposition that the foreign policy of our country should not be such as to help the destructive forces in any conflict.

I remember well the vote of 202 to 201, yes, 2 months before Pearl Harbor. I lived 200 years in three-quarters of an hour. I stated several weeks ago and I repeat now, impugning the motives of no one, just as good Americans as I am but sharply disagreeing with their judgment, that those who voted against that bill seriously erred in their judgment. When Pearl Harbor happened, if our country had lost its sovereignty and our people had become the slaves of Hitler, the same force as communism, I wonder what would have been the conscience of those who voted "no" 2 months before Pearl Harbor. If I had voted "no" and my vote was harmful to my country or had lost my country's freedom, I doubt very much if I could live with my conscience.

I say all this in these brief few minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the Members, not as Republicans or Democrats, but to each and every one as Americans, with our individual responsibility as Americans, not as a Democrat or as a Republican. It goes above allegiance or party affiliation but comes under our citizenship as Americans. I beg of you in these days to think and if you are going to err to err on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I am certain the distinguished majority leader does not want to make any statement that would convey an incorrect impression about the bill passed in 1941, which he refers to as an extension of the Draft Act. If he would refresh his memory, he would find that the sole purpose of that measure was to extend the 1-year training period of men drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1940 to 18 months. The 1941 bill did not terminate the Draft Act of 1940 at all. In fact, the bill of 1940 was for 5 years. It was passed on September 16, 1940, but there were no inductions under it until the last week of November 1940. I am advised by the Selective Service Department that only a few men had been inducted by December 7, 1940, which was 1 year before Pearl Harbor. To be exact, only 20,000 men were inducted between the last week of November 1940 and the end of the year 1940. The public drawing of the first draftees did not take place until October 29, 1940.

Under the circumstances if the bill to which the majority leader refers had been defeated, inductions under the 1940 act would have continued without interruption and no inductee would have been eligible for discharge until the last week of November 1941. Moreover, the very few who would have been released by Pearl Harbor day would have been subject to recall to active duty when war was declared.

Bear in mind that the act of 1940 provided for only 1 year of service for those inducted under it. The extension of service provided for in the 1941 bill was requested by the military authorities on the representation that more than 1 year was required to properly train those who were inducted under the 1940 act. In this connection it should be pointed out that some of those who were contending in 1941 that a year's training was insufficient, now feel that 6 months' training is adequate.

In the light of these facts the conclusion is inescapable, that those who claim that the passage of the Service Extension Act of 1941 by a margin of one vote saved the Nation from disaster are either endeavoring to mislead the members of the committee or they are wholly unaware of the true facts. I am sure, in this instance, it must be the latter.

(Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we are here today with a very important bill. It has been repeated here before that it probably is the most important bill that will come before the House in this session of the Congress. We are in a critical situation, in my opinion, in this country. I want to tell you how I came to vote for this bill in the Committee and why I intend to support and vote for every feature of the bill. In order to understand this we have to have background because unless you interpret the events of the last 33 years you will not have a clear conception for the need of a bill of this kind.

The first Selective Service Act of the United States was passed in 1917. Then the next one was in 1940. This Act was extended in 1941 and continued in force until the 31st of March, 1947. Then we passed a bill in 1948. So in all the time that we have been out of the shooting war for only one and a quarter years have we been without a selective service law.

It must be obvious, if that is the case in peacetime, we must be in some kind of a critical situation. It certainly is a dismal feeling to every single person in this House that after winning the greatest war in the history of the world in the most decisive manner a war was ever

won, namely, by complete and utter surrender of two great countries of the world, that we are still having to take men into the Armed Forces by law. The shadows of war began to stretch across this continent within 1 year after the war ended. Many of you do not remember this, but in the fall of 1945, I think it was, in the early part of 1946, we began in the Committee on Military Affairs to study the stockpiling problem, and on July 23, 1946, the President signed the stockpiling bill. Everyone here knows that you only stockpile in contemplation of a war; you do not stockpile in times that are peaceful and stable. So at that early date we had some kind of a warning that perhaps trouble was in the wind. As I see it, in order to understand what we are to decide in the next few days, we have got to go back to the first World War and see what happened. That was a war that some of us took part in. We were assured, and I believed it was a war to end wars, and after I had seen a little destruction for two or three months on the western front I was sure that there had to be a way to end wars. We had air power in that war. That was the first time that airplanes began to be used as a weapon in war, and every single technique that we had in the last war was started in the first one. We bombed, we strafed, we dropped bombs to harass troops, to took photographs, we did everything that they did in the Second World War but on a smaller scale. As I came out of that war I felt I could see that if any future conflict ever came, woe be unto the world, because the destruction as evidenced at that time, which was minor compared to what came later, was really terrible.

Then in 1918, when Alcock and Brown, two Englishmen, flew a plane from Newfoundland to Ireland, I could see that the world had gotten smaller and that it was being compressed into a very small scale.

I am frank to confess that I was one of those who believed in Woodrow Wilson's idea of a League of Nations, bebause I believed I could see then, and I can see more clearly today, that unless we have some type of collective security we could have a war that might destroy the great nations of the world. We must find some way to build a world of law, and it must be backed by enough force so that when decisions are made they will be obeyed.

We demobilized too fast in the first war. The troops were sent home rather hurriedly. We did not take our occupation job seriously, and soon we turned our backs to the rest of our allies and said, "We will go it alone."

It was only a few years, a little over 10 years, from the Disarmament Conference till the war clouds began to appear on the horizon again. A dictator was struggling in Germany to make headway with a demoralized country. As always happens, he emphasized nationalism, dwelt on their persecutions and sufferings, and said, "Follow me, and I will get the justice you are entitled to." They did not take him seriously. He finally invaded the Ruhr. In the pockets of the generals, we are told, were orders to retreat if resistance was offered. It was not offered, and the dictator went on and soon plunged the world into war.

Another dictator appeared on the horizon in Italy. He persecuted the people, and with ambition tried to spread the glories of the old Roman Empire. Pretty soon we could see that war was on the road. We all saw it. Did America get ready for it? She did not. It came right at us. Every person in 1939 to 1941 knew very well that that world war would finally engulf us, and it did. We did not get ready, we did not prepare, just as in the first war. We did not prepare for the war when it was coming right at us. The Secretary of War quit because we were so reluctant to get ready for the war that was advancing on us so hurriedly.

So in a second world war we still ignored the danger signs. We remained weak. We did not make the proper preparations. About the only preparations we made were to pass a Selective Service Act in 1940 and renew it in 1941.

Then the World War broke out, and it caused destruction beyond the wildest nightmares of any of the men who knew the arts of war. Nobody ever dreamed of such a blood bath as we got in that war. I do not mean America, but the world. It will be twice as bad next time.

Then, when the war was over and America had won it what did we do? As one of the gentlemen here told us today, we sifted through our fingers the strength we had by demobilizing headlong into weakness. We never saw such a sad thing, as I look back on it now, I am one of those who are responsible for it. I confess to it. I came back from the West in 1945. I saw the chairman of my committee, Mr. May. I said, "Let us find a way to rush the men out of the service." He said, "What do you suggest?" I said, "I suggest we break ourselves up into committees of three and go to every separation center that we can and try to force them to let the men out more quickly."

That is exactly what we did. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I traveled around urging them to get the men out and they returned the men to civilian life so quickly that they could not be carried away on trains and steamships.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Perhaps we can all take some responsibility for demobilization. But when the gentleman remembers that Germany and Japan, our enemies, were prostrate, and that our national policy was appeasement of Russia, it is rather difficult to go back and realize that we needed to have any forces because our Commander in Chief had the grand design of killing Russia with kindness at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is a great deal to what the gentleman says. I want to add this: Besides all these other woes, we had some very inept statesmanship and diplomacy which has gotten us into this terribly critical situation. I do not believe you can solve the problems of today by harping on the mistakes of the past. Let us learn something from our mistakes. Let us take a lesson from our failures and our weaknesses and our mistakes, and build with what we have today to make the kind of a world we want tomorrow. But I do think that the ineptness in our statesmanship and diplomacy should be called to the attention of the American voters at the appropriate time, when I hope that they will take steps to make a change so that we will not have these things again repeated.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman referred to the special committees with reference to demobilization. I was a member of one of those special committees which traveled all over the country urging immediate demobilization. As I look back, I realize it was a horrible mistake. The percentage of demobilization was even faster than it was in World War I. But as I look back on that it seems to me there was a touch of communism in the program to get our country prostrate even at that early hour and Russia had her finger in the pie.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think there is a great deal of truth to that, too, and we should have sensed it and taken steps to neutralize it. Anyway, here we are.

We have this bill and the 3,500,000-man force that we are being asked to build up is the concept of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to what is adequate to protect us under the present conditions. It is hard to prove that, like simply saying 2 and 2 makes 4, but that is the concept of the highest men and it is the combined judgment of the highest and ablest men in our Military Establishment. Also, in this bill there is a provision for universal military training. That is the thing which is causing all the trouble. In my opinion we have gambled in the past on our security. We have gambled on having allies who would hold an enemy at bay. We have gambled on time being in our favor. We have gambled on distance being in our favor. But those advantages are gone to a great extent today. We have no strong allies that can hold off a tough enemy. We do not have the time that we once had. Planes span the ocean every day. We do not have the cushion of distance between us and our enemies because we have annihilated distances with our new weapons and new types of planes and machinery. So, as I see it, the problem is this: How can America, how can the United States, get itself in the correct military position except by devising some scheme which will permit the inflow of appropriate manpower continually so that we will always know that men will be coming in to be trained and on whom we can rely quickly to help defend America in case of sudden emergency? It is something like this situation: Out in the West we have hundreds of acres of arid land on which not a thing can be grown without irrigation. What do we do? We build huge dams along the rivers. We dam up the water and in the summertime when the weather is right we bring the water through these irrigation ditches to the arid lands so that

we can farm those lands which, without irrigation, would be impossible to farm. We figured that out and built the West by the conservation of water. It is the same problem that we have in our military.

We must devise a similar scheme to have a firm flow of trained men in the military. I do not think there is anything backward, that there is anything underhanded or anything secret about putting this into the law now. When we are in this rather critical situation, when our minds are focused on the method and means to properly protect ourselves in the future, why should we not think of a national over-all military policy that will give us security? I cannot see that there is any objection to thinking about it now. Now is the time we ought to do it. This provision is an integral part of this bill. If we do not get that permanent policy it means that our build-up to a strong, virile Nation, that will perhaps hold off aggression, will not continue to maintain a strong place in the world.

One of the greatest men who ever served in the House of Representatives, Mr. James Wadsworth, whom all of the older Members know has been for this plan since 1915 or 1916 when he was a Senator from the State of New York. You have heard him expound it. He is no militarist. He does not want to militarize America. There are hundreds of our men, educators, the Governor of my State and men of that type, who are thoroughly dispassionate in their approach to the problem, who favor this measure. Our whole history has been like a fever chart. Once we build up and then we drop down and then we go up again. We go up fast and then we come down too fast. I want to see America get the proper equilibrium so that we will always have a flow of citizen soldiers, sailors, marines, and fliers, ready to go into action. I believe if we have this type of thing, the aggression which we fear today will not come. We can lick Russia. We all know that. But let us not lick her on the battlefield. Let us beat her before she starts. Let us scare her by our power, our efficiency, our production, and our manpower.

Just think this over: Since 1945 the Soviets have gone from a nation of 200,000,000 to a nation that now dominates 800,000,000 people in the whole world, and perhaps more today, considering the fact that they have their finger in China. They keep biting off a chunk here and a chunk there and a chunk here and a chunk there, and soon America will be facing them on both oceans and we will have to fight the battle entirely alone.

We have allies in Europe. It was my pleasure to be sent there by the chairman, and I want to say now that I do not know of a better man as chairman than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. He is a worker and he is intelligent. He compromises when he has to, and he sets an example for all of us. Someone has implied that he runs over us and disregards our rights and privileges. He does not do that. If you insist on your rights you will get them. If you do not insist on them you will get them. I know of no man in the last 30 years in this House who has seen all these ups and downs of the military who has done more for the national defense than the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON.

There is no freedom without security. We talk about our freedom, and that is the most precious thing we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. One out of every five and one-half of the men in this House is the first of his generation in the United States. That illustrates the wonderful freedom that we have and the opportunities that are afforded us. But I want to point out to you, and I wish you would all remember it, that this bill will be an economy measure. The 3,500,000 celing that we are talking about will cost $35,000,000,000. You know that the American taxpayer cannot possibly take care of an expense like that. You know that they will rebel, after a little while. By getting these trained Reserves, my idea of it is that they will serve about 6 months, get their basic training, and then they will go into the Reserves for 6 years.

Then we can reduce the ceiling of our professional soldiers. They are the ones that cost the big money. To train a National Guard man per year costs $624. To maintain a reservist costs $523. If the training were twice as much, which it may be, to keep them battle-worthy, we would soon save a lot of money. Furthermore, we will get about 500,000 men into our services every year, maybe more. In 5 years we would have turned out, therefore, 2,500,000 men and by keeping them battle-worthy in the Reserve training that we know will be properly developed we would have men then to replace the professional soldiers that we turned out.

This bill is the first time since I have been here when we have had a chance to vote on whether we want to formulate a permanent plan that will give a permanent solution to our security problems.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In reference to the gentleman's statement that this is the first time he has had a chance to vote on this matter, I would call his attention and that of the membership to the fact that during the Eightieth Congress this same proposal for a program of military training was unanimously adopted by the Armed Services Committee when the Congress was under the control of the Republican Party. But because of the imminence of adjournment that year the bill never came to the floor for consideration; so that this is not the first time that a bill of this nature has been submitted to the House for action.

Mr. JOHNSON. I understand that, but we did not get a chance to vote on it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman tell us why there is so much difference in this bill and the one that was reported back in 1946?

Mr. JOHNSON. Frankly, I cannot do it.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield, I will tell the gentleman. It is because this is not a leaf-raking bill, not a soil-conservation bill, not a CCC program bill, this bill is designed to have men trained for a military emergency should it arise. That is the difference between this and the other bill. There are teeth in this military training bill and that is what we need in this country.

Mr. TEAGUE. In my opinion the 1947 bill had teeth in it. The question was whether we should write our own bill or take suggestions that were sent down to us.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the plan when we finish with it will be a good plan, and it is our bill, written by my committee. If the plan they send down to us is not a good plan the committee will fine comb it and make it good. The purpose is to teach men to fight, to train them to defend themselves, to teach them how to fight, how to kill, even though that may go against the grain of our past thinking. If a man is suddenly called upon to do his supreme duty of defending America he must know how to protect his life; it is important to him. I hope he will never have to do it but that is what we are training them for, giving them the right to live and to survive in combat if it should come.

The program will also, in my opinion, be of great value for these young men; they will learn discipline, which, God knows, the children of America need badly; they will know how to get along with other people; they will learn how to subject themselves to reasonable rules; they will learn team play; they will do all these things that I believe are the things that we need in America; and, above all that they will have the satisfaction of knowing that they have sacrificed something of their time, their opportunities, and their talents—for what purpose? To make America secure, to protect America, where they are going to live and have their children. That will be a satisfaction that will go with them to the day they die.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Do you want to take 7 years to do it as this bill proposes?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; it will take about 6 months' training. Then they will just have refresher courses every year of from 2 weeks to a month.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is that authorized in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON. The bill just provides a general plan and the plan will be submitted to Congress. It is possible that after the Committee on Armed Services has had a chance to fine comb it and see that it is a proper plan some changes will be made. But it will not be sub-

mitted to the House for approval until it has had the considered judgment and approval of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is that the estimate of General Marshall or the lady who has charge of this?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is a composite discussion of what occurred there. I cannot give you all the details. You must have a little faith in the people who will be appointed as members of this Commission, that they will know something about the problem and use their common sense and intelligence in bringing it to fruition. We have provided for a Commission of five men, three of whom are civilians, two military men, one of whom will be a reservist and will understand the viewpoint of the reservist.

Mr. Chairman, this program is different from what we have ever had before, and it is better than any we have ever had before. We need something different in this changing world we are living in at this time. This is a program that fits the New World in which we are living. I predict, Mr. Chairman, that if we stay strong the aggressors will be very slow in attacking us and that ultimately we may get to the point where negotiations may be taken up and we can find some way to resolve our differences and go forward in a peaceful way. I am looking forward, like you are, to a world of law, backed by enough force to make those laws virile as our civil law is, and ultimately to a concept by all citizens that the only kind of a world to have is one in which the people have respect for law and order. That is what I hope this kind of a bill will bring into being, putting us in a position to expound and bring about a peaceful, law-abiding world. It is a tough, delicate, difficult job, but of all the countries this great Republic that has demonstrated it knows how to develop laws and to change them to meet varying conditions is the one that can furnish the leadership which will bring this about.

If we have an appropriate security system, I look forward to the day when we will not be worrying about an oncoming war; all we will have to worry about is to see that the system which we devise as between the nations will be one which will be workable and successful.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman spoke of looking for new ways to meet this terrible aggressive force. The gentleman also eloquently referred to the fact that in World War II we used many things developed in World War I. Among the things developed in World War II was the efficient use of an underground in enemy-occupied territory. Did the committee in its consideration, in addition to the allies we have in various parts of the world, consider the potential allies that we have in such places as China—the guerrilla army of China—and in such places as behind the iron curtain in Russia itself, the allies that may be there?

Mr. JOHNSON. That was not considered in connection with this particular bill, but we have had testimony on that subject, for instance, when we passed the CIA bill. I have heard that discussed by many individuals in open and executive sessions of our committee. In my opinion, there is a fair prospect that the underground in some of the countries behind the iron curtain may finally revolt, but remember that with the police state we have today revolution is made very difficult. Remember that Czechoslovakia developed a fine republican form of government and then learned that without security your liberties go out the window.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. In line with what the gentleman just said in reference to the possibilities of our allies behind the iron curtain, does he not believe that the present policy of the administration in trying to come to agreements with these gangster governments is such that we are to a very large extent abandoning those allies behind the iron curtain?

Mr. JOHNSON. There may be something to what the gentleman says. There is a lot of merit to his statement, but still I say it is pretty hard to get behind there and do anything effective.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I rise to call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that the gentleman from California who is now addressing the House is one of the combat pilots of World War I. He knows what he is talking about from the ground floor on up.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman very much for his complimentary remarks. Knowing his sincerity I appreciate his comments more than I can really express in words.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I respect the gentleman's judgment very highly, and I congratulate him and the members of his committee on bringing out this piece of legislation in the form it has been brought up.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, as I listen to the arguments being raised against this important legislation, I wonder if those arguing against it are truly familiar with the purpose and the title of the bill. This is no bill to prolong the draft and to establish universal military service and training merely in order to make ours an armed democracy, another Sparta. The times are too serious to permit of such experimentation. This is a bill, called for by the times, to provide for the common defense and security of the United States.

I grant, Mr. Chairman, that how defense and security are to be provided is a subject that falls properly within the scope of congressional consideration. Unless our Government is to become a military dictatorship, Congress must continue to exercise the authority assigned to it by the Constitution, and raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy. But the arguments over this legislation are not arguments over the authority of Congress. That is granted. The arguments over this bill are arguments, primarily over the need for defense. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the prolongation of the arguments, and the acrimony involved, can lead to no other conclusion.

This is a very sobering and a very saddening thought, Mr. Chairman, because it implies a decline in national morality and a diminuition in the patriotism for which Americans were once noted. In our colonial period, when danger of attack lurked in every neighboring forest, in the early days of our Republic, when enemy vessels sailed brazenly along our coasts, and even into our estuaries, Americans were not so indifferent to national defense. A century ago, when Great Britain built ships for the Confederacy, and France sought to establish a European monarchy in Mexico, the United States did not fail to recognize the danger to the security of our country, and to take steps to remove it. My reading of history does not tell me that Congress failed to support Theodore Roosevelt when he shook the big stick, or that Congress failed to support Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt in their defiance of Germany and the Central Powers. But today, there seems to be a disposition on the part of some Members of Congress to gamble with American security because the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have asserted the need for a larger Military Establishment. This disposition to deny the needs of national defense seems plainly a disposition to ignore the existence of danger. We are living in a time of danger and of crisis, and yet the disposition of many Members of this House is to do nothing but argue about it.

If this is true, the threat to our national security is compounded. It is dangerous to deny the existence of danger; it is even more dangerous to become complacent about national security. And yet I fear that complacency is becoming a national vice. Because ours is a large country, we think it is a strong country. Because ours is a free country, we think it is secure from all aggressive attack. Because ours is a rich country, we think it is invincible. Because in the year 1951, 150,000,000 people are citizens of the United States, we are not impressed by the fact that even 5 years ago 193,000,000 people lived in the Soviet controlled countries. Nor do we take note of the fact that in 1950, 795,000,000 people were already under control of communism, whereas there are only 725,000,000 people in the United States and all the free countries allied with us in the defense of western democracy.

Mr. Chairman, before we became complacent, I do not think we argued very

much about the need of national defense. We did something about it. Now that we have become complacent, we argue instead of acting. It is true that at one time we could afford a measure of complacency. Our situation between two oceans, and among the friendly democracies of the Western Hemisphere, protected us from immediate attack, and gave us time to prepare an offense in any war in which we became involved. This fact was true of the continental United States in 1941, in spite of what happened at Pearl Harbor. It is not true in 1951, as the U. S. S. R. reaches closer and closer to us, and the intercontinental bomber—which our enemy has, as well as we—makes what distance remains of less importance.

Mr. Chairman, last June we were called upon to fight a war we had not expected in a part of the world in which we had no strength, against an enemy we have not even yet been able to reach. And yet, in spite of the stern warning of that situation, and the heart-rending reversals our troops in Korea have endured, we are still arguing about the size of our Military Establishment and the obligation of all citizens to contribute to the strength of it, instead of taking steps to increase that strength while we still have time.

We are quibbling about the draft of men of 18 or at 18½, while men grow daily older, and the danger to all of us increases. As if 6 months in any man's life was important to a nation facing a threat to its very survival.

We are ignoring the considered opinion of the leading military experts of the Nation, on the size of the Military Establishment needed, in spite of the fact that Russia already has command of trained troops outnumbering ours by the thousands.

We are denying the democratic principle of universality of service—though our military leaders tell us that only by maintaining a constantly replenished reservoir of trained personnel can we hope to build a lasting defense with which to withstand the insidious, the recurring, and the unpredictable attacks of the Communist world.

Opponents of the bill raise, among other objections to it, the argument that it is a hybrid bill—one part, the part covering the draft, to meet an emergency; the other part, the part providing universal military training, a long-range proposition. Mr. Chairman, I say both parts are emergency measures—the draft for the immediate present; UMST for the lasting emergency into which previous failures to act have plunged us. If we had established UMST when George Washington asked for it, if we had established it in 1946 when President Truman asked for it, maybe we would have achieved a stable peace that would have permitted us to do away with UMST before now. But today we need UMST as an emergency measure—to guarantee our future and to save the United States.

Today we live in a period of tension of uncertain duration. True peace is something living generations may dream about and remember, but may never know again. Armed truce is something we may yet bargain for, as being preferable to war.

And yet neither war nor armed truce is necessary, so long as we maintain a posture of strength adequate to our defense and sufficient to discourage a would-be aggressor. If we are poor in manpower, in comparison with our enemies, we are rich in technical skill. And if we will substitute for complacency the firm resolve, the boldness in planning, and the consuming devotion to our country that our forefathers consistently displayed, we need not dream of peace, but obtain it. War is not a necessary condition of living, but the maintenance of strength is a necessary condition of living as freemen.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this legislation because it creates machinery for building our security. In the words of that distinguished soldier and able Secretary of Defense, the Honorable George C. Marshall, it seeks to "give us a durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of public alarm or complacency." It would provide for our defense, not for today and this year but for the future and the endless years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the separate provisions of this bill because I think each is essential in providing the common defense and security which is the over-all purpose of the bill.

I am for continuing the draft, so long as it is necessary to meet the present emergency, or to continue our posture of strength. I am for the provision of the bill that makes men of 18½ eligible for induction, because 18½ appears to be the median age at which there occurs naturally, in our society, a break between high school and college or work as the case may be. The average age of high-school graduation in the United States is 17½ years. The deeds of men of 18 in the War of the Revolution, the War Between the States, and the World War illuminate the pages of our history. Eighteen is not a basic dividing line on physical development or between adolescence and emotional maturity. Some men are mature and married at 18. Some are boys at 21. But 18 is an age by which most young men have achieved stamina, resourcefulness, and adaptability. An age, in short, as many leaders have testified, at which young men make excellent soldiers.

I am for the provisions of the bill that establish universal military service and training, because I believe that service to our country is a privilege and an obligation of citizenship. Furthermore, I believe that training in self-defense—not against the neighborhood bully only but against the international bully who threatens all nations—training in such defense is something that every young man has a right to demand that his government give him. I think, Mr. Chairman, that if we asked the young men of this country about universal military training instead of asking the oldsters we would hesitate less to provide it. Our high schools with their gymnasiums, their swimming pools, their football fields, their classes in physical education, good diet, and clean living are providing only a part of the training our young men need. The House bill would provide that extension of high-school training that would enable our young men to lead not merely healthy productive lives, but free lives, unhandicapped by fear of any man or any enemy.

Mr. Chairman, universal military service and training, with selective service to be operative when necessary, provides the most effective, economical, and democratic answer to the problem of defense, of security, and of peace in a harassed world. George Washington warned us that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Surely such vigilance, consistently maintained, participated in by all Americans, affords an opportunity for a resolute people to maintain their liberty at a reasonable price.

I cannot believe that any Member of this Congress, or any living American could be against this legislation if he keeps uppermost in his mind the purpose of it, "To provide for the common defense and security." This is no measure of expediency, but one of necessity—and the only possible insurance of our survival.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

(Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

UMTS PLAYS INTO STALIN'S HANDS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, UMTS, like most fair deal schemes since UNRRA, plays into Stalin's hands. This scheme for regimentation of American youth would be a sort of delayed-effect atom bomb on all America.

At one stroke it would wipe out the foundation of individual freedom on which our military security rests and at the same time poison the morale of the American people.

Still proponents try to sell this bill of goods as a weapon against communism.

This claim comes from the very officials whose bungling made Communist Russia a world menace. Yet, they now ask us to again take their advice.

And so I proposed first to explode the false claim that this scheme would strengthen our defense against communism. That hoax should no longer deceive Congress.

It worked with UNRRA in 1944—and Congress discovered afterwards that much or most of UNRRA actually went to strengthen communism.

It worked for the Acheson crew in 1945, when they dressed up Bretton Woods as a peace measure. Later, the individual who maneuvered Bretton Woods through Congress was identified as a Communist agent.

In 1946, the Acheson crew worked that trick on the so-called British loan—using a mantle of anticommunism to bulldoze it through Congress. Now we know that these billions expanded and entrenched English socialism, the halfway-house to communism.

In 1948, this emotional trick was used most blatantly when the House passed selective service.

Now Anna Rosenberg repeats this counterfeit claim:

It—

UMTS—

gives us our first solid hope of bringing the Soviets to the conference table in a serious mood to make peace.

This claim has been the trump card in the propaganda for every new deal foreign scheme since 1945. Yet, the Acheson-Marshall crew that offers it has nothing but blunders on its scorecard.

History tells us that he who blunders once in statesmanship will blunder again, and such blunders are as fatal as crimes.

For my part, I choose the intellectual level set by General Bradley. He has declared:

National defense is the only justification for UMTS.

Mr. Chairman, this House should not pass UMTS. It is unsound in at least five major respects, any one of which could prove fatal to the country. I discuss these perils briefly.

CONSCRIPTION HAS ALWAYS BROUGHT WAR

First, it would weaken America because it would propel us into war, yet sap our strength as hostilities result.

The history of all major nations which have adopted universal military training tells a single story. Each such nation went down the primrose path of military expansion, foreign war, defeat, and national decline. In France, Germany, Italy, and Japan, the consequences were the same. Always the rulers found it expedient to involve their countries in war in order to preserve their political power.

I challenge those who assert that this consequence will not result here to present some concrete evidence to support that claim.

The second way in which this measure would weaken America is equally significant.

UMTS WOULD END INDEPENDENCE OF CONGRESS

With this scheme in operation, the power and independence of Congress would soon cease to exist. Congress would almost certainly become a lackey for the military. This is a strong charge—but an honest examination of the facts of our political life today buttresses its accuracy.

This year the military departments will spend a sum equal to more than $100,000,000 for each congressional district in America.

Would the spending of such gigantic sums ever operate to reward or penalize Congressmen as they favor or resist the demands of the military departments?

To ask the question is to answer it. Money is power, and military men are human.

The military departments are headed by men who owe their position to the Fair Deal political organization—who must be expected to use their spending power to keep in office the Congressmen who do their bidding.

Mr. Chairman, add to the financial vote-pressure force the power to regiment the youth from every home and fireside in America, and you would have us on the threshold of a totalitarianism terrifying in its outline. No men can safely be trusted with such concentrated power.

If Congress is to exist free from domination and control by the military, universal military conscription must be defeated. For next to the American people themselves, an independent Congress is the only great bulwark of human freedom on earth.

UMTS HEADS US TOWARD SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. Chairman, the third reason why this measure would weaken America is that it would constitute a detour road into socialized medicine.

This measure contemplates that 90 percent or so of our males reaching 18 would be inducted into military service. Most certainly, they would be entitled to Federal medical care during that service—and more important—that service would create a base for future Federal medical treatment for illness or disability.

In another 20 years or less, most males of the adult population would be covered by governmental medicine. Socialized medicine would be here.

Here is the fourth way in which universal military training and service would critically weaken America.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT GIVE UP FREEDOM

This measure would deliver into the hands of this administration new and greater powers than Congress has ever before surrendered to the executive branch of this Government.

Here, Mr. Chairman, this proposal approaches the fantastic.

Not in 75 years has Congress or the people had less confidence in the competence or integrity of the executive branch of this Government than right now.

The American people do not trust this administration.

The majority of the membership of this Congress do not trust this administration.

The people are demanding that Congress not give this administration more power—instead, that Congress recover some of its responsibilities now in Executive hands.

Mr. Chairman, those who vote for universal conscription should remain silent in the future about administration arrogance and bungling. They know the record and makeup of this administration.

A surrender of our basic freedom to those in whom the American people have no confidence would be an inexcusable betrayal of responsibility. No Member can dodge that fact.

LIBERTY IS SOURCE OF FREEDOM

Mr. Chairman, the fifth reason why universal military training and service would weaken America is that it would strike a fatal blow to the heart of freedom.

Listen to the late Prof. John W. Burgess, of Columbia, long a leading authority on political science:

I cannot believe that the framers of our Constitution vested the power in the Government to raise and employ conscript armies for, and in, foreign war. It is the most despotic power which Government can exercise. It can be so exercised, at any moment, and on occasion created by Government itself, as to sweep away every vestige of individual liberty and put the last drop of blood of every man, woman, and child in the country at the arbitrary disposal of the Government.

Once this scheme became law there would remain no area of personal liberty not exposed to seizure by the state.

All rights could and would ultimately be swept away, unless the people were able to break the shackles and regain their liberty. Personal rights, property rights, and freedom of conscience would disappear as they have been swept away in other lands that went beserk when the menace of communism seemed at their door.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, it seems hard to believe that UMTS should have serious consideration. Never has a lesson been written so plainly on the pages of history as this one.

In the last 25 years, three great nations—Germany, Italy, and Japan—bewildered by terrifying propaganda on the perils of communism, surrendered their liberty to rulers demanding absolute power.

In each case, almost unlimited disaster resulted, not from the Bolshevik menace without, but from militarism and regimentation within.

With the blood of these disasters, identical in pattern with the Fair Deal's proposals, not yet dry on the ground, dare Congress lead the American people into the same ambush?

IS ROAD TO TYRANNY

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I remind this House of the declaration by Talleyrand to Napoleon, "You can do anything with bayonets, sire, except sit on them."

With the rapid obsolescence of modern weapons, Talleyrand's shrewd answer to Napoleon pinpoints the fatal flaw in universal military service today even better than it did 150 years ago.

If America continues on the road of all-out military expansion and unlimited meddling in the affairs of foreign lands, America is headed for permanent futile war.

Add continuous military expansion to the political attractions of war prosperity—and you have the virtual certainty of perpetual war and life without hope for America's children.

The American people are entitled to a better fate for their children than unmarked graves in far-flung futile conflicts.

What tyrant in all history has sent the youth of his country farther from their homes to die than recent Presidents?

This question measures the peril of putting more power in the hands of men who are moving us toward another bloodletting.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress betrays the American heritage if it approves the shackles of universal conscription and effectively destroys the strongest bastion of America's liberty.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have sat on the floor of this House all afternoon and listened to all the

speeches and I was somewhat amazed at certain of the utterances of these Monday morning quarterbacks. It is mighty easy to be a Monday morning quarterback when the game was played on Saturday afternoon. You can look back and say: Why didn't the quarterback call for an end-run in place of a forward pass? But it is a little bit different when you are down there on the benches as a coach, or you are out on the field playing the game.

These continual references to Yalta and Potsdam ought to be put in their proper place. Let us go back to March of 1945 when the Yalta and Potsdam agreements were made. How many of these Monday morning quarterbacks who are now finding fault with those agreements stood up on the floor of the House at that time and criticized or complained about them? There were very few, because the condition at that time was somewhat different from what it is today. It was in March of 1945, as I remember, when the Potsdam and Yalta agreements were made, not as a decision of the Department of the State or of the President of the United States but made as the result of a military decision by the Chiefs of Staff of the Allied forces.

They made those decisions on the ground of saving the lives of American boys, French boys, English boys, and other boys in the Allied forces. What was the situation in the Pacific at that time? Remember that this was before the surrender of the Japanese, and it was before the atom bombs were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. It was at a time when we were fighting on Okinawa, in the South Sea Islands, digging Japanese soldiers out of the fox holes with flame throwers, and when American boys were dying by the thousands. It was at the time that over 200 of our ships had been sunk by Kamikaze fliers in the South Pacific and we had found not adequate defense against them. Yes, we made the agreement with Stalin at that time to bring Stalin into the war. A million soldiers were on the line in Manchuria, a million Japanese soldiers were up there. When VE-day came, as it did come within a couple of months, and if those million soldiers on the Manchurian border were not engaged, they would have come home to the home islands of Japan, and there would have been a million more Japanese soldiers for the American soldiers to fight, and the military staff at that time said that if the scale of losses that obtained in the invasion of the home islands of Japan was the same at it was at Okinawa, that we would have lost half a million American boys at that time. Yes; we were anxious at that time to get the Russians into the fight because we did not know that the atomic bomb would explode. We did not know that the Japanese Empire would surrender on August 12. I want to point out further, they talk about the appeasement of Russia during those days when Russia was our fighting ally. Russia had 12,000,000 casualties and lost a million and a half men fighting the Germans. Yes, Russia was fighting our war as well as theirs at that time. There was reason for us to give lend-lease to Russia and be friendly with them. We did not know, of course, what would happen in the years that lay ahead after the World War was ended. We are all against her now, and rightly so. But at that time Russian lives were being sacrificed instead of American lives, and that may have had something to do with the Yalta agreement to get Russia into the fight. At the time the Potsdam agreement was made and the east-west line of occupation was drawn throughout Europe, we had not yet captured Berlin. We did not know that the Germans were going to fold in front of Patton's tanks and the other armies that were sweeping across Europe. We did not know whether there would be a last-ditch stand in the mountains of Bavaria or Berlin, and we wanted the Russian armies to go into the great city of Berlin and save half a million American lives, if necessary, as was true at Stalingrad with Russian losses when the Germans were trying to capture that city. Yes; the times were a little different then. No one arose in the House at that time and criticized the Potsdam or Yalta agreements because there were American lives at stake. Let us put these things in their proper timing, in their proper framework of time and military importance. It is easy now for the Monday morning quarterbacks to criticize the strategy of Saturday's game. Hindsight is always better than foresight.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I have often had occasion to criticize the present administration and I certainly would be one of the last to try to defend the present administration on a partisan basis or along partisan lines. But, when it comes to the security of my country, then I want to support that administration and certainly partisan politics should not be injected into this important debate. I have often criticized the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements and I intend to do so at the proper time, and I agree with the last speaker, the gentleman from California, that it has no place in this debate. As a boy at home and in school I absorbed almost all the reasons why universal military training was wrong, why it was contrary to American principles and ideals. Thus the idea was always abhorrent to me. Even today if I should listen to the beat of my heart, I would still vote against any universal military training measure. Many Members of this body must feel likewise. But, when endowed with a mind as well as a heart, dictates of reason should and must prevail.

After the year 1945 I began slowly but surely to change my mind about the various aspects of universal military training. The change in my mind was definite when in 1947 I introduced in the New York State Senate a resolution which would memorialize this body to enact a universal military training law. I felt then and I feel now that it would be the only peace insurance that this country could buy.

During the debate thus far I have heard arguments that universal military training does not cut down the casualty rate. Sure, I read the yellow sheet put out by the National Council Against Conscription. That same group, those same thinkers pinned my ears back when I introduced my resolution endorsing universal military training a few years ago. To that argument I say, is it not reasonable to assume that South Korea would never have been invaded, that our casualties now would be zero instead of 60,000, if 2 or 3 years ago this Congress had enacted a universal military training law? The least that can be said is that we would be far better prepared instead of being caught sadly unprepared.

I appreciate the fact that the Pentagon has had a strong hand in this matter. I realize in more ways than one that this is a Marshall product that is before us, but I do have confidence in the Armed Services Committee of this House. Certainly it would have been much better to enact this measure at a time of absolute peace, but did we do it? In 1945 and 1946 it was widely insisted that any action taken at that time might be dictated by the hysteria of war psychology. We were told to make haste slowly and let excited wartime feelings settle down before arriving at a decision. Well, wartime feelings did settle down. Our wartime Army was demobilized, but nothing was done when it should have been done. I am wondering how many men who were then Members of this body can now search their conscience and say, "I would have voted for it in 1948, but I am not going to vote for it now." How many can say that?

While I raise my voice today in favor of the general principle of universal military training, I, too, am opposed to lowering the age limit below 19. I am convinced that a successful program can be carried out without going below age 19, but this is something that is secondary and will probably be resolved and compromised before final enactment of the measure before us.

There are other items in the legislation before us that can be objected to, yes, but as I see it, the sole question before this House is whether or not we will properly implement our strong foreign policy which has been virtually agreed upon by the enactment of this legislation.

Three times in one generation this Nation has been caught unprepared, and on each occasion our isolationist feelings, our state of unpreparedness, did not keep us away from war. We have stumbled three times, and there we should have corrected our mistake after the first fall we did not. We cannot remake the past, but we do legislate for the future. Is it not only fair, is it not only reasonable that we try universal military training as peace insurance? Of course the idea of compulsion is distasteful. There is no moral satisfaction that by law we shall compel the youth of our land to learn how to kill as well as to keep from being killed. There is no moral satisfaction that for the first time

in our history we must resort to compulsory conscription, but we do not live in a world of our own choice, of our own comfort. We are faced today with an implacable adversary who does not and will not understand our honorable intentions unless these intentions are backed by unquestionable might.

Even the enactment of this bill and of a universal military-training program will not be a guaranty against war, but we will be prepared. Those of you who are lawyers know that it is easy to talk settlement when you walk into the courtroom with your case prepared.

If settlement is not reached, whether it is in a courtroom or in international affairs preparedness is essential and certainly very helpful.

Mr. Chairman, each day we pray for Divine guidance, but I think we pray that our minds be guided and not our hearts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under normal conditions it is perhaps advisable to accept the advice of one's elders. By the same token one could assume that under normal conditions in Congress the views of the experienced Congressman should be accepted rather than doubted. However, the bill under discussion demands individual consideration by each Member, young or old, experienced or inexperienced.

I enjoyed listening to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] but as he proceeded with his argument I became more skeptical of his views. Speaking in the vernacular, I kept asking myself: "What's his angle?" The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] answered my question in his opening remarks when he said:

> There is no man who is foxier, more astute, or resourceful than the gentleman from Georgia. He has a barrel of tricks and no one can tell when he will pull one from the bottom of the barrel to upset his opponent. This is not to indict him as a master of artifice or chicanery but to prove that the gentleman from Georgia is always determined to win his point.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country are not interested in having a haphazard draft bill thrown at them so that the gentleman from Georgia can win his point.

I have not been a Member of this body long enough to become involved in any factions, if there are such. Nor am I owned or dictated to by any organizations. Although I am a member of the American Legion and admire the many fine things they have done, I am not obligated to vote for this bill. Although I have a long Methodist background, I am not committed to vote against universal military training. I am only interested in the facts and after receiving same my uncalloused conscience will exert all the pressure necessary for me to vote my convictions.

This is not a partisan argument. It is not a military argument, but rather a problem affecting every American. In fact as I see it there are two problems to be considered: One is of a temporary nature, we all hope—that of getting prepared quickly enough to defend our way of life; the other problem is after we have handled the temporary one—what must be done to guarantee America's protection in the years to come. Our future problem is one of economics, morality, and, yes, even survival.

Now is not the time to decide whether universal military training is the solution to our problems. Now is the time to make ourselves strong and secure in the present emergency.

Last week during the recess I received the cooperation of the county school superintendents in my district and through them arranged to talk with hundreds of 18-year-old high school senior boys and their parents. I felt that if the boys were old enough to be drafted they were old enough to be told why they are needed. It was encouraging to learn that the young men are willing to be drafted when they finish high school even though they may be only 18 years old. However, neither they nor their parents want the military to have sole jurisdiction in determining their future. The military has lost so much prestige in the last year that it is impossible for the American people to have the confidence in them to turn every 18-year-old boy into their camp.

I believe it is entirely possible for the Armed Services Committee to write a selective service bill that will guarantee a strong defense, raise morale, be economically sound and equitable to all persons affected. It is possible to work out a training program in conjunction with educators that will not discriminate against the not-so-intelligent boy or the financially poor chap.

As Mr. Mel Hartley, editor of the Lorain Journal, said and I quote:

> The time has come to end all wishy-washy procedure concerning the draft. Parents and youths of draft age want a definite program set up and followed so that young men of the Nation can know in what direction they are going. Congressmen face the duty of prompt and intelligent action.

I am confident the Members of this House who speak for the people can meet this challenge if the gentleman from Georgia will have his committee submit a bill to this House free of any universal military training entanglements. At a later date he can likewise through his committee submit a bill written by the committee providing for a national preparedness corps. Then the people through you, their representatives, can express their opinions and determine our future course.

We must consider first things first and in my opinion the selective service bill comes before any long-range military program.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 5, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against William L. Patterson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, No. CRIMINAL 1787–50

To Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, *of California, House Office Building:*

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at United States District Courthouse in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 5th day of April 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson.*

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN,
*Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 5, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against William L. Patterson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, No. CRIMINAL 1787–50

To Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, *of Minnesota, House Office Building:*

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at United States District Courthouse in the city of Washington, D. C.,

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 6, 1951
For actions of Apr. 5, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 61


CONTENTS


AAAct.....10
Adjournment.....7
Auditing.....6
Cooperatives.....1
Education.....13
Farm program.....20
Fibers.....15
Flood control.....23
Foreign affairs, aid...5,19
Grain.....5,19
Housing.....2
Information.....9
Labeling.....15
Lands.....14
grazing.....16
Military training.....8
National defense.....9
Nomination.....1
Personnel.....4,12
Reports.....6,9
Research.....17
Taxation.....22
Tobacco.....11
Transportation.....3,24
Water, utilization....18,21


HIGHLIGHTS: Senate received nomination of Farrington to be Cooperative Bank Commissioner. Sen. Ferguson criticized employee-loyalty program. Sen. Hickenlooper objected to criticism of U. S. for not giving wheat to India. House debated military-training bill.

## SENATE

1. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Robert L. Farrington to be Cooperative Bank Commissioner of FCA (p. 3466).

2. HOUSING. Continued debate on S. 349, the defense-housing and community-facilities bill (pp. 3433, 3440-56, 3463-6).

3. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Stennis criticized a recommendation by the Defense Transport Administration that load limits on public highways be relaxed (pp. 3433-6).

4. EMPLOYEES' LOYALTY. Sen. Ferguson urged that the employee-loyalty program be tightened by providing for discharge of employees who were formerly (but not necessarily at present) disloyal (pp. 3456-9).

5. INDIA AID. Sen. Hickenlooper stated that Russia and China are being commended for selling grain to India, but that the U. S. is being criticized for failing to "donate wheat, without even being accorded the privilege of buying, for our dollars, certain strategic supplies which India has in abundance" (pp. 3463-4).

6. AUDIT REPORT. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the audit of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs for the fiscal year 1950; to Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (p. 3427).

7. RECESSED until Mon., Apr. 9 (p. 3466).

## HOUSE

8. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military training and service bill (pp. 3468-99).

9. REPORTS. Received from the President the First Quarterly Report of the Director of Defense Mobilization, and the report of the Munitions Board on the National Industrial Reserve (p. 3500).

Received the Fourth Semiannual Report of the U. S. Advisory Commission on Information, regarding the foreign informational program (p. 3500).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

10. A.A.ACT. H. R. 3552 and H. R. 3554, by Rep. Sasscer, Md., to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3501).

11. TOBACCO. H. R. 3553, by Rep. Sasscer, Md., to amend the tobacco-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3501).

12. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3545, by Rep. Wier, Minn., to decentralize and improve administration of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3501).

H. R. 3556, by Rep. Klein, N. Y., to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement on full anuity at age 55 after 30 years service and with optional retirement at reduced annuity after 30 years service when age is 50 years or more, but under 55; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3501).

H. R. 3557, by Rep. Klein, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide a full annuity computation for employees involuntarily separated after having rendered at least 25 years of service; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3501).

H. R. 3559, by Rep. McCormack, Mass., and H. R. 3560, by Rep. Shafer, Mich. to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, and to define its duties; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 3501).

13. EDUCATION. H. R. 3543, by Rep. Celler, N. Y., to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require that at least 25 percent of the regular program operating schedule of each commercial television station shall be devoted to noncommercial education programs; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 3501).

14. LANDS. H. R. 3540, by Rep. Berry, S. Dak., to provide for boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3501).

15. FIBER PRODUCTS LABELING. S. 1267, by Sen. Green, to protect producers, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of fiber content in spun, woven, knitted, felted, or other manufactured fiber products; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 3428).

16. GRAZING. S. 1269, by Sen. Chavez, directing the issuance of a grazing permit to Harry A. Mosimann; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 3428).

17. RESEARCH. H. R. 3536, by Rep. Corbett, Pa., and H. R. 3538, by Rep. Denny, Pa., to provide for research into the health hazards of air pollution; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 3501).

18. WATER UTILIZATION. H. R. 3544, by Rep. D'Ewart, Mont., granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Mont., N. Dak., and Wyo. for utilization of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3501).

NORTH CAROLINA

Susie I. Ledbetter, Mount Gilead, N. C., in place of J. H. Ledbetter, deceased.
Charles Braxton Craven, Ramseur, N. C., in place of J. R. Steele, retired.
Berdis R. Stone, St. Pauls, N. C., in place of W. J. Butler, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Charles W. McNeil, Mott, N. Dak., in place of W. T. Wakefield, retired.
Vivian M. Hilden, Reeder, N. Dak., in place of J. F. Ford, retired.

OHIO

Harry F. McLaughlin, Carrollton, Ohio, in place of E. F. Lawler, retired.
Warren D. Huffmyer, Cortland, Ohio, in place of J. K. Dilworth, retired.
John Bennett Burford, Farmdale, Ohio, in place of G. F. Burford, retired.
Charles R. Kline, Medway, Ohio, in place of M. C. Rees, resigned.
Howard R. Thompson, Piketon, Ohio, in place of G. J. Stoll, resigned.
Donald P. Auxter, Seville, Ohio, in place of C. L. Hewit, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Lorraine S. Fogarty, Guthrie, Okla., in place of G. J. Martin, retired.
Homer Schneider, Hitchcock, Okla., in place of G. T. Wilkinson, transferred.
Francis B. Bordenkircher, Jennings, Okla., in place of E. B. Simpkins, transferred.

OREGON

Harry E. Way, Aumsville, Oreg., in place of A. E. Bradley, resigned.
Velma F. Evers, Elmira, Oreg., in place of E. D. Smith, resigned.
Chester L. Langslet, Klamath Falls, Oreg., in place of B. E. Hawkins, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert W. Ecelbarger, Big Run, Pa., in place of H. F. Ecelbarger, deceased.
Charles J. F. Ellis, Connellsville, Pa., in place of L. M. Clark, deceased.
Patrick N. Lindner, Enon Valley, Pa., in place of E. G. Watt, transferred.
Louis S. Heins, Huntingdon Valley, Pa., in place of R. M. Montayne, resigned.
Willis P. Kiehl, Mayport, Pa., in place of Harry Reinsel, resigned.
Carl F. Hynek, Jr., Meadowbrook, Pa., in place of F. M. Rorke, resigned.
Guy V. Kingree, Smoketown, Pa., in place of G. L. Brookmyer, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Willard F. Martin, Pukwana, S. Dak., in place of H. F. Evers, transferred.

TEXAS

Edgar L. Coale, Angleton, Tex., in place of A. J. LeRibeus, resigned.
Frederich W. Wiedner, Cibolo, Tex., in place of E. H. A. Schlather, retired.
Frank C. Newbrough, Hargill, Tex., in place of Foster Stewart, retired.
Kenneth L. McAdoo, Higgins, Tex., in place of L. G. Sherrieb, resigned.
Lillian Belle Burke, La Villa, Tex., in place of Harold Sparks, removed.
Genevieve J. Short, Machovec, Tex., office established January 26, 1948.
John D. Yoakum, Milano, Tex., in place of Louella Elam, removed.

VIRGINIA

William B. Newton, Ellerson, Va., in place of B. H. Garrett, resigned.
William E. Phillips, Gladys, Va., in place of R. C. Morgan, retired.

WASHINGTON

Sanford M. Lord, Kelso, Wash., in place of T. H. Van Noy, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bob Henderson, Sistersville, W. Va., in place of J. C. Archer, retired.

WISCONSIN

William R. McCarville, Darlington, Wis., in place of N. M. DeMuth, transferred.

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 5 (legislative day of March 26), 1951:

### POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Willie Mae Green, Uriah.

ARIZONA

May E. Roebuck, Tiger.

COLORADO

Dorothy R. Arko, Royal Gorge.

FLORIDA

Mildred F. Thornton, Ormond Beach.

GEORGIA

Louise S. Drum, Franklin Springs.
Philip R. Bradford, Lavonia.
James T. Bray, Scottdale.

KANSAS

Alvin L. Helin, Brewster.
Paul P. Mudd, Gorham.
Lauren Holt, Hoyt.
Omer E. Landry, Zurich.

KENTUCKY

Raymond D. Stigall, Danville.
Rollie R. Bell, Philpot.

LOUISIANA

Garland Bond, Denham Springs.
George M. Scott, Varnado.

MAINE

Gardner C. Grant, Cherryfield.
Ernest H. Niles, Monmouth.

MARYLAND

Joseph H. Johnson, Cardiff.
Laura McC. Lee, Perryman.
Jane V. Thume, Trappe.

MICHIGAN

John H. McFarland, Jr., Alma.
Mancel J. Wintermute, Deckerville.
Frank C. Middel, Detroit.
Carl Knepp, Fairview.
John C. Lane, Galesburg.
James Post, Grayling.
Melvin E. Lietzke, La Salle.
William J. Johnson, Leland.
Ivan J. Payne, Middleville.
Clayton R. Ramsay, Mulliken.
Earl Willey Kenrick, Onaway.
Robert W. Crawford, Otisville.
Stephen J. Doster, Plainwell.
William A. Wright, Tecumseh.
John Youngs, Vandalia.

MINNESOTA

Robert E. Kennedy, Ah-Gwah-Ching.

MISSOURI

Alice Rhodes Sharp, Gideon.
William J. Onder, Mapaville.
James F. Roberts, Martin City.
Levi Judson Henry, Jr., Ravenwood.
Argyl E. Kistler, Stella.

MONTANA

Glenn L. Buckingham, Terry.
John R. Vickers, Virginia City.

NEW YORK

John Eugene Robson, Bovina Center.
William A. Murphy, Irvington.
Norman S. Wilber, Mount Tremper.
Francis V. Leahy, Newark.

NORTH CAROLINA

Auburn E. Andrews, Banner Elk.
Birdie W. Twombly, Barium Springs.

OHIO

George F. Graf, Findlay.
Michael J. Belardine, Mingo Junction.
Cyril S. Gladden, Mount Gilead.
Mark R. Seaman, Peebles.
Reva J. Snowden, Rutland.
Fred P. Jung, Twinsburg.

OKLAHOMA

Edward G. Foster, Talihina.
Roger W. Butner, Wewoka.

OREGON

Chester R. Merrill, Hillsboro.
Bernice I. Denson, Seneca.
Treva K. Reiss, Weston.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jack Kiser, Hungerford.
Robert Schneider, Scenery Hill.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Easton M. Rice, Calhoun Falls.
Earl S. Dozier, Marion.

TEXAS

Earl G. Saxon, Boerne.
Alfred W. Johnson, Cayuga.
Letha M. Garrett, Center Point.
Donato Flores, Hebbronville.
Alla B. Poynor, Kamay.
Mary A. Thomas, Leggett.
Claude B. Pottinger, Lott.
Una M. Watkins, Markham.
Nicholas F. Miller, Waelder.

VERMONT

Harley W. Hutchins, Alburg.

VIRGINIA

James A. Mills, Bayside.
Henderson B. Harris, Berryville.
Aylor Richardson Stone, Blairs.
Grace M. Autry, Denbigh.
William R. Stamper, Elk Creek.
Carson H. Turner, Laurel Fork.
William H. Gillespie, Monterey.
Byron P. Lambert, Richlands.

WEST VIRGINIA

Addie M. Burnett, Crum.
Erma E. Keeney, Eastbank.
Wayne S. Myers, Ravenswood.

WYOMING

Michael J. Koski, Newcastle.

# House of Representatives

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Vernon Yearby, pastor, First Baptist Church, Midland, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, great God, in humility we recognize Thee as sovereign and boldly come to Thy throne of grace. We beg divine direction in these unprecedented days when our world is fear-ridden. We pray for a true sense of spiritual values when we see men's minds are warped, their faith damaged, and values are distorted. We bring these statesmen to Thee, asking that Thy hand may rest upon them to bring healing to this sick civilization. Grant these, our petitions, and may Thy mercy and grace be demonstrated in spiritual awakenings because we pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANFUSO asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

### CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 22, page 3396 of yesterday's RECORD, I am not recorded. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. SIKES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Evins | Multer |
| Allen, La. | Gamble | Murphy |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gillette | Murray, Wis. |
| Armstrong | Halleck | O'Konski |
| Bakewell | Heller | Powell |
| Barrett | Hill | Rains |
| Beall | Horan | Sabath |
| Bolton | Jackson, Wash. | Scott, Hardie |
| Boykin | Judd | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Brehm | Kearns | Shelley |
| Brown, Ohio | Keating | Sieminski |
| Brownson | Kee | Smith, Kans. |
| Buchanan | Kennedy | Smith, Va. |
| Burton | Kilburn | Tackett |
| Carnahan | King | Talle |
| Celler | Kirwan | Thomas |
| Chenoweth | Klein | Tollefson |
| Combs | Latham | Vursell |
| Coudert | McCarthy | Welch |
| Curtis, Mo. | McGrath | Whitaker |
| Dawson | McKinnon | Widnall |
| Deane | Mansfield | Wood, Ga. |
| Dingell | Meader | Woodruff |
| Dollinger | Miller, Calif. | |
| Dorn | Morton | |
| Engle | Moulder | |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had consumed 4 hours, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] had consumed 2 hours and 58 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will permit me to use 1 hour at this time.

Mr. SHORT. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, ranking majority member on the Committee on the Armed Services [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking forward to this opportunity for a long, long time, the opportunity to appear in the well of this House to discuss this particular bill, S. 1, as amended by the House.

Mr. Chairman, the bill has two fundamental purposes, the first, that of an extension of the Selective Service System.

Military drafts in the history of the United States are not new. We had military drafts many years back and in emergencies, but the modern draft—that is, the Selective Service System as we know it today—had its beginning in the First World War.

We entered the First World War with no Reserves and no Selective Service System. It was not until approximately the midpoint of the First World War that this Congress did adopt a Selective Service System and put it into effect. It was in full operation before the end of the war. We let it lapse after the termination of that war.

When the war clouds developed over Europe, when Germany attacked Poland and later on attacked France, we moved quickly to adopt again a Selective Service System which served us well when this country was engulfed in the Second World War.

It is significant, however, that the Selective Service System that we adopted in the year before we entered the Second World War was the first time that a peacetime draft law—that is, a law passed during time of peace for the Selective Service—was put on the books. Since then, of course, we have extended the Selective Service. We carried this act on the books for a number of years; then in 1948 we passed another major bill extending the Selective Service System.

Mr. Chairman, the use of younger men in military emergencies is not new. If you study the history of the world, you will find young men have always made excellent soldiers when they were used. Napoleon found that out in the course of his marches over the hills and valleys of Europe. This Nation found that out during the Civil War, when we resorted not only to 18-year-olds but to men much younger than 18.

If you will pardon a personal reference, it has not been long since I had occasion to drive out over the hillsides of Virginia to Haymarket, looking for the grave of one of my great-uncles. He was killed in the second Battle of Bull Run. When I uncovered the headstone and removed the fungus and growth of many years on it with soap and hot water, I discovered the fact that he had

been killed in the second Battle of Bull Run, a first lieutenant, at the age of 18 years, 3 months and 21 days. On both sides, both North and South during that war, 18-year olds did perform a magnificent job and were certainly entitled to the recognition which their age and their service and their valor gave to the history of this country.

I might make a further personal reference, if you will overlook it, in the fact that I, too, entered the First World War as an 18-year-old soldier; not as a colonel or a major, but as an enlisted soldier, and I know something about what the 18-year-old soldier can do from my own personal experience. I say to you today, Members of the House of Representatives, that sometimes I think we would be far better off here if the voice of the enlisted man was heard oftener on the floor of the House. I was an enlisted man. Sometimes they, too, can contribute a great deal to the discussions of the bills and the resolutions which we have before us for consideration. I would like to have, if it were possible, a statement from enlisted men alone as to what they think the 18-year-old man can do in a war and in a battle. I think it would be most interesting to the House of Representatives.

So much for the draft because, after all, that is not the serious feature of the bill. That is not the feature of the bill that has given us concern and trouble and major discussion at the present time. On the contrary, the feature of the bill which is of great interest to us, certainly, and concerns us, is UMT—that is, universal military training. Universal military training is something new to this country and yet it is not new to the discussions or to the forum or to the town meetings in the United States. It was shortly after the First World War that great patriotic organizations, like the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other patriotic and service organizations, thought the time had come in the history of the country, if we were going to stay out of war, that we should adopt some form of universal military training. Through the years these patriotic organizations have gone on record in their conventions, in their meetings, in their posts, in their discussions in favor of some form of universal military training. It was not until the Woodrum committee was officially set up, however, that we recognized the force and the contents of the argument for universal military training. I served as a member of that committee. We had hearings lasting 3 to 4 months, and I heard hundreds of witnesses take one view and then another view with reference to the need for universal military training in the United States of America. I came out of that convinced that the time had arrived in the United States to liberalize the burden of national defense by adopting some form of universal military training. As inventions and mechanical contrivances have been perfected and the world has, in effect, shrunk, and our problems have increased and our period of isolation has retreated further and further, we can no longer think of ourselves as a nation like an ostrich with his head in the sand. More and more I am convinced that if this country is going to stay out of another major war, if we are to make the country secure, we must adopt some form of universal military training.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. As one Member of the House who does not have the privilege of serving on the gentleman's committee, I would like to know if the gentleman is in any position to tell us just what kind of a system of universal military training should be adopted—that is, the general consensus or opinion of his committee. Should it be conducted for periods of 1, 2, or 3 months in the summer or should it be conducted in the high schools of the country, or just how does the gentleman feel we should do it?

Mr. BROOKS. I can tell the gentleman my own opinion.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. BROOKS. But the gentleman does not want me to speak for the other members of the committee.

I like the plan that they submitted to the committee several years ago. It was embodied later in the report of the American Legion and other service organizations. There were 16 weeks' basic training. Others may have a different idea.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that as a matter of concern to the Members of the House who are going to vote on this bill and vote on that portion of it to which the gentleman has just referred, we should like to get some idea of what the committee feeling is concerning this very subject. It is an important matter.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think that is the important thing. I think the important thing is the reports that are brought in here to the Congress and what this House decides it wants in the way of a program of military training. Under the contents of this bill, that is the way it will work out, that the Defense Department will bring us such a report and we will consider it, we will advise with it, we will act upon it, and then we will in effect decide what is going to be done.

Mr. HINSHAW. What is in the bill now in respect to universal military training? Do we have it on a "take-it-or-leave-it" basis when a report is filed, or what?

Mr. BROOKS. When the report is filed, it goes to the Committee on Armed Services. It is considered, and they have 45 days in which to consider it. After that the House can consider it by a simple motion.

Mr. HINSHAW. But not by amendment? We will not be able to amend the plan?

Mr. BROOKS. They must vote it either up or down. If the House does not like it, then it goes back to the Defense Department for such changes as the Defense Department is willing to make.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. In connection with the question raised by the gentleman from California, may I say to the House that I propose to lay before the Committee on Armed Services for its consideration Monday or Tuesday of next week a change in reference to the plan submitted, that when the plan is submitted to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate it will be open to amendment by the committee, and when the plan is submitted to the House it will be open to amendment by the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that is a very reasonable proposal.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to lay before the committee another thought, that the commission immediately after it is appointed, within 6 months from the date of its appointment, must submit to the Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate its plan, and that after the plan has been adopted by the House and the Senate, any time thereafter by concurrent resolution the plan can be changed or modified by the Congress.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank my chairman very kindly for those suggestions.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say further that that will enable the Congress always to keep complete control and write its own plan.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman intends to offer this proposal as an amendment when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. VINSON. I propose next Monday to respectfully request the Committee on Armed Services to consider as a committee amendment the statements I have just made to the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Very good, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank my chairman very much.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask the chairman of the committee this question: Is it your intention, then, that a plan will be considered in the same fashion in which the House considers all legislation?

Mr. VINSON. Absolutely, it will consider the plan and the plan will be open to amendment just as any other bill is considered by the House and the majority will of the House will prevail. That is fair and democratic procedure, and no Member of the House can possibly complain about that sort of procedure.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Then to the extent that the plan is adopted and goes into effect it will go into effect by action of the House.

Mr. VINSON. That is the plan that will have to go into effect. That is right.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And if the House does not act then nothing will go into effect?

Mr. VINSON. If the House does not act, the plan that they have brought up will go into effect. Otherwise the House must act within 60 days.

May I add further, of course, that the House can repeal this now by concurrent resolution.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Several weeks ago the gentleman from Texas and I were involved in a colloquy on the floor of the House in which the gentleman assured me, and I took his word and I believe he was sincere, that there would be nothing brought in in this bill which would lower the emoluments and the pay of the draftees, and those, as I understood, who were taken in under the provisions of this bill. I would appreciate it if that matter could be cleared up at this time because it is going to affect my constituents.

Mr. BROOKS. There is nothing in the bill to lower the pay of those purely under military control. There is nothing in the bill which will lower the pay of anyone.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is it the gentleman's conception that it would not affect the pay or other benefits of those who would come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. It would not affect the pay or the benefits of those in the Regular Establishment or in the Reserves. The only stipulation in reference to pay or emoluments is, you might say, of the men under the universal military training program.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot go along with any plan, I will say to the gentleman, which gives these boys who are taken anything less than what the regular soldier gets.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. I have asked the gentleman from Louisiana to yield because the gentleman from New York referred to a colloquy between us. If the gentleman will get the record he will find at that time he was speaking of the draft of 18-year-olds for service and that I assured him as one member of the Committee on Armed Services that I would oppose any provision for unequal pay for military service, and I felt the committee would sustain me in the proposition that any man drafted for service would receive the same pay as any other man drafted for service. But the theory of the Career Compensation Act was that there should be equal pay for equal responsibility in service incurred. This bill does not affect the pay under the Career Compensation Act of any person called for service. But as for those who enter the National Security Corps and are not subject to service and cannot be used for military service but must be used for training only, the pay is $30. That statement is in accord with what I said in my colloquy with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BROOKS. The history of the question of universal military training is known throughout the United States of America. It is well known because it has been debated and discussed not only in the Congress but outside of the Congress as much as any other proposal or any other debatable question in America today. So these things come to us today, not as someone said yesterday or the day before, without proper consideration. Not only did the Woodrum committee consider this, but the Compton commission studied it and leaders in civilian life gave their views and their conclusions in reference to universal military training. After it came from the Woodrum committee, the Military Affairs Committee of the House—this is before the consolidation of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs into the present Committee on Armed Services—took it up and had extensive hearings which ran over a period of several months. There are thousands of pages of hearings on this subject which anyone can study. During the Eightieth Congress we held further hearings before we reported out the Towe bill. By the way, the Towe bill was reported favorably without a single dissenting vote. Many of our members today who speak on both sides of the aisle were members of that committee and they failed to dissent from that vote. It came out by unanimous vote and was stifled in the Committee on Rules. I do not think it was exactly to the credit of the Committee on Rules that the bill was not permitted to come up for a vote on the floor of the House.

So at long last, after a great deal of debate and discussion throughout the country and in the House and Senate of the United States, at long last we will have an opportunity to vote on this subject, and the Members of Congress can stand up and be counted on universal military training.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wish the gentleman from Louisiana would explain the fact the training program to be created by the Commission appointed by the President will be a program of real basic military training. I am of the opinion many Members of this House believe the five-man Commission will prescribe rules and regulations of who shall be called and who shall not be called. This belief is not correct.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the bill uses the term "full military training."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Let me make an observation from my own experience. If I were called upon to train men for the military service in accordance with a military training program constructed on the floor of this House I would quit immediately.

Mr. BROOKS. We all know what basic military training is. Personally, I did not like all of this "squads east" and "squads west," but you may differ with me. What we want is a full and adequate military training program; the type which will save lives in time of war.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that the gentleman is chairman of the subcommittee that will handle the Reserve program which will tie in with the universal military training program, the National Guard and the Reserves, I wonder if you would want to discuss your thinking on that subject.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman there are a great many people concerned as to what program is going to be carried on after they have received basic training, and what kind of units they are going into. We are greatly interested in that.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much. Let me move on with what I have to say.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that when universal military training would be put into effect by a concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, the inductees would be subject to a 6-months' military program?

Mr. BROOKS. No. Four months' training, but 6 months' service. They cannot be sent overseas into combat areas before 6 months.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to read from the report that I have here.

Mr. BROOKS. The bill says "4 months' training."

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to clear that up, if I may. The report says that when the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution eliminates the period of service for all persons who have not attained their 19th birthday, then all persons who have not attained their 19th birthday will be left for induction in the National Training Corps for a period of 6 months. Why keep them in there for 6 months if you are going to train them for only 4 months?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Wherever in this report the word "training" is used, it means universal military training. Where the word "service" is used, it means drafting for the Armed Forces.

Mr. HARRIS. This is under the paragraph of initiating for universal military training.

Mr. VINSON. Six months for training, and no time for service.

Mr. HARRIS. Then he will be inducted for training for 6 months?

Mr. VINSON. He will be inducted for training for a 6 months' period, and the President has discretion to reduce it below 6 months, if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] asked a question a moment ago as to what was the plan—16 weeks, or whatever it might have been—and I understood the gentleman from Louisiana to say it was not outlined in the bill.

Mr. BROOKS. That is true. The training period is there, but there is no definite plan set forth in the bill. The plan is to come from the Defense Department, to be submitted to the Congress for its consideration and approval.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that the President cannot reduce the 6 months' universal military training period.

Mr. HARRIS. Then it seems to me that the answer to the question asked by the gentleman from California should have been "6 months."

Mr. BROOKS. I gave my own views that.

will yield, I shall. If the gentleman own views on that the gentleman for his in that way. Then the chairman presented it committee explained that he was of the to submit an amendment to the bill, if the committee approved it, on next Monday morning.

Mr. BROOKS. Now, let me proceed, if I may.

They ask why I have been so deeply interested in universal military training. I will tell the Members of the House why I am so deeply interested. I have always been interested in a strong Reserve program. UMT is merely a part of a strong Reserve program. I basically believe, fundamentally, sincerely, and honestly believe that the type of defense for the United States of America is a strong, efficient, consolidated, well-equipped and well-trained standing army of a small or reasonable size dependent on the international conditions. But behind it and backing it up, a well-trained, well-equipped, and well-organized, efficiently handled Reserve program; and I believe that unless we have such a program we do face the possibility that the country will go too far in the military line. I sincerely and honestly believe that the way to keep our country safe and sound in a military way is to have that type of defense.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Would the gentleman agree that this basic military training which he has mentioned could be given without disrupting the educational program?

Mr. BROOKS. If the schools will cooperate, and I am satisfied they will, it seems to me it might be handled in that way.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman tell the committee where General Marshall received his basic military training?

Mr. BROOKS. I understand he is a graduate of VMI. But going further into the Reserve program, I want to say that I have become interested and I have at times been able to conduct hearings on behalf of the Reserve program; and, as Members of the House know, I have tried to sponsor legislation that would support a strong and adequate Reserve program. I do not tell the House that I am satisfied with what has happened in the past in our Reserve program; on the contrary, I have been anything but satisfied. But as the years have gone by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just asked me a question about the Reserve program will agree and admit that we are making substantial progress. I do not think we are making enough progress, and I do not think we can make such progress unless we do adopt universal military training at this point.

We have a very good Reserve program. The Navy Reserve program, for instance, at the beginning of Korea numbered 1,200,000 persons; the Army program was around 1,000,000 people; the Air had had its own program for 4 or 5 years, but the programs were constantly shifting. The Navy program was fair; I am satisfied of that, but the other programs were shifting, they were changing, and in the Army we had merely a list of names to a very large extent unknown, not kept down to date, without proper contacts the organized and unorganized. Re- type of [illegible] it was not adequate or the country was en[illegible] to have to guarantee us the national se[illegible] to which we are entitled.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Doubtless the gentleman received a telegram from the Legionnaires in Indianapolis including the contents of a cable from Rome, I think it was filed by Commander Cope, saying he was sure after a tour of Korea and Europe that many lives could have been saved if we had had universal military training.

Mr. BROOKS. I think perhaps we would not have had a Korea today. I will go further than that and say that in my opinion if we had had universal training some years back we possibly would not have had a Second World War.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman referred to the 1947 Towe bill, saying it was reported out without a dissenting vote on universal military training.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SUTTON. And the gentleman said there were thousands of pages of hearings on it.

Mr. BROOKS. I said there have been tens of thousands of pages of testimony taken on the subject of universal military training.

Mr. SUTTON. Did the National Military Establishment oppose it at that time—universal military training?

Mr. BROOKS. The Towe bill?

Mr. SUTTON. Universal military training.

Mr. BROOKS. The Towe bill was supported by the Defense Department.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield, but then I must proceed with the discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wish to say first that I want the gentleman to understand I am not opposed to the idea of universal military training, although I am opposed to the way it is presented in this bill. I object to the subject of military training being tied on piggy-back to the draft bill. What I would like to know from the gentleman, who is a very learned member of this committee, is whether all of the problems attendant to any program of universal military training have been ironed out by the committee, such as: Are you going to give these boys who are given 6 or 8 months training under universal military training GI benefits? If not, why not? If you do, how much is it going to cost? I think those are things that the Congress should know.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that he has a distinguished war record. I am sure he is very proud of and the State of Mississippi is proud of his war record; but I can tell the gentleman from Mississippi that I am close enough to the people of Mississippi to know how they think and I can tell the gentleman from Mississippi that down in his native State of Mississippi they want adequate national defense. They want it whether it is piggy-back or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, [illegible] gentleman will let me determine what t[illegible] want down in Mississippi, and I will let him [illegible]rmine what they want in Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gen[illegible]man is an able and conscientious Repres[illegible]tative from Mississippi and I hope he will go along with this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman answer the question I asked, Are we going to give GI benefits to them?

Mr. BROOKS. Certainly I would give GI benefits, but under the terms of the bill we propose that that be worked out and submitted back to us for discussion and decision.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will recall we discussed in committee the question of GI benefits for the youngster under universal military training and I recall we decided to leave it in the hands of the commission, hoping the commission will come up with a program of other than GI benefits.

Mr. BROOKS. We are not going to take these young men out of the schools and out of the homes and not give them adequate protection against disease, injury when they are on an errand of this sort for the people of the United States. There is going to be more legislation than that one matter come up behind this bill. There is bound to be more legislation to follow through as that program develops, as it should develop, into the greatest bulwark of protection for the people of the United States of America.

Going back to what I had in mind in reference to these reserve programs, we had no reserve program in World War I. We entered that war with nothing but a very small standing Army and nothing but the protection the European friends gave us, allowed us time to develop an Army and later on send that Army over to fight.

As we entered World War II we found that our reserve program was not anything to be proud of. The individuals

in the program were capable, efficient, and patriotic people and they did a magnificent job for the United States of America; but we did not have an adequate reserve program. We cannot boast or be proud of what we had. There were many troubles and difficulties in the reserve program. For instance, they found that we had 110,000 officers, practically all officers, available, physically fit and of proper age to serve the country; but that is all we had at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And the reserve program was very poorly administered, was it not?

Mr. BROOKS. At that time?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. We had a most inadequate Reserve program. Does that answer the question?

Since the Second World War, I w[illegible] to say something about the Re[illegible]ve program. When these me[illegible]ame out of the service we sought to interest them in a Reserve program. We got a list of names that totalled two and a half million, which sounds like a very formidable force in the Reserves, but it was not formidable at all because the program was not backed up with adequate training, equipment, and support from Congress as well as support from the Military Establishment. We did not have what we should have had. Why, for instance, the Congress under the inactive training pay bill allowed only enough money for 900,000 reservists out of the two and a half million.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman agrees we had no Reserve program and the gentleman recognizes also that although the chairman of our great committee has asked the Department of Defense over 2 months ago to come up with some kind of a Reserve program, they have not come up with any program as yet, is that not right?

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania they are ready to come up whenever we are ready to hear them. We hope as soon as this bill is out of the way that the subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, with the consent of our chairman, will proceed to hear the Reserve program which they have to present to us.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, the gentleman quite agrees that the Members of the House who are interested in UMT should also be interested to know what kind of a Reserve program the Department of Defense is going to present, and therefore I think we should advise the Members of the House what this Reserve program is going to be in view of the fact that it ties in with UMT.

Mr. BROOKS. That is true. I think we have a heavy duty to keep the House advised; and I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to tell the Members of this House that the chairman of this subcommittee fully understands the Reserve program. He was instrumental in having one of the best laws passed, Public Law 810, that gives retirement pay to Reserve officers and National Guard officers. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] was the man who initiated that legislation. You can be sure of a guaranty of a good plan if the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is going to listen to the hearings and present the bill.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is very kind. I want to say this on behalf of the gentleman, that in his [illegible] he has been in favor of a st[illegible] preparedness program.

Mr. M[illegible]ER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. After the man is out of UMT or training program, does he automatically go into the Reserve program?

Mr. BROOKS. He will automatically go into the Reserve program.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. For how long?

Mr. BROOKS. For a total of 6 years.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Another question I want to ask that puzzles me. The testimony for the last 2 days has been to the effect that a plan would be brought in that we would have to approve here in Congress. It was said that no amendments could be offered to the plan as brought in, to change it. The chairman said this morning that he proposes to offer an amendment, a little sugar to sweeten it up somewhat.

Mr. BROOKS. That would be a happy solution.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say to the gentleman it is not sugar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, what is it?

Mr. VINSON. It is to get your profound wisdom to carry out your views.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When you gentlemen come to your profound decision, yes, because 2 days ago he said it could not be amended; we would have to adopt what they brought in here, and it is in this report right here.

Mr. VINSON. That is true, but I will answer the question in this way.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When did you come to that great decision, overnight, or did you have a dream on it, or somebody tell you something was not just right?

Mr. VINSON. After listening to the gentleman I thought probably there might be some merit in his suggestion, so I want to give the gentleman credit for changing my views on it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, you are so gracious.

Mr. VINSON. So this plan will be known as your plan, the Miller plan.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I appreciate that. I want to congratulate the gentleman for having a change of heart. I think the plan the House will write here will look like a bunch of Dukes Mixture.

Mr. VINSON. No; it will not. Let me make this statement if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The plan that will be submitted will be the thought of the commission. Then 435 men will contribute their thought, just like you do on any other bill that comes from the department. It will be open to amendment open to any thought that a majority on the Members of Congress not fair? the matter. Now Nebraska. Was it in

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Was it in the presentation?

Mr. VINSON. No; it was not in the original bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Why not?

Mr. VINSON. It was not, because we had not finished thinking on this subject.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, because I definitely cannot agree with my chairman on this.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. My understanding is that what he now proposes simply is to spell out in the law what all of us anticipated would be the actual method of treating this problem when we reach that point. There is no change in heart. It is spelling out definitely in the law what everybody thought would be the mechanics of dealing with it.

Mr. BROOKS. My purpose is to see that the country gets adequate defense. Now, this small thing or that small thing does not concern or interest me a great deal. If they bring down a fair program of military training, I am going to be for it. I think the greater part of the American people and the Congress, too, are going to be for it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will agree when the committee agreed to the five-man Commission we made sure the Commission would be controlled by the civilians?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. There are to be three civilians and two military men on the Commission, and one of the military has to be a Reserve officer. Did we not agree that before the program would be presented to the Congress and to our committee, the Commission would come to Capitol Hill and sit down with the Armed Services Committee for a preliminary study of the program?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course.

Now that we have discussed and agreed with the Miller plan, may I proceed?

Up to the present time we have gradually obtained appropriations for the Reserve program up to around a billion dollars a year, and the Reserve program is making progress, but it has not made the progress it should. When Korea burst upon the troubled world, what did we find? We found that we had about 2,500,000 names on our Reserve rolls, but, as I say, only 900,000 of those were receiving pay.

After Korea started, the emergency was upon us, and we had to call them into our Reserve program immediately.

This shows the vital necessity of having a strong, efficient, and well-trained, and well-equipped Reserve.

When we found we were in this emergency, what happened? We called on our National Guard. We called our four divisions of the National Guard and they have received months and months of training, good training, throughout the United States. We called out two guard regimental combat divisions and we called out some separate units of our National Guard. At the present time, we have called out roughly 30 percent of the National Guard. I might say that 80 percent of the Air National Guard has been called into active service in this emergency, leaving us, as you can see, practically no Air National Guard.

The Naval Reserve has been called. I do not have the exact numbers, but it is a goodly percentage at the present time. The Marine Reserve has been called out completely, and has been sent in large measure overseas. I know that in my own home town within just a few short days after the war in Korea broke out they called out 253 reservists at one time, and within a short time they were moving toward the camps and to training and for overseas.

I want to mention the Army Reserve program. A large percentage of officers has been called at the present time and practically all of the Enlisted Reserve has been called, but the Enlisted Reserve program of the Army has not been developed as it should. To a large measure the Army Reserve program was one of officers and cadres, and very few enlisted men. That was one of our extremely weak points in the Reserve program.

As I said, I have spent long hours and lots of time on the reserve program. I do not believe there is any Member of Congress that has received more letters and more criticism from more reservists—organized, inactive, volunteer—all reservists in the United States, than I have received. Not a mail comes into the office but what we do not receive some word from some reservist somewhere who feels that he is in trouble.

I am not telling you that I have the answer to the reserve program. I do not tell you that I can give it a solution, and I do not tell you it has been handled right. I think great inequities have grown up, and unfairness, and injustices. But I do say that in presenting this program of universal military training to you here today we have the fundamentals of a program that can be made fair and equitable and just and adequate to the defense of a great power such as we have in the United States.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question about the Reserves, since he is talking on that subject now. In my community, Reserve Navy men are being called to duty who are essential to be deferred for the health of the community. There are hundreds of boys of draft age who are not being called. I have tried my best for the sake of the health of the community, to have them defer these boys and they say, "No, we need them." The people will not stand for that.

Mr. BROOKS. As I say to the distinguished gentleman I do not agree with that sort of procedure. I think these cases of injustice ought to be ironed out. When we give the country this universal training program, I think most of them will be ironed out.

If I may proceed, I want to show you another injustice and I think everybody will agree with me. When these men came out of World War II, after years of service in many cases, when they came out of the far Pacific and came back from Europe, we encouraged them because of their training and their experience and ability to enter the Reserves. What did we find when the Korean situation burst upon the United States and the world? We find in the Marine Reserve, for instance, that 90 percent of the Marine Reserve officers were veterans. They are men who have already served and fought for the people of the United States in the Second World War. We find that 80 percent of the Marine Reserve enlisted veterans are men who have already given the full measure of patriotic devotion to the service of their country. I do not have the figures on the other branches of the service, but I will say that these same percentages substantially will be found to exist.

So what are we doing in Korea? We are calling on the same men again, men who have already risked their lives on the field of battle. We are calling them again to go to Korea, and remain there an indefinite period of time to defend the people of the United States, our Government and our institutions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. If I understand the language of this bill, if its provisions are adopted, those reservists that the gentleman has just spoken of will be released at the expiration of 1 year's service?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true under this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, if they are veterans with 3 months of service or if they had 12 months of service between 1941 and 1945.

Mr. HARRIS. That applies both to the active and inactive reservists?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, and I will go further. Mrs. Rosenberg said that she realized the injustices that have been done, and it is her program and purpose to get them out of the service as soon as they can with adequate replacements.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman advise the House whether or not it is the intention of the military establishment to call into service more of these reservists, the inactive reservists who have not yet been called?

Mr. BROOKS. I have a letter which I am going to place in the RECORD—which I cannot read now because time will not permit—but in this letter from the Defense Department, the letter itself is the best evidence and you will be able to see it in the RECORD later. The Department says, that as far as the inactive reservists are concerned, it is the program where replacements can be found to relieve the men on duty and not to call any more inactive reservists.

Mr. HARRIS. And not to call any more inactive reservists?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My understanding of the question propounded by the gentleman from Arkansas was this: Will the 12-month provision permit the immediate separation from the service of all Reserves. Is that your question?

Mr. HARRIS. At the end of 12 months.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The 12-month provision in this bill provides that only volunteer and inactive reservists who have been called to active duty shall be restored to inactive duty at the expiration of 12 months.

Mr. BROOKS. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. If he makes application to be separated from the service he will be separated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS. The situation as it now exists is that by July 1 we will have called in over 800,000 reservists who are largely, perhaps to the extent of 80 percent or 90 percent, veterans of the Second World War, men who have already done their duty, patriotic men who are willing to go into the reserve program to do it again if we had an all-out war; and in the event that we needed the total manpower of the Nation. They were glad to do it, but when you have a war in one part of the globe and you have a constant recurring series of crises throughout the world which needs an expanded Military Establishment over a long period of time, it is not fair, it is not equitable, it is not just that this Congress expect those same men who have fought in World War II to continue to fight indefinitely in Korea or serve anywhere else in our Military Establishment.

I believe in rotation. I believe the Department is on the right track when it says it wants to rotate. We ought to liberalize the burden of national defense, if you want to know the truth about it. No one man ought to be called upon to carry the full load. It ought to be diffused throughout the whole manpower of the Nation, within the proper age groups, and there is no escape from it. We come to a fair program of universal military training, and that is why I am speaking to you today. S. 1 will give us that program. S. 1 will call these young men out at the age of 18½ for 6 months' training. S. 1 will permit those of older age, who have not had prior service, to go ahead and do their part as they should in carrying the burden of citizenship. After all, the obligation of citizenship has its pleasures and its benefits and its advantages, but it has its burdens too, as we find in modern days. It will give those people who are overseas, who are bearing the burden of this Korean conflict, and who are or perhaps will be overseas in Europe under the resolution

passed by the Senate yesterday, a reasonable opportunity to be rotated out and to come back to their homes and families.

Now, my colleagues, those men have the right to life and home just as much as we have here in the House of Representatives. Because they are 6,000 miles away we do not hear their voices as loud as we hear other voices on the floor, but when those men come back, 800,000 of them, we will hear from them, and we are going to know that we have not been fair and equitable and just in the proper distribution of the burdens of citizenship in that group.

So I appeal to you today to support S. 1 for that reason. It will give us this uniform universal program of national defense. It will liberalize the burden of protecting the Government and will distribute it uniformly among all of the male population of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything in this bill pertaining to the veteran reserves that would prevent the President from calling them back into service 24 hours after they went out of service?

Mr. BROOKS. No. There is nothing in the bill on it.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In relation to your remarks about the injustices that have been accorded those reservists, has any plan been suggested other than the universal military training that offers any hope of being able to work out this solution.

Mr. BROOKS. No. No other satisfactory plan has been offered. Following the gentleman's question of a moment ago, when these men come out of the Reserves, do not think they are going back to reenlist voluntarily in the Reserve program. They are not going to do it. I get letters from them. They do not write me that as soon as they get out they are going back into the Reserve program. They write me that when they get out they are going to stay out. I have not, to this hour, heard from a single reservist who was a veteran of World War II who has said he is going to go back into the program when he gets away from Korea and gets back home.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], I think that the answer to that is that the inductees will fill up the ranks and provide for the rotation system. The UMT will not do that. The defense chiefs tell us that they were building up the inductees and training them to have available a pool now to begin replacements in Korea.

Mr. BROOKS. Now, let me follow through before I have too many interruptions.

The point I am getting at is that we have 800,000 of these men in active service. When they come back they will be well trained. We do not want the Reserve program to fail. If they do not go into the program or are not placed in it, where is your Reserve program going to be? You will find yourself someday with no Reserve program. The Congress of the United States, unless it acts, may wake up some morning and find it has nothing to protect the United States of America except the regular Military Establishment, and our Reserve program is going to be completely wiped out. That is going to be the way it may work out unless we provide this alternative.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You want to protect your veteran reservists in their right to return to their homes and enjoy life as we do here in Congress. Why not provide in this bill that they can resign from the Reserves without making them subject to recall within 24 hours?

Mr. BROOKS. We cannot leave our country stripped of its defenses. I would not want to have them live like we do here in the Congress, I may say to the gentleman from Iowa; I would give them a different type of life if it were left to me.

But what I am getting at is this, here we are with another crisis coming up in the world. Our great Speaker took the floor yesterday and told us about the situation which he had learned from immediate first-hand contact with our military chieftains. I woke up this morning and heard a report from London that troubled me a great deal, the report that there were some 3,000 Soviet planes massed in Manchuria and apparently ready for combat. I read further in the morning paper that MacArthur had been given authority to bomb in China. Then I looked at the papers of 2 days ago and saw where our Mediterranean Fleet had been doubled in size. Then I read in a paper a few days older than that where some potentate in the Middle East had been slain and a little later where his successor had been the subject of several attacks on his life, and in both cases the men were friendly toward the democratic powers of the world, and that is apparently why they were attacked. I know that Soviet planes in use at Korea at the present time are not the best Soviet planes. When they bring these new jets, we may find that some of our planes are outstripped by the new Soviet jet planes. So I say that this is a critical time in the affairs of the United States and in the affairs of the world and we cannot hesitate or vacillate; we must go forward.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Right at that point, does the gentleman know of any reason why we would expect to have less than a force of about 3,500,000 under arms in the next 10 years, say?

Mr. BROOKS. The program is 3,500,000 for the present. But if we can build up our Reserves, then we can cut down our Regular Establishment; and that is the program advocated by George Washington, the father of his country. That is the program advocated from time immemorial throughout the United States, that in a democracy the proper method of national defense is a reasonably small regular establishment with a strong reserve from the citizenry.

Mr. VORYS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, but what I am trying to get at is this: We hear talk about 3,500,000 for this year; I wondered if the experts before the gentleman's committee or on the gentleman's committee had any idea that we were going to be able to have within a period of 10 years, the period that President Hoover and General Eisenhower have mentioned as a period of tension that we must be armed to the teeth, what possibility is there that we are going to have any force less than 3,500,000 during the next decade?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed beyond the hour and that I may yield him five additional minutes; and I should like to make a little observation myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question and it should not take him more than a minute to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. My question is, Has the gentleman or his committee any information that would make any of us believe we are going to have need for less than three and one-half million during this period of tension which we have been told may last for 10, 20, or 30 years?

Mr. BROOKS. Certainly this program provides that as our reserves are built up in power and efficiency the regular establishment will be reduced perhaps a million or more.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that it was testified by General Marshall he hoped world conditions would not get any worse and that if we inaugurated a UMT program and built up a reserve, then he would be in position to reduce the standing force. I say to the gentleman, and I say to the House, that if you inaugurate a worthwhile military training program and have a sufficient force, 500,000 or 700,000 just as soon as they are available you will see the standing force reduced in proportion to the number of reservists who will take their places.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about this—the American people will not permit this Nation to become weak during these perilous times. They will demand protection, as they have the right to demand, and that protection will either be a large standing Army, or an adequate, well-trained Reserve. We propose the creation of a strong Reserve—constantly maintained by freshly trained men who have completed a period of 6 months of universal

military training. Our proposal provides security. It provides security at far less cost than the maintenance of a large standing force. And it provides security with far less disruption of American lives. Which do you prefer? Keeping our World War II veterans on active duty and drafting men for 26 months of service; or a system by which young men can be trained for a short period of time and then returned to their communities for normal peacetime pursuits and a reasonable Reserve obligation.

I suppose it is natural for a general and an admiral to want to command more and more men. I have even known Congressmen who have wanted to enlarge their constitutency. But it seems to me that we ought to pause here for a moment and consider just what UMT means to the generals and the admirals.

As the size of our Reserve increases, the size of our standing forces will decrease. That is the economic justification for UMT. And, let us give credit where credit is due. As the size of our standing forces decrease, the need for general officers and increased rank decreases proportionately. No; Mr. Chairman, instead of criticizing our military leaders for favoring UMT, I think it is time we gave them the credit that is their due.

UMT has also been called a foreign ideology. I never knew that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other patriotic organizations sponsored un-American ideas. It is the first time I have ever heard Dr. Conant called un-American. It has surprised me to hear that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison embraced a foreign philosophy. And, contrary to all of the laurels that have been heaped upon him, it is the first time I ever heard George Marshall accused of favoring the destruction of democracy.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the American people are thinking a bit ahead of some of the opponents of this bill. I believe the American people, being realists, want preparedness. I believe they want universal military training. And I, for one, will support this measure without reservation. If it is undemocratic to favor national security, then I am undemocratic; if it is un-American to favor UMT, then I am un-American; if the proposed bill is a shotgun marriage, then I can think of no better honor than to be the best man; if if this bill is an unholy alliance, then the preservation of freedom and liberty is grim mockery.

Let those who oppose preparedness now, as they did in 1940, and again in 1948, explain their actions to posterity. For me the course is clear—preparedness now—or disaster later.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Under this bill will we not abrogate our powers and let the executive department carry them out so far as sending troops abroad, or anything else, is concerned?

Mr. BROOKS. No; we do not. We retain more congressional control under this bill than we do under the Draft Act of 1940 or the Draft Act of 1948. We provide for civilian control and congressional check on it, too.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does this give the President the right to send troops to Europe without the consent of the Congress?

Mr. BROOKS. This does not touch upon that point whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday our distinguished and beloved Speaker took the floor to tell us that the situation in Korea is much more serious than we think and that in due time he will give us information which he says the most of us probably do not have.

I do not know what the Speaker plans to tell us. But I think it appropriate to inquire why this grave information has not been given the House Committee on Armed Services.

If there is anything that is bipartisan, it is our national defense but the administration apparently does not want it that way. They would have us legislate in the dark until it becomes necessary to creat an atmosphere of panic and hysteria to accomplish the program they have in mind. When a key vote is about to be taken, when it is felt that the bill may take the form the majority of Americans want, they will then reveal to us something purporting to be grave and startling.

This side of the aisle recognizes the seriousness of the existing international situation. By an overwhelming majority our committee reported this bill, and by an overwhelming majority we will support the proposed changes in the Selective Service Act to increase the size of our Armed Forces.

It is naturally difficult for the Members to view the present situation as extremely grave when we read in the press, as we did this morning, the relaxation of the regulations with respect to deferments under the Selective Service Act for college students and even to guarantee high-school gradutes a year in college. I assume that these regulations were promulgated by General Hershey in accordance with our present military needs this year and next. If we are so close to war, as the Speaker's remarks indicate and he may be right about that, why not immediately build up our armed might through selective service to the necessary strength rather than try to put through a program which looks to some distant date as to what we might need.

For the possible guidance of the new Members, who have not experienced these last minute startling revelations, I venture the guess that our distinguished Speaker will give us the information he has just before the vote is taken on a pending substitute bill or just before the vote on some amendment vitally important to the American people.

My colleagues, I am disturbed about what is going on in the country today, and possibly I once again find myself in a similar position to that prior to World War II when we were forced to legislate in the dark here in the House of Representatives. I did not know in January of 1941 that America had been committed to war. Did any of you? How many Members of the House who were here at the time were aware of that fact?

I quote to you now from the Grand Alliance, written by British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. This is what he wrote, and it will be found on page 23 of this volume of his memoirs:

> On January 10, 1941 a gentleman arrived to see me at Downing Street with the highest credentials.

Then Mr. Churchill goes on to tell why received this gentleman and spent 3 hours with him. The visitor was Harry Hopkins, whom Mr. Churchill received as the "closest confident and personal agent of the President." I quote again from what Mr. Churchill wrote:

> With gleaming eye and quiet, constrained passion, Mr. Hopkins said:
>
> "The President is determined that we shall win the war together. Make no mistake about it.
>
> "He has sent me here to tell you that at all costs and by all means he will carry you through, no matter what happens to him—there is nothing that he will not do so far as he has human power."

That was 11 months before Pearl Harbor, when by this record, we were committed to World War II, and I knew nothing about it as a representative of the people of the great State of Illinois.

Let me read another thing that Mr. Churchill wrote in his memoirs. It will be found on page 593 of the same volume. One month before Pearl Harbor, in November of 1941, Churchill wrote a letter to General Smuts, which he incorporated in his book. I now quote from this letter:

> I do not think it would be any use for me to make a personal appeal to Roosevelt at this juncture to enter the war. At the Atlantic meeting I told his circle that I would rather have an American declaration of war now and no supplies for 6 months than double the supplies and no declaration. When this was repeated to him, he thought it a hard saying. We must not underrate his constitutional difficulties. He may take action as Chief Executive, but only Congress can declare war. He went so far as to say to me—

And let me remind you these are the President's own words to Mr. Churchill—

> "I may never declare war; I may make war. If I were to ask Congress to declare war, they might argue about it for 3 months."

Gentlemen, I am disturbed. Do we know what we are here doing? Do we have full and factual information? You can always be sure that Congress will make the right decision if it is given the facts and told the truth.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before us, it seems to me, in a rather garbled condition. We all believe in preparedness. We all, I think, are committed to selective service. It is the American way. We have had the draft for years and years.

Why is it necessary to bring universal military training in on the heels of and wrapped up with selective service? If it is necessary, if it is so good, if it is to take effect, as we are told, not before a year or possibly a year and a half, why can it not be debated coolly on its own merits and apart from what we are all anxious to do and willing to do? No, it is the same old story. It is getting the foot in the door, it is getting the camel's nose under the tent. Then when it is too late we all wake up and say, "How could this have happened to us?"

I know that a great many good people and a great many good women in this country believe that universal military training is a necessity, that it will save us from war. Where have I heard those words before? I heard them years ago in Germany on the floor of the Reichstag when the people of Germany were told, "Unless you have the biggest army in the world you will have war." I heard it in England when the people groaned under the taxes, and they were told, "Unless you spend more and more on armaments you will have war." I heard it in France, and now I hear it in my own country. It is nothing new.

Universal military training, Mr. Chairman, is conscription. Let us face that fact. Maybe we need conscription. I am not going to argue with that.

I would like to take you back a little in history and ask you to consider with me what conscription has done for the world. In 1770 a Frenchman, Comte de Guibert, wrote as follows—and mark you, this was in the year 1770 when there were no conscript armies in Europe. I quote:

> Today the whole of Europe is civilized. Wars have become less cruel. Except in combat no blood is shed. Prisoners are respected. Towns are no longer destroyed. The country is no more ravaged.

That was true in 1770. Can we say that today? Can we say that after the bombing of Dresden, where 250,000 civilians were killed in two nights? No. After 1770 came the French Revolution and after that came the conscript armies of Europe. Since that day war has wracked that continent and now we, too, are being brought into this same pattern. It seems to me one of the greatest contributions which has been made to this debate was the contribution of our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] when he explained the tie-up between the philosophy of the German General Staff and the philosophy of our own General Staff. I do not blame the generals in the Pentagon for going to General Guderian and those other great geniuses—because they were military geniuses—and asking them how to build up military power. Of course, if you are a soldier you want to see military power. Why not? Do we have football teams in our colleges not to play football? Are we going to have one of the greatest armies in the world kept up by ever-rising taxes and never to be put in the field of battle? Oh, no, that is not human nature, and it will not be true here any more than it has been in Europe.

Let us look at what is proposed in the present bill. Let us compare it a little bit to what the nations of Europe who are living under the guns are doing. The present proposal is that the United States shall draft 18-year-olds to serve 27 months anywhere in the world. Let us see what other nations have done and are doing.

In Belgium—and Belgium has been invaded and ravaged twice—they draft young men at the age of 20 years to serve 14 months in Belgian territory.

In Denmark men are drafted at 21 years of age to serve 11 months at home.

In France they are drafted at the age of 20 years for 12 months of service in French territory.

In Holland they are drafted at 20 years of age to serve 12 months in Dutch territory.

In Italy they are drafted at 21 years of age for 18 months of service at home.

Luxemburg drafts young men at the age of 18 years for 6 months service at home.

Norway, again a country which has been ravaged and conquered, drafts its young men at the age of 20 years with provisions for 9 to 12 months of service at home.

Portugal drafts young men at the age of 20 years for 18 months of service at home.

The United Kingdom drafts young men at the age of 18¼ years for 24 months of service, but only under certain conditions, and in British territory.

It is a very far cry from that to having an army of 3,500,000 destined to go all over the world. As it seems to me, before our people are committed to such a program, we should pause. We should not be carried away by hysteria, Mr. Chairman, we should think and look back at the history of the world. We should see what conscription has brought to Europe. We should see what Americans have done in our American way in the past. Surely what we have done in the past we can again do in the future. Every year in this House we dust off George Washington's Farewell Address, and it is read aloud to a very small audience. Everyone says how wonderful it is, and it is put back again. I would like to read to you two sentences, because the father of our country dealt in very long sentences, from that address. I would like to point out before I read those two sentences that he was by profession a soldier. Therefore, he cannot be expected to be anti-army or anti-military. He said this:

> They will avoid—

He is speaking of his countrymen—

> They will avoid the necessity of these overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty.

Then he said again:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional sphere, avoiding, in he exercise of the powers in one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, in whatever form of government, real despotism.

We are in danger today of having the Department of the Army and the military encroach on other departments. It is for us, the representatives of the people, to keep cool heads and clear minds, and to see that this does not happen. It is for us at this time not to be pressured by the clamor and hysteria that is all around us. It is for us at this time to go back to the wisdom of our fathers.

Oh, it has been said on the floor of this House that surely none of us was subject to the influence of foreign ideology. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are subject to those ideologies. We have heard of them and we have been pressured by them for a long time. Take just what was read a few minutes ago from the book of Winston Churchill. Do you think that Winston Churchill did not have an influence on the United States? He had far greater influence on our policy than any man or woman sitting in this House today. Do you believe that General Guderian over there in Germany, who wrote out this elaborate plan and gave it to our officers, and showed them the one flaw, the one reason that the German General Staff failed—and we all know what that was; it was because they blamed the civil power which prevented their taking command of the entire government and entire economy. He has warned our people, our generals in the Pentagon, against that very thing.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes, I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Will you not have an opportunity under this bill to vote and speak calmly and clearly whether you want military training when the commission reports to the House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. From what I know of the working of the House and of these commissions, I think it will be very unlikely that you will be able to change anything by that time. I think we have got to make a decision now. I think this is the time. I believe firmly that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation ever to come before this House. I am saying that very advisedly and very sincerely. I think the whole destiny of our country is going to be changed by this legislation. It may be necessary for the United States of America to become a great military empire. I foresee that future but I would like to pause and think carefully, and I might say prayerfully before we do so.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I agree with the gentlewoman from New York, but under this bill it does not establish universal military training; it only es-

tablishes a commission to report to us in this House, and you will at the time the report is submitted have an opportunity clearly and quietly to decide whether we should have universal military training.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. We need selective service now; I am sure my colleague appreciates that. Why tie the two things together? Why not let us put through the draft that we need and that we have got to have—I acknowledge that—and then wait a little and deliberate this as a separate bill?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Then the gentlewoman possibly wants to call up the Reserves who have served their time previously?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am not at all sure that that is necessary. In view of some of the testimony that has been given on this floor I do not believe we need to call up a great many Reserves. It is a thing that should be very carefully considered before it is done. We know that the Army has cut down the call by 50 percent. Either they cannot need men quite as badly or else some very terrible mistake has been made.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Does not the gentlewoman believe that the world and our country are in desperate condition at this time and need the security and protection of Reserves and possibly our 18½-year olds?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I disapprove of the 18½-year-old provision; I think the 19-year-olds are quite young enough and will make better soldiers. I am sure that the gentlewoman from New York knows boys of 18 as well as I; and I will ask her very frankly if she thinks they make good military material? I do not.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I do not know, but I believe that. I only hope and pray and wish that my boy had had military training for the last 4 years. I would be very happy at this time had that been the case rather than to think that he will be called into service and possibly have only 6 months' training.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Merely for a question of fact after a most informative speech: There has been some discussion between two of the gentlewomen of the House concerning the result of bringing in plans by the Commission; am I right, after a careful reading of the bill, in assuming that any plan coming in under the form now presented would not be open to amendment by any Member of this House?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I believe it would be subject to amendment.

Mrs. CHURCH. It would be available for amendment on the floor of the House by any Member?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It would be subject to amendment or a substitute could be offered, as I understand.

Mrs. CHURCH. I do not think so, from my reading of the bill. If the gentlewoman would permit, I wonder if the chairman would be willing to tell us whether the plan could be amended.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentlewoman from New York will yield, I am really embarrassed to enter this argument, but I may say to the gentlewoman from New York that under the bill as written today the plan could not be changed or modified either by the committee or by the House. But I did announce that I would offer an amendment to make it subject to all amendments just like any bill that comes before the House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. And may I say I feel very sure this bill has already been greatly improved through the good offices of the beloved chairman of our Armed Services Committee. I only hope that he will continue his work of improvement until we can finally pass the legislation with a good conscience.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the statements which the gentlewoman from New York has just made, it causes me no hesitancy to have entered into the colloquy a moment ago.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I was struck by the reference of the gentlewoman to the statement of General Washington, in which he expressed apprehension that this country might pick up the tools of the old country, and I am wondering how the gentlewoman can reconcile that apprehension with General Washington's own fervent or ardent advocacy of a program of universal military training for his own country.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I cannot quite reconcile the two, but I read one sentence which I think is very typical of General Washington's thinking in which he warned against allowing the military to take over undue strength, and in which he also warned of letting one department overcome or override another. That is my meaning. I am not against the military. I do not want the gentleman from New York to think that one minute I am opposed to conscription; I am opposed to militarism as it existed on the continent of Europe; I am fearful that we may get something similar in this country; I cannot believe that the father of our country wanted to see the United States Prussianized.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentlewoman opposed to a program of universal military training?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am opposed to the program outlined in this bill. I am in favor of the draft and for enlarging the draft principles. I would like to see this particular universal military training feature revamped and changed.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. An inspection of General Washington's recommendations will show that he advocated a system of service in a universal militia, a militia under the control of the States, a militia that could only be called into service to suppress insurrection or rebellion. He never said anything about having universal military training under the control of the Federal Government.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for the contribution. May I point out that is the very thing that has been destroyed in this country, and I refer to the National Guard and the Reserves. This is going to take over in its stead and this is conscription.

I want to say in conclusion, and may I repeat, this is one of the most serious and one of the most difficult things to come before the House. It seems to me at this time we all from now until next week should do what one very distinguished Member of this House told me he is doing—get down on our knees and pray for guidance. To my mind this is the time when we must think only of our country. Let us stop thinking of the pressure groups, let us stop thinking of the mail, let us stop thinking of the next election. It is a matter of no importance whether any of us come back. Let us think of our country and let us turn to our God.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In view of statements that were made on the floor of the House by Members representing our leadership yesterday with respect to the extreme critical condition in which they believe our country is faced at this time, would this not be the proper time, here and now, to bring all facts to the floor of the House and not wait until the last moment to present them? If the situation is as critical as was presented to us yesterday, why wait until next week? We should have all of the facts now.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. We should know the truth. Only through the truth can we keep our freedom and our liberty.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the measure now before us there are many questions that need to be asked and answers given, not only for the benefit of Members of the House, but for the public as well.

First of all, let me make it plain that I believe the United States must be prepared to defend this continent. That is the first and major requirement. What it is possible to do beyond that depends entirely upon the ability of the American people to supply the military manpower while still maintaining production and the solvency of the United States Treasury. It will be fatal if we attempt to maintain a huge Military Establishment at home and abroad if we at the same time bankrupt the American people, morally and financially, lower the standard of living, and force upon the Nation a dictatorial form of government.

We are told that we are embarked on the process of building an armed force of 3,462,000 men. What is the basis for that figure, and how is it proposed to use these men? Are there more Koreans in the making? Is it planned to ship 8 or 10 divisions to Europe? Or is it necessary to have three and one-half million men mobilized to defend this country?

And this measure provides 26 months of service. Since the necessary period of training is admittedly much less than that, then why 26 months? Is it because Anna Rosenberg wanted 27 months and she would agree to shaving off 30 days?

There has been much discussion with respect to the opinion of experts on the proper age at which the draft should take effect. I want to make my contribution by reading a letter which I wrote to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, and his answer on this subject.

My letter to General Bradley is dated September 18, 1950, and reads as follows:

As you are well aware, those of us in the legislative branch of the Government face vital decisions as to manpower.

Endeavoring to approach the subject of universal military training on an honest and human basis, I would like to ask you this question: At what age does a man make the best combat soldier?

And in your opinion, how long does it take to train a man to be an efficient combat soldier?

Your views on these questions will be appreciated.

General Bradley's reply dated October 5, 1950, is as follows:

I have your letter in which you ask two questions concerning age and length of service desirable for soldiers. As you undoubtedly know, there is naturally difference of opinion among authorities as to just how long it takes to properly train a soldier and as to the age when he receives this training with maximum advantage. I might further add that each of the three services have different problems in training.

As to my own personal views, I think that the average man between the ages of 19 and 35 can stand the rigors of combat. Of course, there are exceptions; some men stay in good physical shape longer while at the same time some men 35 years old require longer to get in good physical condition and cannot stand so much exposure in combat. Quite often it is a question of offsetting resiliency and physical condition with judgment that comes with greater age.

During the last war we tried to give each soldier basic training of at least 13 to 15 weeks before using him as a replacement in a well-trained unit. However, to train an individual for all-around service and as a key member of the unit most people thought that the time required was at least a year.

All the services require a large proportion of specialists. Specialist training, of course, requires considerable longer time than indicated above.

Hoping that this answers your questions, I am,

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

You will note that General Bradley made no mention whatever of 18-year-olds. His effective age bracket was between 19 and 35, and his effective training period was approximately a year. Then why this talk about 24 or even 26 months of military training and service? If this is such a good thing for the youth of America, let us spread the good to the greatest number by drafting for 18 months at the age of 19, with a continuation of service in the Reserve. Under such a program there would be no excuse to set up an educational deferment deal by which President Truman or anyone else could make fish of one youth and fowl of another.

Much has been said by some of the brass hats in Government about equality of service and equality of sacrifice. It seems to me it is about time that those who espouse the Truman-Rosenberg scheme demand some equality in the matter of military manpower from those so-called freedom-loving nations over the world who have taken so much from us in the last few years and given so little in return. Since it has already been made a part of the record it is not necessary for me to more than reiterate the cold fact that under the terms of this bill it is proposed that the United States conscript youth at the earliest age and for a longer period of service than any other nation in the world.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that while breaking their collective backs to inaugurate universal conscription, the Truman-Rosenberg crowd makes no recommendations for universal conscription of all resources, financial and material, as well as manpower.

Which is more important lives or money?

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this military manpower bill, the most sweeping ever brought before a United States Congress, there are some things that need to be said about the recent appearance of General Eisenhower in Washington.

In the first place, the attempt has been made to sell Congress and the American people a phoney bill of goods that Eisenhower toured Europe and ascertained that we have allies in fact as well as in name.

In his appearance before a joint meeting of Congress the first of February, Eisenhower dealt in glib, if not glittering generalities. He gave it as his belief, unsupported by facts or figures, that the will to resist was growing in Western Europe. How did he know? By his own admission he made hit-and-run visits to 13 capitals in something less than 21 days, including that great military power known as Luxemburg. In those 13 capitals, he talked with the brass hats of government and the generals. He did not talk to the people—those who will do the dying, if they elect to fight.

Eisenhower said the French agreed to raise what he called 25 battle-worthy divisions. It was the only specific figure for any nation in terms of actual divisions. No information was provided as to the numerical strength of these divisions or how many of these pitifully few divisions the French would leave on the continent of Europe when they have a playboy emperor to maintain on the throne of Indochina and at the same time give protection to some Vichy French who still insist on fattening themselves on the bones of the natives of that hapless country.

It is easily within the memory of many Americans, if not that of Eisenhower, that France, in 1939, modestly admitted to all who would listen that her army was the best in the world. Are we supposed to assume that Eisenhower, alone of all Americans, was not stunned when the Germans ripped that army apart in 1940 in a matter of days?

And today, with thousands of publicly and Communists in France, and with the French people still fresh in the minds of there to believe that a logical reason is greater resistance than it will offer against the Germans, a traditional enemy?

Permit me to say for the record that I am opposed to uprooting young Americans to serve in and for the interests of European countries who drag their own feet. Let these so-called foreign friends provide substantial military forces to protect their own countries, if the danger is as dire as claimed by those beating the war drums. If they fail to do so, we can only assume they would be of less than no help to our troops if the Russian war machine rolled westward. In that case, what would happen to 8 or 10 American divisions? If our alleged allies will fight on their own soil, as they have not done to any appreciable extent in Korea, let them prove it. Let them stand up and be counted in terms of men, equipment, and sacrifices necessary to supply the same. In the name of survival of the United States, we simply cannot continue to squander American lives, resources, and money all over the world, including a slothful Western Europe.

And make no mistake about it, the Truman administration appears to be equally as adept at squandering lives as resources and money. That was tragically demonstrated when Truman launced our forces into war in Korea without consulting Congress; after his Joint Chiefs of Staff testified in 1948 that Korea would be untenable in the event of a major military move by the Communists; after practically all American combat troops were pulled out of Korea in 1949; and after Secretary of State Acheson announced to the world as late as January 12, 1950, that the United States would not defend Korea.

As a result, thousands of American homes were broken, with reservists indiscriminately recalled to active duty. Thousands of Americans have been slaughtered, and the economy of this country convulsed. This is a terrible price, and Americans have paid almost all of it, alone, with virtually no help from our paper allies. Yet, how much has all this cost Stalin? How many Russians has he lost in this blood letting? Are we to permit a continuance of the debauchery of American lives in perhaps more and more Koreas by clamping our youths under the heel of the military for 6 years in one way or another. I say, we have ample evidence that American lives are no more sacred to the squanderers than the taxpayers' money or our national resources.

A few days ago, the congressional welcome mat was rolled out for the President of France. I read his speech carefully but in vain as I sought specific figures and facts upon which to base a hope that France is now ready and willing to lift her burden from our shoulders. The French President failed even to substantiate the 25 paper divisions about which Eisenhower spoke so warmly.

I hope I have not misjudged the French in this situation. France, with her manpower and productive potential, is the present key to the fortunes of Western Europe. Perhaps, as a result of the French President's visit, there were some secrets left behind at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in that repository of knowledge and good cheer. Once in a while the common herd in Congress is permitted to recall the secret agreements made at Yalta—agreements that were locked away at the far end of Pennsylvania Avenue—agreements that handed to the Russians Eastern Europe and set the stage for exactly what is being attempted here in this House today.

I listened with much interest on Tuesday when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] alleged that the Russian bear has reached out to grab territory throughout the world. I disagree with him in this respect; it was not even necessary for the Russians to exert themselves by reaching. All they had to do was swallow, because practically all the territory consumed by the Russians was fed to them on a silver platter by the previous and present administrations at Tehran, Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam in a succession of the most stupid displays of statecraft known to modern times. Let us not, for the purpose of enacting this legislation, sidestep the moral and territorial sell-outs and hand-outs rubber stamped by the Truman administration. Let us not deceive the American people. Let us focus the blame where it belongs.

But let me return to Eisenhower. In his Library of Congress performance before Members of Congress, he decried use of Germans in any army he would command, asserting that would be on the Hessian pattern of the Revolutionary War. Yet, the next day, appearing before a congressional committee, he advocated the formation in the United States Army of a Foreign Legion on the pattern of the French Foreign Legion. What, I would like to ask, is the fundamental difference? Does a name make them any less mercenaries?

And what is the complexion of the French Foreign Legion? It has long been a sanctuary for assorted rascals, fleeing before the law. Is this the pattern for a Foreign Legion in our Army? Would the ranks, if shot out, be refilled with kindred spirits from this country or would the replacements be the 18-year-olds that would be conscripted under this measure?

At no time did Eisenhower tell the assemblage of Congressmen that it would be necessary to ship American divisions to Europe, yet a few hours later, before congressional committees, he was urging the early shipment of additional American troops across the Atlantic. Is it possible he made that decision or was the decision made for him in the few hours that elapsed between his appearance in the Library of Congress and then before congressional committees?

Again returning to the Library of Congress performance, Eisenhower said this:

> I do not believe * * * that the United States can pick up the world on its economic, financial, and material shoulders and carry it.

Yet, with the greatest of ease, he made it plain that the United States must continue to drain her financial and material resources and further convulse the economy by shipping vast quantities of war materials to Europe, already the recipient of billions upon billions of American gift dollars plus uncounted tons of materials. Is it too much to expect Eisenhower to step down from his pedestal and tell the American people, hungry for facts upon which to base reason and logic, just how many more billions he expects his European program will cost?

In one breath he called for the spending of billions for arms, ships, munitions, and maintenance of troops in Europe while in the next breath he decried against the United States being made a twentieth-century Atlas.

It is interesting to note that Eisenhower made no mention to the joint meeting of Congress about his feeling that pay scales for European soldiers should be raised because of the higher pay of United States troops. Before a Senate committee, he insisted European soldiers must be paid more because, he said, "American soldiers have more money to spend on wine in the villages" and "on the girls."

So it looks as though, in time, American taxpayers, will be asked to pick up the check for millions of dollars worth of pay increases to Europeans. And these are the same American taxpayers to whom Eisenhower gives lip service when he says the United States cannot carry the world on its collective shoulders.

At this point, I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], for his statement made on Tuesday that it is high time the military leaders of this country ceased being policymakers and devoted their time to carrying out the orders given them. This form of government was never designed for the luxury of diplomats and policymakers in uniform. It is the cloth from which dictators are cut.

Yesterday, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], took the floor to assert that 30 enemy planes were over Korea Tuesday and he further asserted that enemy troops, not all of them Communist Chinese, were being massed in Korea.

May I remind the Speaker of the House that this is not the first time enemy planes in numbers have been over Korea, and if Russian troops, as the Speaker seems to imply, are being massed in Northern Korea then Congress and the American people ought to be let in on the secret.

It has been my observation that during the past 2 years almost every time a major piece of legislation came before the House, with the question of passage in doubt, a situation of emergency or crisis was evolved in an effort to obtain a favorable vote for the administration.

I do not say that the Speaker of the House is attempting to deceive the Members. I do say that during the past 2 years this administration has operated from day to day on the basis of emergency and crisis and I am one of those Members who does not now know whom to believe.

The Speaker has promised he will speak again on the pending measure when it is considered under the 5-minute rule. I hope he will address some of his remarks to the reasons why confusion is compounded in Washington and why the American people have so little confidence in the present administration. I can say to the Speaker that the people at the crossroads of Iowa believe the Truman ship of state is rudderless and drifting in the storm. They need more than anything else strong, honest, and decent leadership. They need to know where they are going and why. There will be no real unity of purpose until they are given the facts of life and I hope the Speaker will recognize this crying need.

I am opposed to the pending bill because it is, as aptly described, a legislative abortion. I am convinced the military manpower needs of this Nation can properly and adequately be met at this time by extension and revision of the Selective Service Act.

It is unnecessary to sustain this unholy wedlock of selective service and universal military training. I trust that the Barden bill, with certain amendments, will prevail.

Members of this House will do well to remember that President Truman appears determined to fasten permanently upon this country an economy based on emergency spending. It is not enough, apparently, to proceed with some degree of sanity to build the defenses of the United States, the Western Hemisphere, and the island perimeter in the Pacific, give whatever aid we can elsewhere and remain solvent.

This is a time and place for the House of Representatives to speak with a collective voice against a perpetuation of this world of make-believe here in the United States of America.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska who has made several valuable contributions to this debate.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman was not here in 1948, but I recall that in April 1948, when the Marshall plan was before the Congress, there were whispers going up and down the cloakroom that we would be in war with Russia in 30 days, and the same type of talk was used then just as it is being used here now, and in my book that type of mental terrorism is an insult to the intelligence of this House.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. What does the gentleman say to this suggestion that if the spark of world war III is about to be ignited, as has been mentioned by our affable Speaker, on yesterday, and that the outbreak of world war III is so imminent, would not the gentleman think that our Commander in Chief should convoke a joint session of the Congress immediately and state those facts to us?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman made a very fine contribution when he mentioned pay. I have been trying to get some information for the last 2 days, in asking the question which I expect to ask the gentleman, and perhaps he can give the answer for me. Do I understand that the 18-year-olds who will be taken in under the draft law will enjoy a different status than the 18-year-olds that we place in UMT, side by side, so that you will have one group of young men obtaining the same benefits as a soldier, and the other group getting $30 a month, with no benefits whatsoever? I wish the gentleman would answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to answer you. UMT conscripts will have a different and much lower pay status than selective service draftees. These 18-year-old conscripts would be paid $30 a month during their training period. There are no mandatory GI benefits in this bill for conscripts under UMT.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is discrimination, is it not?

Mr. GROSS. That is discrimination, of course.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. And they will not get the emoluments?

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman will yield, the situation you raised could not happen in a thousand years.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is exactly what I was told a half an hour ago.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I realize the gentleman has given a great deal of study to the statement he has presented today. I would like to ask this question: What reason or justification exists, in your opinion, if any, for the taking of American boys at 18 years, when the European nations, with one or two exceptions, set the age at 20 years?

Mr. GROSS. There is absolutely no justification for it, and I am glad the able gentleman from New Jersey emphasized that point by his interrogation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would not presume to change the opinion of anybody on this floor, for those who are opposing the philosophy of universal military training I doubt that I can change, and I will not even insult their intelligence by making an effort to change them against their will. But for those who are on the fence and are willing to listen or who are undecided, I am going to make an effort to direct my remarks to the point of universal military training and endeavor in some measure to answer as honestly as I can and with whatever capacity I possess, your question.

To begin with, the Committee on the Armed Services spent 60 days on this legislation; and, brother, "that ain't hay"; that is not pleasant. Under CARL VINSON, you either work or they work without you, and 35 members of that committee languished morning and evening in an effort to write a bill for you; and, good or bad, this is our bill and not the bill of the military, and not the bill of the administration. I am not here to defend either group. I come here not speaking as a Democrat or Republican; I am speaking as an American and a southern American. A lot of people call us other names, but for the moment I am a southern American and speaking for a section of the Nation that once lost a war, and we do not want to lose another. While there is still time I want to prepare my Nation. I am not here defending any administration; they will have their day some other time. But for today this is MENDEL RIVERS' responsibility, and to the best of my obviously limited capacity I am going to discharge my obligation with whatever tools the good Lord temporarily entrusted to me, but, I admit, with obvious incapacity.

Now, what does this bill contain? And this is our bill. Let me tell you something. I heard the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, and I want to say this, that if I were a person who wanted to be persuaded I know of no one in this House who could do it better, but I am just not going to be persuaded. I am just old, brother, but I can look. But may I say to the gentlewoman from New York that she was wrong in her presumptions and assumptions about our committee. We were not mesmerized by the military. We have had the military come to us decorated like a Christmas tree that shook in the light, but more than one of them have said: "I think I will change my assignment tomorrow; I would rather be in Korea than before CARL VINSON and his crew." I want to tell you this, we do not take orders from the military; we give orders in that committee. We searched this thing with a fine-toothed comb in an effort to bring something to you because we realized then and we realize now that we are going to make history within the next few days.

I know that you are going to vote for the extension of the draft as it is here; there is no question about that; I know you are going to vote for it by a tremendous majority. You will either vote for this bill, the Barden bill, or an amendment of some other name, but substantially it will be the provisions contained in this bill; it may be the Towe bill. I was for the Towe bill when it was reported out some years ago, and I am for its 1951 edition, which is the Rivers bill.

Now, here is what this UMT bill contains, and let me give you this little background: The Federal income for Federal purposes is approximately, and in round figures, $38,000,000,000. That is a lot of money. The military budget is in excess of $34,000,000,000. That is a lot of money also. We cannot continue to go along under those astronomical figures for even one segment of our military. Why, people in foreign countries pay taxes, too, but, like you, they do not like it. We want to get away from that.

This universal-military proposal we have here is composed of a civilian commission. One man says: "Do you not know that commission is going to be incompetent?" I said: "It may be, presume that it will be, but here is the safeguard: They will have to come before our committee," and, like the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] said, we are not going to take that thing hook, line, sinker, and all. This committee we are on does not do business that way. We are going to have the right to amend their proposal. The chairman of the committee has made that plain today. You are going to have the right to amend the proposal before anything is set up. But in this bill today, let me tell you, you are not setting up universal military training. Far from that. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] asked, "How can you have universal military training and the draft?" You do not have it, that is all. When one comes in, the other goes out. When a boy gets to be eighteen and a half he is inducted into the training corps. Now, that may be a college program; I do not know what it is going to be. That is going to be your responsibility, not my responsibility today and not your responsibility today. That is going to be your responsibility tomorrow when this thing is finally worked out. All we do is set up here the commission. I do not believe I will love it anymore than you will, may I say in passing.

Someone asked, "Why bring it up in this piggy-back fashion?" I would rather get there piggy-back than not at all while there is still time. My conscience tells me to prepare my Nation. I think it was George Washington who said: "In time of peace prepare for war." If he did not say it, I say it.

Let me tell you that I came to this Congress 11 years ago. The first thing they fed me was to vote for the extension of the draft. I did not know any more about that than the man in the moon. Do not say what you think, but I know a little more now. I had to vote for the draft with great misgivings. The Speaker paid me the high compliment of discussing it with me, and I voted like the rest of you. That passed by one vote. I had not been here long enough to know many Members of the House, and I do not know so many more now. All of you are delightful people, may I interject.

When the war came on we were about as prepared as the man in the moon. The then Chief of Staff did not recall where he was at a certain time. That is his responsibility. But for the time being I want to prepare my nation for any eventuality. Two years from now or one year from now this country is going to be putting out 138,000,000 tons of steel, while we have only been putting out 100,000,000 tons in the immediate past.

We stumbled along by our mixed up foreign policy, and you know it was mixed up. The whole world looks to this Nation for leadership. We have invested untold billions of your money to get into that position, and I am not going to falter in that responsibility. I did not put this country in its present condition, I am not apologizing for it, but I have three babies and I am going to try to prepare for them while time still remains.

Now, getting back to this universal military training commission. We set up, as I stated, only the commission.

I say to you that I do not have any special information on what is happening in Korea. I know we have 60,000 casualties; I read that in the newspaper. Nobody comes to me with special information. Maybe they have good reasons not to do it, but I have no special information. But I do have this, I have a responsibility, and I know this, I do not believe we are going to have a war this year; I just do not believe it. I know one thing, though, if we have our Army in good condition, our Air Force in good condition, and our Navy in good condition, we will not have a war next year either because Russia is not looking for a push over. Regardless of what you think about Korea, I am as bitter on certain phases of it as are you.

Regardless of what we think of some kind of Korea, it had to be met somewhere in the world, but when we meet it again, if we have to meet it again, my colleagues, I plead with you, let us put out Nation's military house in order. Keep it under control of the Congress. That is what CARL VINSON told you we are going to do. You can read it. This is not universal military training. This sets up a commission to bring some program back to you. If you do not like it you have your conscience to sleep with, and then do what you want to do. But, you have got to meet it some time. Let us meet it now. CARL VINSON has told you when we have this universal military training, we pay those boys $30 a month. Now we pay them in the service at least $90 a month or thereabouts. What is the difference in a large armed force? Do you not know that that boy can program his life so that when he gets to be 18½ years old, he knows he will be in for 6 months, and then go into the Reserves? The gentlewoman from New York said we have no Reserves or National Guard. I wish you could have heard the questions I asked in committee as to what happened to the National Guard and the Reserves. Of course, our Reserve is composed of veterans; you know that, and if this thing affects the National Guard, I am against it, and so are you. This thing will make the National Guard and the Reserve, that is what it is designed for, and I am not going to vote to take that National Guard away from the governors, either, and neither are you. That is our force, and they are in the Army now because the Congress never declared war to be at an end. If there is anything wrong, you are as much to blame as the boys down the street, and so am I. We never declared peace; that is why they are taking the National Guard. We never declared the national emergency at an end, and I am going to fight to keep that National Guard under the governors and keep the reserve in a healthy condition. As CARL VINSON told you, we appropriated $822,000,000 for the Defense Department to create and operate a Reserve program. They did not do it, and you know it. I am not taking the responsibility for it, but now I am face to face with my own responsibility. What am I going to do? I am going to vote to build my Reserves up for my Nation in the democratic way. If they bring something here that is not democratic, do not pass it, and if you think you can go back to South Carolina, if you do, brother, you have not been down there recently. We have a big stake in this set-up, and we have always enjoyed the distinction of having a large percentage of our boys join voluntarily. They did not have to be sent for. In my district there is one of the finest police schools in the world, at Parris Island, the marine base. You have heard of that. It has the finest police school in the world. And, there is a big Navy shipyard there, and we are very proud of that, too, and we are going to fight to keep it in the democratic fashion in which, I am sure, you are interested.

Now, what about this corps? The Congress can put an end to this training. Is that not democratic? If you do not like it, stop it. You do not have to make any appropriations. You have a trigger set up on it. Now, somebody told me they did not like this negative action. I would not fight if it were changed, but it is democratic throughout. Our whole proposition is democratic. We have a committee that looks at everything with a fine-tooth comb. I wish you could hear the distinguished gentleman from New York with his analytical mind; he can analyze anything. I am speaking of my dear friend, STU COLE. I sat with him for 6 years on the old Committee on Naval Affairs. We are proud of our committee, we are proud of the handiwork of our committee. You may not agree that this is exactly the way to handle it. Well, change it, but let us get to the point where we will have some form of training and some form of reserve and National Guard in the days that lie ahead. This may be your last chance. If it is, let us perform our duty in a dignified manner of which we are capable, thinking always not as a party but as Americans.

In the days that lie ahead, if we have this integrated force, well trained and well reserved, no nation on the face of the globe will dare attempt another Korea.

You know that if they invaded Western Europe we would be at war. You know that. I do not want to be at war with a token force. There is time yet remaining. This is our day in history. We cannot falter.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I can say all I want to say in less than 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, no one in this debate has taken a position yet against the draft bill. Technically, we are not at war, but no one can brand the Korean police action as just a matter of keeping order, with casualities of 60,000 on the side of the Americans.

I am not here to debate the question of a selective draft or a compulsory military training. That is not what I rose for on this occasion. I rose for a deeper purpose than that.

The President has stated, and everyone knows it, Democrats as well as Republicans, that he will send troops anywhere in this world, where he thinks it is necessary to send them, regardless of Congress. That is why I am here. If the President can do that, do you suppose I am going to sit here in this House and vote reservoirs of men for him to draw upon, either in the draft of the military training, unless we have some information on what he is going to do with them? I for one will not do it.

When I became a Member of this body I took an oath that I would support the Constitution of the United States, and I meant it. I am going to do it. That Constitution provides that on the question of war the Congress of the United States shall determine that matter. I am not going to be a party to creating any reserves of men for somebody to draw upon that acts independently of the Congress of the United States. This body represents the people of the United States of America right now. We are the representatives of the people. When our forefathers created this Congress they left in the hands of this body, not the Senate, but in the House of Representatives, the power to preserve this democracy, because the President cannot do anything, he cannot make a move without the support of this Congress in the matter of appropriations.

Suppose the President now or at any time takes another notion to start a war without the consent of Congress, he can be definitely stopped by this Congress in refusing appropriations or the drafting of men when Congress does not know where the President intends to send them or when.

Much has been said about the growing power of bureaus of the Government in usurping the power of Congress. No bureau has ever exercised any power that was not first given to them by Congress.

It is time for you to ascertain the fact that the Congress of the United States represents the people of America. You have given away this power—every one of you. There is no bureaucrat that makes a rule or a regulation this evening or tonight who does it without the consent of the Congress. Men are incarcerated, tried and convicted and sentenced upon the basis of laws that you do not know anything about—laws that are made in the nighttime by some bureau in the city of Washington. I know what I am talking about because I have visited them in jail after they were convicted. One of them asked me, "Is there any law against selling 100 pounds of sugar to a legitimate buyer?"

I said, "No, for God's sake, there cannot be. But," I said, "I am living in a complex government. I will ask the Library of Congress Reference Bureau."

They told me there was no such law. So when I went back at night this grocer said to me, "What did you find out?" "Oh," I said, "just as I said, they cannot convict you for selling 100 pounds of sugar to a legitimate buyer." "Well," he says, "what will I tell them when they come around?"

Well, you can imagine, from the district I am from, what I told him to tell

them. Well, he told them, and the next time I saw him he was in jail down in Virginia. He had violated a regulation of the Treasury Department.

There is one curb that this body has upon the President of the United States or anybody else, and personally I do not refer to Mr. Truman alone but refer to any President we may have in the United States who may take a notion that he is bigger than the Congress. We hold the purse strings and the draft law. If we will exercise the power we already possess, which the fathers of our Constitution placed in our hands, you will never have a charge leveled against us that we are surrendering the power of Congress. They cannot do a thing unless Congress furnishes the money.

Even this august body across the hall, which never makes an error, cannot draw a dime unless we first pass an appropriation and the President cannot draw a nickel unless we pass it first. So the people of America have left the purse strings of the Nation, the most powerful control in this Nation, in the hands of this body of their own representatives. They elect you for only 2 years. Two years is long enough, if you are no good. It will not hurt you to come up for reelection. You are always close to the people. You get one of these Senators elected for 6 years, and nobody at home will often see them again.

If any President of this Nation would take us in his confidence and say to us, "I do not intend to send troops anywhere unless it is approved by the Congress of the United States," you would not have any trouble on the draft. You would not have any trouble on military training. But when one who occupies that position of President says in the public press that he will send men anywhere he wants, and any time he wants to, I say to you that is a violation of the constitutional provisions of this Government.

If this unbridled demand of the President and the military is not stayed and the authority of Congress over war restored, it is the first effective thrust ever made against freedom in this country and may well lead to the complete destruction of our constitutional liberties. I have no objection to our contributing as much as we possibly can to the spirit of freedom throughout the world, but while we are engaged in this altruistic enterprise, we want to make sure that we do not lose our own freedom here at home.

When we deliver the greatest power we possess to the Commander in Chief of this Nation and strip this Congress of power to preserve democracy, we have indeed lost our liberty.

Mr. SHORT. I yield the gentleman one additional minute, if that will be enough.

Mr. BURDICK. I just want to explain this emergency.

Mr. SHORT. Can the gentleman do it in a minute?

Mr. BURDICK. I am not so keen as others, but I have noticed that the Democrats are long on emergencies—we have had them ever since 1932. In this present emergency the administration is attempting to turn what emergency we have into fear and frenzy in order to strip this Congress of the power to say what wars we shall have and when and where our men shall be sent overseas to fight.

Probably some of you Democrats do not like my reference to Democratic emergencies, but let me tell you I have voted with you and stood against my own party time after time when I thought you were right, but this time you are wrong.

As one Member of this Congress, I propose to maintain this democracy and keep alive on this continent the spirit of independence and liberty transmitted to us by the signers of the Declaration of Independence and translated into government at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787.

All the enemies of this Republic are not in foreign countries, but many are right here among us. Those who seek to usurp the constitutional powers of the Congress of the people are more to be feared than all assaults ever made upon this Government by any foreign power. Remember the caution that has come down through 150 years of our history: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 10 minutes to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the Speaker, for whom I have an affectionate regard and whose judgment I value, told us yesterday that because of the current massing of Communist troops in Korea and Manchuria, it is his "firm belief that we are in greater danger of an expanded war today than we have been at any time since the close of the World War in 1945."

Mr. RAYBURN said:

I think that we stand in the face of terrible danger and maybe the beginning of world war III.

It should be evident that the administration apparently has information which it has not imparted to the other Members of Congress and to the American people. We all know that we are in a critical period in our international relations. And that we must use every resource at our command and a maximum of wisdom if we are to survive. We have known that for some time that is why we have the draft and are spending billions for armaments. Whether we are on the immediate brink of another world war, I cannot say.

But I do know this—because of adherence to policies long since proven disastrous, our State Department today is blocking the use of the fullest resources available to us.

I refer to the failure to employ the 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa under the command of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. I discussed this failure to use Formosan troops in a speech I delivered in Brooklyn on February 12, and I have reexamined this question in several speeches since.

Under the legislation we are considering here today, we contemplate calling up tens of thousands of additional American boys to hold the front in Korea, and for dispersal to Europe. We have had the testimony of General Eisenhower and the highest officers of the Pentagon concerning the European theater. The Congress unfortunately has not had the benefit of similar advice from our Far Eastern Command.

I want to say to this House that if we are closer to a third world war today than at any time since 1945 because of the current massing of Communist troops in Korea and Manchuria, then I think it is imperative for the safety of our Nation that we know completely and thoroughly the views of the Far Eastern Command, and at once. It is because of this belief I have decided to make public a letter that I received a week ago.

Several weeks ago I wrote General MacArthur a note and I enclosed a copy of my February 12 address. I wanted to make sure my views were not in conflict with what was best for America.

General MacArthur was kind enough to reply to my letter, and I wish at this time to read it to the House:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: I am most grateful for your note of the eighth forwarding me a copy of your address of February 12. The latter I have read with much interest, and find that with the passage of years you have certainly lost none of your old time punch.

My views and recommendations with respect to the situation created by Red China's entry into war against us in Korea have been submitted to Washington in most complete detail. Generally these views are well known and clearly understood, as they follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counter force as we have never failed to do in the past. Your view with respect to the utilization of the Chinese forces on Formosa is in conflict with neither logic nor this tradition.

It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words; that if we lose the war to communism in Asia the fall of Europe is inevitable, win it and Europe most probably would avoid war and yet preserve freedom. As you point out, we must win. There is no substitute for victory.

With renewed thanks and expressions of most cordial regard, I am,

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

It is perfectly clear from General MacArthur's words that he strongly favors the employment of the anti-Communist forces on Formosa. I wish to ask that if, as the general says, "The utilization of the Chinese forces on Formosa is in conflict with neither logic nor tradition," why in God's name are we not using them?

I think it is high time that the administration and the Pentagon came clean with the Congress and with the American people. Certainly if there is danger, the enemy knows it. Why hold it back from the American people?

I do not have to tell the Members of the House that down through the years we have heard high officials of this Government utter time and again the direct

warnings of imminent bloodshed when a particular piece of legislation they wanted was before the Congress.

On the other hand, and this was particularly true a year ago immediately before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, high administration officials, including the occupant of the White House, have told us that we were closer to peace than at any other time in recent years.

Now, what puzzles us more is that on yesterday, while Mr. RAYBURN was warning the House that a third world war was imminent, another administration spokesman arose in the Senate. The spokesman was Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who usually is presumed to be speaking with the authority of the administration behind him.

I now quote from Mr. CONNALLY's remarks as printed on page 3382 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 4, 1951:

> The course of world events is uncertain, but it is my view that there will be no world war this year. The Russians will not defy the free nations of the world.

I think when the Senate is being told one thing and the House another by administration leaders on the very same day an explanation is due.

We in this House respect and cherish the integrity of our speaker. I know that we can count on him, as we have always counted on him, to join us in our desire for a full presentation of facts to this Congress, and it was characteristic of him that he promised the House yesterday he would do so. The Congress is an integral part of this Government and its members are the elected representatives of the people. They must have the facts if they are to make intelligent decisions.

The people of the country trust Congress. They want them to have all the facts and they are ready to accept their judgment when the facts are fully impeded. The people are tired and worried over the constant fag of secrecy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I know of no one piece of legislation presented on the floor of the House during my limited term of service in Congress that is more vicious in its intent, more distortionary in its purpose, and more destructive of American principles, precepts, and traditions, than the present bill labeled S. 1, and relating to universal and compulsory military training.

I have read and studied the provisions set forth in this bill, and I am frank to say that what the bill attempts to do to our youth is both shocking and brutal. The language in the bill is confusing and so loosely drawn that it may conceivably be treated and construed to mean most anything. Indefiniteness in its terms and the apparent flexibility to which the language is susceptible would readily provide the vehicle that could easily reduce the great middle-class people of our Nation and their sons to a state of vassalage and military serfdom. If this came to pass such a situation would be comparable to that which prevailed for centuries in major European nations, and invariably resulted in rule by autocrats and tyrants.

The bill in its present form is bound to invite trouble in a free nation like ours. It proposes to add another bureaucracy to long line of similar institutions that are gradually encroaching more and more upon the civil and political rights of our citizens, and thereby expressly or by implication pave the way for a military dictatorship.

What has been said on the floor of the House thus far in support of the bill, in my opinion, has added very little, if anything, to the value or clarification of the conflicting or unconscionable terms and provisions contained in the bill. It is apparent to me that the bill, if enacted into law, would tend to enslave and put in military bondage millions of our youth at an age when their minds are most impressionable and their characters are being molded in anticipating of taking on responsibilities that are inherent to the lives and conduct of all individuals who grow from youth into manhood.

Under the terms of the pending bill you propose to draft forcefully for compulsory military training millions of our adolescents at an age when they are living in the springtide of life, and compel them to spend 26 months on parade grounds and in military barracks. What benefits does the bill under discussion confer upon the 18-year-old boy as they relate to the Manual of Arms or military tactics that he cannot now obtain in his high school or college, through ROTC training or by joining the National Guard? Why should a boy of 18 be subjected to the potentialities that this bill calls for, and particularly throwing himself open to the harsh and vicious provisions of the bill dealing with infractions of its terms?

In brief, what can this Nation gain by a law that inflicts 5 years of penal servitude and a $10,000 fine upon our youth who, at 18 years, do not possess mature minds fortified by experience, nor have they a clear concept of the full impact of their acts and conduct which, in many instances, are due largely to their state of immaturity and impetuousness?

I am opposed to this bill, and believe that this Congress should vote it down and thereby discard and get rid of this vicious piece of legislation; I am firmly convinced the great mass of American people do not want it. We should promptly proceed to investigate and determine who is responsible for, and who are the masterminds back of, this legislation. We should explore all of the facets available through which we might develop who it is that stays in the background, but is basically and primarily promoting this legislation. Unquestionably, there is already sufficient evidence to put the public on notice that this bill has the backing of some undisclosed principals who apparently have been working cleverly and fiendishly with the avowed intent and purpose to turn the United States into an armed camp, and thus pave the way for the destruction of the last vestige of a constitutional form of government and substitute therefor a military autocracy and dictatorship.

What is being proposed here by this bill is exactly what subjected Central and South American countries to sporadic rebellions in the past and created the unrest and clashes between the military and civil population in some of these pan-American countries today. These countries are living examples of what compulsory military training and attempted rule by might can accomplish when the people themselves are not fully alerted to the dangers that are wrapped up in legislation of this character. It is a matter of general knowledge and historical fact that wherever military might has been exploited to extremes tyrants and despots have prospered and thrived in their unholy and wicked endeavors.

To my mind this bill is a modified facsimile of the pattern for creating military might that prevailed in continental Europe, and which was the curse of European countries for centuries. Compulsory military training was the real and underlying cause that broke the back of every major country in Europe. Germany, France, Italy, England, and numerous lesser countries are good examples of what happens when the forces of military might get control and take over. It is a matter of record as well as common knowledge that the vast standing armies under the control of European monarchs frequently got out of hand, and in some instances it is conceded that the only remedy to curb the unrest and the smoldering rebellions among the armed forces was for the rulers to make war. We now have before us the aftermath of compulsory military training in these countries. No one has yet challenged the statement that compulsory military training has been a failure in every country where it has prevailed on a major scale.

As further evidence of the viciousness of compulsory military legislation, practically all of the countries in Europe are presently insolvent and economically bankrupt. Their manpower has been destroyed and their physical assets reduced to a minimum. In brief, all of these countries are on the downward grade. About a century and a half last past Napoleon Bonaparte typified the No. 1 military dictator. France is a living example of the effects of the drain that military might puts upon its manpower and the tangible property of the French people. In modern times Hitler and Mussolini are glaring examples of the vicious and destructive repercussions that can follow over-all attempts to substitute military might for right and even-handed justice. England lost an empire because economically it could not stand to bear the burden in costs and expenses entailed by maintaining vast standing armies and a powerful navy in her colonial possessions.

In spite of all the preliminary training that European armies were subjected to, it can be asserted that the armies of the United States, when put up against European might in two wars during the last 30 years, were able to defeat and whip the Kaiser's powerful

standing armies—and later on were able to defeat and destroy the military might created and built by Hitler and Mussolini. At the same time, we defeated and drove the Japanese to cover and confined their activities to a series of islands far remote from the vast territory which that nation occupied and exploited in the Pacific sector.

We did all of this with American boys who had no previous compulsory military training extending over a period of 26 months. We met the most powerful and best-trained armies in all Europe, and met them with the courage and fighting spirit of armies composed of soldiers who entered the army as freemen and not driven chattels coming out of an armed stockade. But, it is urged that Soviet aggression is so apparent that we must turn all America into an active and militant fighting force. American fortitude and courage and our ability to out-produce any nation on earth is the real substitute for compulsory military might. What we did to Hitler and Mussolini we can duplicate and repeat in any armed conflict or clash with Joe Stalin.

The military "brass" obviously is alerted to the fact that the legislation under consideration may produce many soft jobs. Alarmist and artificial-scare promoters are frantically fanning the air in the hope that a noticeable wave of hysteria will be the means of misleading the people and presently lulling them into a false sense of security. It is my considered judgment that the puffed-up proponents in the various departments dealing with our military forces are in for a surprise, if one is to judge from the letters of protest that are coming to my desk, as well as to the desks of many other Congressmen, in astounding numbers. These messages appeal to me as representing the state of mind of a large segment of the people of our Nation, and reflect what a great many people are thinking about legislation dealing with universal military training. The people are aware of the subtle and underhanded approach to this question. Furthermore, the people are not to be deceived as to why the present bill has wrapped up in it two major issues, either or both of which vitally affect the lives, liberties, and general welfare of the youth of our country. There is every indication that the people do not propose to be fooled by this legislative monster masquerading under the cloak of military necessity, and hanging on to the same and often-repeated assertions about the actual or potential dangers of Soviet aggression. The people of America do not want their youth to be Hessianized and put on a military auction block as was done in the days of George III with standing armies. The American people realize that a large area of their country is populated by men and women whose forebears migrated to the United States for one purpose only—that was to get away from the vicious and tyrannical system of compulsory military training which grew to such vast proportions in Europe during the last two centuries.

It is pointed out here that a number of patriotic groups and organizations are bringing pressure to bear in favor of the passage of the bill. In my opinion, those who propose to speak for these patriotic organizations do not represent the sentiments and wishes of the rank and file of those bodies. I contend that such influence is of no more force or effect than the veiled and subtle threats which the overlords of labor were dishing out in their attempts to prejudice the union workingman against the Taft-Hartley bill.

I do not propose to resort to intemperate language or inject collateral issues into the debate while voicing my opinion on this bill, but it is my considered judgment that if we ever played into the hands of the Communists, this is it. As sure as faith, legislation of this character will lead to our moral, spiritual, and economic ruin and destruction. It will more or less retard the progress of every youth of America who has been sucked into the maw of this proposed military octopus.

The influence of this legislation will extend beyond that of marked effects upon the person. It is all too apparent that it will slow down our factories, our workshops, and mills—it will interfere with our transportation—and decidedly impede our home-defense program to the extent that it may be bogged down completely. It is bound to bring into play the venal influence of bad environment and temptation for that of a clean, wholesome, and moral atmosphere which prevails almost universally in our schools and institutions of learning. We may not fully realize it now, but I fear that the repercussions flowing from this piece of legislation, if passed, will be so glaring and destructive that nothing we can do in this generation will wipe out its evil effects on the lives and social welfare of the people of our country.

The adoption of this legislation may bring down upon the heads of the public servants of the people in America more than just verbal or written protests. If the bill is passed, there will be very little, if any, rejoicing among the youth of America and their mothers and fathers. On the other hand, there may be cause for a celebration in the Kremlin and in the haunts of Stalin's fellow travelers residing in the United States. The purposes and objectives of this bill offer a real challenge to the mothers and fathers of this country. I am sure that they will meet it with infinite and unflinching courage. They are already giving out evidence of what their aims will be in the not-too-distant future.

The whole structure under which this plan is being proposed is repugnant to the best traditions of our American way of life. I feel that I can do no greater service to my constituency and my country than to vote against S. 1 in its present form.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

(Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for allowing me this time. During the last Congress I presented a plan called Blueprint for Security—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 21, 1950—which I thought might have some bearing on our national defense. That plan has never been considered.

It seems to me this bill is not adequate. It seems any plan which has been presented and considered so far is not adequate. Let me tell you why I think so, if I may.

In the first place we have to have certain facts. One of them, in my opinion, is this: This Nation can never have as large a standing army as that of Russia or any other nation which we may oppose at any time in the future. There are many reasons for that.

In the first place our men, by and large, are the best-paid, best-clothed, and best-sheltered of any fighting men in the world. That is not true at all times, naturally. But by and large that is the fact.

Secondly, we pay them more and we take care of their families better by way of allotments. Then, in our industrial and economic set-up we do not make use of slave labor. We do not exploit other nations. So, for many reasons which I do not want to bore you with, but for many, many reasons this Nation never can have as large a standing force in the Regular Armed Forces as other countries may have. Apparently we are to have a standing force of 4,000,000 men. The figures varied from 3,000,000 and something up to 4,000,000.

What is the financial cost. My own figures are a little less than those of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but I am satisfied to go by his statement. By his figures it takes about $10,000 a man per year. Four million men at $10,000 a man a year and you get about $40,000,000,000 each year for a four-million-man army.

Over how many years can this Nation, or any nation, stand that economic strain of $40,000,000,000 a year? How long is the emergency period going to last? I think that is basic in this matter.

The difficulty with this entire administration, in my opinion, and with the entire Armed Services Committee and the Congress, and the whole Nation, as far as that is concerned, is that at no time have we come to any opinion so that we can have a long-range program.

In my talk in the last Congress I pointed out that I thought some program had to be devised that would take into account the fact that this was not something for a temporary period of 1 or 2 or 3 years, but that we ought to try to have a long-range program. I used the figure of 25 years. It does not matter whether you take 5 or 10 or 25 years, but before you can come to a well-reasoned, considered conclusion, you have to have some sort of basic premise. This bill is not founded upon any basic premise at all. This bill goes from one emergency period to another, so that

year after year we have a continuing drain.

There is another thing that ought to be taken into account, and that is what are you going to do with the men after you get them in? If we were to use every single ship that we have, every means of transportation that we have in peacetime, let alone in wartime, we could not get 1,000,000 men to fighting fronts in 6 months' time. That, to me, is another basic point.

The next point that I think is important before you can reach a decision is this: Apparently we can train a man for combat duty in 6 months. When I looked into this some years ago, they were talking about 10 or 12 months. My own opinion is that you can train a man in 4 months for combat duty. But let us take their present figure of 6 months. If you can train a man in 6 months' time for combat duty, and if you do not have the ships to be able to transport people from the camps in this country to the fighting fronts in less than 6 months' time, why do you need more than a million men in the camps of this country at any one time, provided you have some sort of a fighting reservoir? That is in line with what the committee has in mind in the UMT program. But, again, that is expensive.

The plan I suggested is something which, in my opinion, would save the country billions of dollars a year. Of course, that is important. Money does not matter when it comes to saving lives, but if we are not going to go bankrupt in every way, we have got to have a long-range plan that will take into account our military preparedness, our financial situation, our domestic life, our morals, our American way of life, and our industrial set-up on the home front. This plan does not do it. Perhaps the idea I have does not do it either, but I can tell you this, that if you are going to keep putting men into the armed services when you have a standing Army of 4,000,000 men, costing over $40,000,000,000 a year, and take those men out of industry, have them in armed camps where they cannot possibly be shipped abroad—and the Armed Services Committee can check on this statement if they want to—they cannot ship over a million men abroad in 6 months' time. What good is it to have two or three million men in camps in this country?

So a plan has to be devised that will be within the financial means of the country, not for 1 or 2 years, but for this emergency period, so-called, which may continue for 5 or 10 or 15 years. Russia, in her plan, would like nothing better than if we bled ourselves white financially so that there was no way in which we could support an armed force.

Mr. VINSON. I would like for the gentleman to state to the committee whether or not he thinks that this program to establish the commission and to establish the training corps is feasible? Is the gentleman in favor of establishing the commission and the training corps?

Mr. FURCOLO. If that is the best we can get, I favor it, I may say to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. And then under the proposed amendment that I am going to submit to the committee, it would be in order for this plan the gentleman has in mind to be submitted for consideration when the Congress takes up the determination as to what the character of the plan shall be. Is not that correct?

Mr. FURCOLO. Yes. May I say this——

Mr. VINSON. Why is it in any way unfair? Any man can submit any plan he wishes.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. Then what we are proposing to do is to enact legislation creating the commission, enact legislation creating the corps, and then Congress writes finally whatever plan it wants to, to be implemented by the commission.

Mr. FURCOLO. I understand that. But there are three objections to it. First, you cannot do it economically; secondly, you are not going to be fair to the home and industry; and, thirdly, you are not going to have the manpower pool. Here is what I suggested: I suggested that we keep the draft in operation so that you provide enough men to keep at all times at least a million men in the army camps of America; that is, in addition to what you have abroad. Secondly, I suggested that throughout the entire Nation there be set up what I call civilian selectee boards where millions of men in this country would not be taken from their homes, would not be taken from their jobs, would not cost the Government any great amount of money to train or maintain.

I know from my own experience and any man knows from his experience if he served in World War II that it does not matter much where a man receives his military training in many of its aspects; there is very little difference between learning the manual of arms and drilling in a camp or in a field in your own community. There are so many things that could be done so much more easily and cheaply in the way of giving them basic training right in their own communities at no expense to the Government and at no detriment to their families or at no detriment to industry, in the way I have outlined.

Another thing that astonishes me is that there is so little coordination in the thinking of the people of this country. We are spending three billions of dollars to set up a special air-raid warning system. The basis of that is that we think that planes are coming over here and we have got to warn the people; we think that bombs are going to be dropped and that people are going to be injured. We are spending three billions on that kind of a civil defense system, yet I will bet you cannot name 10 high schools in this country that include compulsory first aid as part of the training for high-school students, yet first aid is one of the things that would be most useful and most needed if bombs were dropped and fires were started and people were injured, and we do not do one single thing along that line. All that could be coordinated in this program, and it should be done.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. All of those things and others might be embodied in the program.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. But we have not reached the stage yet of writing the plan. What we are trying to do here is to provide machinery by which the plan can have the benefit of the learned discussion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. I understand that, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia; I understand what the program is here, but the fact of the matter is you are not going to get this program, in all probability you are never going to get the proper program this way. The only way you are going to get it is to have the Armed Services Committee work it out, and work out all the details. What I am pointing out is that we have got to have a long-range program that is not going to disrupt the American way of life and that is not going to cost these enormous amounts of money. Whether the plan be for 10 years, 5 years, or whatever length of time, it should be such a plan as to let these men get all the training they can in their communities and disrupt their lives as little as possible, and disrupt the industry of this country as little as possible. This plan I outline will save well over a hundred billion dollars in less than 5 years.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the gentleman refer to some plan like the junior ROTC for the high schools of America? I think we have got to expand that plan. There is a bill which I have had the pleasure of introducing to that effect, and hearings will be held on it in due course.

Mr. FURCOLO. Of course, that is going to be hard. That is one very small part of the plan, but that does not go to the essence of what I am talking about here.

Mr. VINSON. Then the gentleman is with us in our effort to start the machinery and to build up the corps and the commission?

Mr. FURCOLO. This bill is probably better than the present set-up, but it is not very much of a bill, in my opinion. It is probably better than the present set-up.

Mr. VINSON. We have to go one step further and let the Congress write the plan or have a voice in it. When you do, then you do have something.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What the gentleman is asking today is to have this plan considered now and not after a bill is passed, is that right?

Mr. FURCOLO. The gentleman has a thought there. Of course, it will never be done, you will never see this recommitted and you cannot have it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Under this bill we are supposed to approve a plan that has come out of the committee, and I have the greatest respect for that committee as does the gentleman, but they want us to do it now and then bring in a plan later.

Mr. FURCOLO. A blank check probably. There is no other way they can do it.

Let me get to one other thing. Some years ago I suggested to the military that there was going to be a shortage of doctors. Of course, there is going to be one in the future as well as there has been in the past. The military needs doctors. They want to have them 24 hours a day and you have to have them that way for overseas duty. In my district we have an air base. Let us assume that air base needs 10 full-time doctors. Within a radius of 8 miles there are 500 civilian doctors. I have checked with them and I know they are willing to go along. As a patriotic group they are willing to form a pool. They are willing to put in 4 hours a week or 4 hours a month so that the air base will at all times have 10 full-time doctors on duty. I suggested that instead of drafting 10 doctors and taking them from the civilian communities in which they live, why not have the military take two or three full-time military doctors and use the services of the other civilian seven part-time doctors. It would save the Government money. The doctors would prefer it. The families at home who depend upon the doctors would prefer it. Do you think the military will do that? Of course they will not. They can draft men and they will take all the men they can get. But the Armed Services Committee can do something about that. But that will not be done.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is the gentleman aware that S. 1 as originally introduced by the junior Senator from Georgia had a similar provision about universal military training which the gentleman mentions?

Mr. FURCOLO. It is somewhat similar. I may say the gentleman from Texas and I with several others have talked about this before the bill came up and there will be an amendment or a substitute offered that may embody some of the suggestions.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. If the chairman of the Armed Services Committee would let somebody talk once in a while we will advance that idea.

Mr. FURCOLO. Well, PAT, I cannot go along with that thought since he has granted me time today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply conscious of the fundamental responsibilities, issues, and implications which are involved in the debate upon S. 1, the so-called draft and UMT bill.

Practically everyone, under the circumstances existing, is for the continuation of the draft. I have never been exactly happy about conscripting people; I did, however, vote to continue the present Draft Act a little less than a month before the outbreak of the Korean war. The draft apparently is the means which is necessary to furnish us with armed forces of three to four million men. I feel that within this range is necessary at this time, in the light of conditions. I am definitely for continuation of the draft for some reasonable period.

The continuation of the draft has been interwoven in this bill with the obnoxious UMT provisions, and this legislation has been described as a shotgun affair of continuing that which is necessary—the draft—and imposing that which is a completely different problem, having nothing to do with the draft—namely, UMT.

Fundamentally I am completely opposed to any permanent peacetime conscription. To me that is what the UMT provisions of the bill mean.

There is actually no relationship between the draft and UMT. The draft is for the purpose of meeting the needs of the Armed Forces under existing conditions. UMT is the plan to put the military in control of the youth of this country.

Putting the military in the saddle would control and destroy this country as surely as it destroyed Germany, Japan, and Italy; it would result in a military dictatorship and would take us down the same tragic pathway to destruction of our very form of government.

Fundamentally I am opposed to the drafting of 18-year-olds, either under UMT or under a draft bill. I was one of 16 Members of the House who in 1942 voted against the 18-year-old draft.

To me the attempted distinction between the drafting of 18-year-olds and 18½-year-olds is twaddle.

I have said that I do not feel particularly happy about any draft bill. I do not think our young men should be called at less than the 19-year old present standard which we have. I was a volunteer in World War I, as I should have been, and as our three sons have since been. Personally, I enjoyed tremendously my service and associations in World War I. I am not bitter against the military. I am their friend. I have the greatest respect for many of our generals and admirals who are fine and outstanding men in their profession. There are a few arrogant militarists in the Pentagon whom I do not trust. I reserve the right to criticize mistakes, arrogance or neglect. I have the highest regard for the great bulk of our officers.

You know, during World War I when you went to a superior officer and asked a question it was absolutely unheard of for them to in any way deceive you or double-talk you. It was an absolute rule that they told you the truth as they expected you to do; that you had to be honest when you answered questions. Apparently some of that does not exist in some sections.

I have always supported a strong national defense as well as a strong Reserve training program.

I want to see the Army a respected, efficient, reliable Army—not a group of politicians who are trying to make over and take over.

I want to see the Congress in control of all of the policies dealing with the military—except in the field of making military decisions, which is the responsibility of the armed services.

I want to see a strong Reserve program—not a Reserve program bungled and buried, as has been done by the Army, in my opinion, since World War II, and then was followed by the horrible mess of calling in inactive reservists since the Korean War. That conduct has left such a bad taste in the minds of those of us who have been close to it that any Reserve program is going to be regarded with skepticism in the future.

I do not want to see a lot of authority given to the Army or Selective Service to promulgate a lot of regulations. I want to see the Congress write the law so that we do not have the spectacle of Selective Service making one announcement one day and the Army issuing a contradictory statement the next day, or vice versa—all of which has left not only the youth of this country in a befuddled, upset state of mind, but has confused the people of the country as well.

UMT will not build the armed services up to the present needs of 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 men. It will not bring home married veterans called under their Reserve status in this war. And in my opinion, it will not relieve a single Korean combat veteran.

Under this proposed UMT plan, the American youth of 18 to 18½ years will not serve from 4 to 6 months in training but instead his obligation of service will be from 72 to 96 months total service, depending upon whether the House or Senate version is adopted.

After the training period and any active service, the man must spend the remainder of from 72 to 96 months—6 or 8 years—in a Reserve component, under a Reserve plan not yet even drawn up and submitted to us. This is mandatory. During that period they may be called back into active service, including combat service, at the whim of the Defense Department, at any time, even though they may already be combat veterans.

What kind of a Reserve program are we to have? We do not know.

I recall with the deepest pleasure my own training following World War I as a Reserve officer.

I was deeply interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO]. The trouble is, his plan is too simple. It is difficult for those who want regimentation and control.

Following World War I we had an excellent volunteer training program which was called the CMTC program, the civilian military training program. I served as a Reserve in some of those camps. You who served in that program during that time will recall that these boys were volunteers. These volunteers served for 30 days of intensive training.

Principally basic training, it is true. It advanced into leadership training. Our camp at Fort Snelling, Minn., was always oversubscribed. Those boys came in and did not get one cent of pay. They got their mileage and their equipment and their food while they were at the camp, of course, but they never drew a cent of pay. I know of my own personal knowledge that out of those camps came literally thousands of the officers and the noncommissioned officers of World War II. One of the boys from my home town whose early training was CMTC came out of World War II as a full colonel.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I think something of a similar nature was placed into effect prior to World War II during the year 1940 in the city of Chicago, where volunteer classes for those who may have been prospective draftees were given at places like the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. Several evenings a week, on a regular schedule, students would join up and go through rifle practice and drill practice, without compensation, in order that they might be trained.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

There has never been submitted by the War Department or the planners a single plan in this great American country, a volunteer plan for universal training, where these boys could go in, say for 2 or 3 months in the summer, for 2 or 3 years, and have intensive training, and then go back to school or go back to the farms or back to their businesses and their normal lives.

Under this bill you draft these 18-year-olds and control their lives for 6 to 8 years; it is 8 years under the bill passed by the other body. You bounce them in and out of the reserve program after they have had their training. How are they ever going to get a start in life? How are they ever going to get an education? How are they ever going to get married and have families? Have any of you ever thought of that? I have, because one of the things I have tried to do has been to keep in touch with the youth of this country and this problem.

I say to you that they have been off balance, purposely kept off balance by this plan and that plan and the contradictory statements, one issued one day by the Selective Service saying one thing and another issued the next day by the Army saying another, or vice versa. These youngsters do not know where they are going, and that is why you have these thousands of youngsters who around the holidays left the colleges and enlisted because they wanted to exercise the God-given right that should be theirs of picking the branch of the service they wanted. But oh, no—you want to draft them all and tell them where they are going to go and what they are going to do. I hope that some of you Members will remember that the most precious treasure we have is these youngsters and we ought to think what we are doing to them, not only today but in the future. I have not heard a soul mention that.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman, of course, has a wonderful war record as we all know. He is a past commander of his State and served some 2 or 3 years in the AEF.

Mr. O'HARA. If I may interrupt the gentleman, that is not quite correct. I was overseas about 12 months.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman was in the service, of course.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, definitely.

Mr. DURHAM. And the gentleman also was in the Reserves, as he said. How long was he in the Reserves?

Mr. O'HARA. A number of years, until it became impossible for me to continue active training because of other demands upon me.

Mr. DURHAM. In view of that, how does the gentleman arrive at the conclusion that 6 months' service and 6 years in the Reserve is going to be so disastrous to the individuals involved? The gentleman has been very successful in his own life, and I do not understand how such an argument can be made.

Mr. O'HARA. I will answer the gentleman if he will give me the opportunity to do so. I took my Reserve training at the time I elected to do so. You are not going to just take these boys for 2 weeks each year for Reserve training, are you?

Mr. DURHAM. No, for 6 months.

Mr. O'HARA. You are going to give them 6 months of training. Then, as a matter of fact, they may be put into a Reserve unit which may be activated or the National Guard unit may be activated. We do not know what they are going to do or what is going to be done with them, do we?

Mr. DURHAM. We, who stayed in the Reserve after World War I, of course, had the privilege of resigning. Some stayed in the Reserves for 12 or 13 or 14 years.

Mr. O'HARA. May I answer that. I do not want to cut the gentleman off, but when I took my Reserve training, I took it at my election. Under the bill that we are now considering, is that boy going to have a chance to elect when he wants to take his training?

Mr. DURHAM. The present Selective Service System does decide whether he should be called up to active service.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, he can be called up just like a draftee.

Mr. DURHAM. I do not see why that should be so disastrous to the individual.

Mr. O'HARA. Why do you not just keep him in the Army?

Mr. DURHAM. Well, you have to have a Reserve pool. We count on the Reserves as we always have, and they have always fought all the wars of this country.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say to the gentleman I have just as deep an interest in having a proper Reserve pool as he has.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, I realize that, and that is the reason why I asked the question.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say that all the patriotism in this country is not lodged solely with me or with the gentleman. I say we should use a little common sense in this program. It was the rule during the war that the infantry soldier got 16 to 17 weeks of intensive combat training. I know lads who went across and who were in combat and who went into combat right after that training. Some of them had been in a great deal of action. They told me they learned everything that they had to know for combat in that period of basic training. Why can we not have something like that? I am for giving the youth of this country a sound basic military training program.

Mr. DURHAM. So am I.

Mr. O'HARA. I am for giving them a basic military training program on a volunteer basis, within reason, and not just tying the youth of the country up in knots for 6 to 8 years.

Mr. DURHAM. Why can that not be worked out under the plan on a volunteer basis? We must have reserves, however. How can it be done?

Mr. O'HARA. I say I do not want many of the things in any bill or any plan that comes out of the Pentagon. I can say that just as positively as I know that I am here talking to you.

Mr. DURHAM. Neither do I.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to have the Committee on Armed Services sit down and write out an American volunteer training program.

Mr. DURHAM. That is just exactly what we intend to do, so long as I am a member of the committee, whenever the plan is presented.

Mr. O'HARA. If UMT is to be a training and Reserve pool program, why should we have to keep the youngsters in so long for training and disrupt their lives and their future?

It is a well-known fact that the Army is the greatest waster of manpower there is. All you have to do is talk to some of the Reserves who have been called back into the service and have done little or nothing in the past 6 or 8 or 9 months.

No less an authority than General Eisenhower is reported to have testified that the thing that gets a soldier in trouble is feeling useless—sort of kicked around. That is an excellent comment.

The trouble is that every time a certain five-star general is in control he wants to have the 18-year-olds. As far as I am concerned, there are too many childless generals who have not the slightest conception of what is being done to the youth of this country, and now want to do it permanently. I say to you, frankly, that for the last 6 years, with the constant drive and propaganda for draft and UMT and submarines off the coast and an emergency convenient for every scheme of the planners, with all the the hysteria that has been built up, the youth of the country has been off balance and too confused to make and proceed on any plans for their future.

I deny that 18-year-olds make the best soldiers, from my wartime experience. I know there are in the House a number of combat officers who commanded troops in combat; not a one whom I have ever talked to has claimed that 18-year-olds make the best soldiers. Quite the contrary.

Many at the age of 18 are immature mentally and physically. Some are ma-

ture, but the great bulk of them are immature. And there is a great difference, Members of the House, between a volunteer 18-year-old and a drafted 18-year-old.

But they want to take them at 18, indoctrinate them into the military type of thinking, and keep them in some long military training program for a period of 6 to 8 years.

I notice in the papers lately that under the draft law they are also playing around with another idea—that they are going to exempt certain youth of this country who have qualified under a fancy, smart-boy theory to continue in college. I am against such an un-American discriminatory plan.

Can you imagine what a fancy deal that would be?

You discriminate in favor of one boy who is in college, and against another boy who is either in or out of college, and you create in the minds of those who are taken that they are a bunch of mental inferiors who are incompetent for anything or any good except as cannon fodder.

If proponents of UMT are sincere, why should not all have to serve?

UMT is the destruction of a fundamental policy of this country. Think of the literally thousands of the finest American citizens we have, whose forebears, or they themselves, fled from the UMT that existed in the old countries.

I want it plainly understood that I will vote to separate the issues of the draft and UMT; and that I shall vote against the form of UMT in this bill.

I am not going to quarrel with anyone about their views. This is a solemn matter of our own judgment and our own conscience, and God help us if we are not right and sound in our judgment in this House, not only for the youth of this country but for the very existence of our form of government.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage, appreciate, and enjoy hearing from not only my own constituents but from people of this country, and having their views upon pending legislation.

Certain representatives of organizations, as individuals and as representatives of organizations, have written and wired me urging adoption of this legislative monstrosity that is before is.

That is fitting and proper.

Certain organizations have been for a form of UMT One organization particularly has been for such a program—but do they know what is in this bill? Many of them, I am sure, do not, or they would not be endorsing it.

It is rather true, I believe, that most of them have never had an opportunity to read this bill. They are responding to telegrams from sources in Washington urging them to wire or write their Congressmen to vote for some bill that they know not what it contains. They do not know what the implications could be. They have been probably innocently misled into believing that what is in this bill is what the organizations, or they as individuals, were for.

Can they know that in this bill we would be creating a commission who would submit a plan which would not be subjects to amendments on the floor—a plan which might have some good and some very bad commitments? It would be a complete blank check to some planners to militarize and regiment this country, and the only opportunity we would have would be to vote against it in this bill which is before us now. The Members of Congress would be stooges who would not be considered to have the intelligent reasoning to write a universal training bill.

It is up to us, regardless of the pressure, to vote and think for ourselves and for what is the best interests of our country regardless of our personal or political future. I shall certainly do so.

It is fundamentally necessary that the military take care of the military end, but always that the Congress as the representatives of the people control the policy.

I recognized, as does everyone, the tragic cost of a large standing armed force. There is a limit to what we can do. But let us not sell the destiny of this country on the bargain counter of Junkerism.

I shall vote for an amendment which I know will be offered, that Congress only shall authorize the sending of troops to foreign shores. To me that is fundamentally the responsibility and the duty of Congress.

Yes; I am for amending this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

(Mr. CRUMPACKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago when many of those now present were standing here in the well of this House discussing military matters in the abstract, I was standing in line in a reception center learning about the military at first hand. I speak to you today as an ex-draftee, a man who spent 4½ years in uniform, a year and a half of it as an enlisted man, or dogface, as we were popularly known in the Army at that time. To put it another way, I speak as one who has been through the mill—the same mill through which you now propose to put the youth of the country—evidently for all time to come.

During my enlisted service I lived, ate, slept, and worked with enlistees, old Army men, new Army careerists, and draftees of all ages from 16 to 50. During the 3 years that I was an officer I was always in jobs where I was working directly with enlisted men. I never achieved such eminence as to become filed away in an office somewhere, piloting a swivel chair.

I place such particular emphasis on this background because I feel that one who has had personal experience with military training should be entitled to some personal opinions on the subject. I lay no claim to the oracular wisdom which some members of the Armed Services Committee evidently feel they have acquired by spending 10, 20, or 30 years listening to the generals and admirals describe military life to them. Even lacking such wisdom, however, I would like to take exception to some of the conclusions which evidently have been reached by the majority of this committee.

I mention the testimony of generals and admirals before the committee, not because I wish to become a brass-baiter, but because I do not believe that all knowledge of all military matters is in the exclusive possession of the men who wear the stars. If you want to discuss high level strategy, tactics, or logistics, their opinions are, of course, of great value. However, as every man who has ever been in uniform knows, if you want to get an exact answer as to how some detailed phase of a military operation works, you do not ask the general, you do not ask the colonel, you do not even ask the captain, you go out on the line and ask some lieutenant, sergeant, or corporal. This is particularly true when it comes to matters pertaining to the training and performance of enlisted men, as these ranks are the ones who have to deal with such problems every day.

And what has the Armed Services Committee done in the course of its investigations? The record discloses that they received testimony from no less than eight generals and one admiral. These distinguished gentlemen possessed, between them, no less than 22 stars. The committee must, indeed, have been dazzled by so much gold braid and so many shiny silver stars, as the bill which they have presented, despite their doubtless correct protestations that they wrote it themselves, presents substantially the program recommended by the Pentagon, only slightly watered down. They seem also to have neglected entirely hearing any testimony from anyone who has viewed the military from the other end of the ladder.

And now to get on with the specific provisions of this bill, and some of the opinions I mentioned before. It has been my experience that the adolescent years of 16, 17, and 18 are the years during which perhaps the greatest development and maturing takes place. The difference in maturity between your average 18-year old and your average 19-year old is much greater than that between your average 19-year old and your average 20-year old. When you get past the twentieth year the annual development in maturity is hardly perceptible, but amongst the late-teen agers, development is at a very rapid pace and noticeable changes take place, seemingly within periods of only weeks. It is frequently argued, in connection with the present bill, that 6 months will make no difference; that if you are going to take the boys eventually, what does it matter what age you fix? If you were to carry this argument to its logical conclusion you could, by lowering the draft age in increments of 6 months or a year, eventually get it down to where you would be taking babies.

Boys of 17 and 18 are not only mentally immature, they have not reached physical maturity either. If you don't believe that, just take notice some time

of the comparative stamina and endurance of high-school athletes, who averaged around 17 and 18 years of age, and college athletes who are 19, 20, and 21. That this difference is recognized by the medical authorities is amply shown by the fact that a high-school football game lasts 48 minutes as compared with 60 minutes for a college game, and a high-school basketball game lasts only 32 minutes as compared with 40 minutes in college.

But to get back to how this works out in military service, I would like to again refer to my own personal experiences. The fighter squadron to which I was assigned after being drafted received a contingent of some 70 or 80 new enlistees shortly after Pearl Harbor. This group was largely composed of 17- and 18-year-old boys who had joined in the rush to get into uniform which followed the Japanese attack. When I say "boys" I use the term advisedly. Although there were notable exceptions, many of the group never were anything but a problem to us. Many of them were undependable and irresponsible. I could spend the rest of the afternoon describing individual cases to you, from the unpredictable kid who, when placed on guard duty, amused himself taking pot shots with his rifle at objects on the hangar roof, to the great joy of those of us who happened to be working inside at the time, to the son of a wealthy family, who, though never needing money, used to steal automobiles in an effort to prove his manliness to us. Suffice it to say, that, in my opinion, they were definitely not the most desirable age group. Some of them fell easy prey to many of the vices to which persons living in military encampments are unavoidably exposed. In short, they were just too young.

And, although I was never in front-line combat myself, I had considerable contact with those who had been, and their story invariably was that when the chips are down in actual combat, you would much rather have men with you who are old enough to know the value of self-preservation and who will still be with you to help on the second day of battle, rather than to have with you inexperienced kids who throw their lives away needlessly at the first skirmish and aren't around to do you any good later on.

In spite of all the statements to the contrary made by highly placed generals who have never served with troops, I still say that when you draft 18-year-olds or even 18½-year-olds and throw them into the infantry, you are sending boys to do a man's job.

One secondary effect of lowering the draft age to 18 during World War II, which seems to have been entirely overlooked in the discussion of the present bill, was that the services which depended entirely upon volunteers, and this, during the early part of the war, included the Navy, Coast Guard, and Marines, and later in the war only the Marine Corps, could obtain nothing but men in the age group immediately below the draft minimum. This was due to the fact that any man who wished to get into a service of his own choice naturally had to enlist before his eighteenth birthday, when the draft minimum was 18, or his draft board would make the selection for him. The Navy, although eventually forced to accept draftees, received many enlistments which were in this category. The ranks of the Marines, toward the end of the war, were, as a result of this, largely made up of 17-year-old kids, while some Army divisions, at the same time, due to this flight from the draft to other services, had average personnel ages approaching thirty—a strange by-product of our manpower policies of that era.

While this effect was bad enough during World War II, it could develop into something far more serious in the near future if we lower the draft age below 19 now and then subsequently become involved in a third world war. The Navy, Air Force, and Marines are at the present entirely dependent upon volunteer enlistments. With the draft age at 19, they are getting most of the men during their eighteenth year—generally immediately after they have completed high school. Judging from the comments made by some of the Members, they evidently do not deem it important to keep a steady flow of good men going into these services. The present inclination of top Pentagon officials seems to be to draft all of our young men and let every third man through the door be assigned to the Navy or Air Force. They have relegated to these services a secondary role in the defense of the United States. Their attitude was well expressed by the chairman on Tuesday when he told the House that the Army was the backbone of our defense. I say that this statement represents a complete failure to comprehend the true military situation as it exists today. You do not have to be an armchair strategist of great stature to know that. Any school boy knows that Russia could not land a man anywhere in the Western Hemisphere without first either bypassing or defeating both our Navy and our Air Force. These services constitute our first line of defense. Any school boy can also tell you that both Napoleon and Hitler, equipped with far stronger land forces than we have ever been able to muster, tried to defeat the massive armies of Russia and failed. If we have learned anything from Korea it is that, despite all of our mechanization and superior fire power, we cannot hope to defeat the massed manpower of the Communists. All we can hope to achieve in either Korea or in our new adventure in Western Europe is a sort of fluid stalemate, with armies marching back and forth, destroying everything as they go, but with neither side ever achieving a clear-cut victory. Russia can withstand that sort of a stalemate far longer than we can.

Our only hope for victory, yes, our only hope for survival, lies in our technical superiority, which, in a military sense, is expressed in our technical services, the Navy, and the Air Force. These services cannot be kept strong by relegating to them what is left at the bottom of the manpower barrel after the Army gets done taking our doctors, scientists, and engineers, handing them rifles and throwing them into the front lines. The Navy and the Air Force, by their very nature, need the cream of American manpower, and should have first priority. They are technical services and every man is a technician, holding a highly technical and highly responsible job. These jobs cannot be filled properly with 17-year-old kids who have quit high school in order to enlist ahead of the draft. Nor can they be filled by every third man who comes through the door, without respect to his capabilities and qualifications.

Now it is frequently argued that you cannot win wars without ground troops. Taken in the strictly limited sense this statement is perfectly true. But to jump from this to the broader statement that ground troops must play the major role in any victory is to ignore a lot of recent history. We have the prime example of Japan, which was defeated without our ever landing a man on their mainland and without ever engaging the bulk of their army. Ground troops in the Pacific war played the purely secondary role of winning naval and air bases, from which the Navy and the Air Force struck the knockout blows.

We also have the example of Britain, which for centuries maintained world supremacy through naval power, with only a small army serving as an auxiliary force. They successfully defended themselves in 1940 with only a scant 20 miles of water serving as a barrier, with virtually no army at all, as their army had been largely lost in the Dunkerque disaster. Air and naval power saved the day for them then. It was only when Britain departed from her historic policy and committed large ground forces to the Continent of Europe in the two world wars that her decline as a world power set in.

There is only one thing further I would like to say in regard to the 18½ draft. That is, that lowering the minimum age by 6 months in order to enlarge the available draft pool is a one-shot proposition. You gain a few hundred thousand men this year, but next year you are right back where you started from. You will have used up the additional pool and again will be waiting for new men to arrive at the minimum age. In passing, it might be well to point out that the administration, by its recent action in connection with the deferment of college students, has taken from the available manpower pool more men than would be added to it by lowering the draft age to 18½.

And now I would like to devote my attentions for a moment to UMT. I received a letter the other day telling me that the initials actually stand for useless military training. I think that is a very apt description. The initials UMT have been sold to many people as a patent medicine cure-all for all of our military ills. We have been told that had UMT been passed in 1946 or 1946 we would not have had to throw green men into Korea last year—completely overlooking the fact that the divisions thrown into Korea were regular Army

divisions, composed of professional soldiers, not of civilians hastily called up and thrown into battle without proper training. If the Army cannot train its regulars, how can they be expected to do an adequate job with UMT trainees? We are told that if we had only had UMT in the past we never would have become involved in the recent wars, completely overlooking the fact that all of the major powers on the continent of Europe have had UMT for many years, yet all of them have been involved in repeated wars.

The present bill spells out no details of just what sort of training will be provided under this magic wonder-drug called UMT. We are asked to buy a pig-in-a-poke.

It should be apparent to everyone that the only kind of training which can or will be given in the 4- to 6-month period provided in this bill is infantry training. There is no conceivable way that technicians for the Navy and Air Force could be properly trained in such a program. The bare minimum of basic military training needed by these men can be given them in few weeks time, and having them spend 4 or 6 months in a boy-scout military camp would be a great waste of their time. Yet, the technical training which they require takes at least 2 years.

The advocates of this UMT program are thinking of warfare in terms of World War I and previous wars. Warfare has undergone great changes during this century but some of our hidebound military leaders are still engaging in their favorite practice of steadfastly gazing into the past, while backing into the future. War has become a contest between technicians. By reason of the length of time it takes to train these technicians, modern technical armed forces must, of necessity, be composed largely of professionals.

I yield to no man, not the gentleman from Georgia, not the gentleman from Texas, not even to the distinguished Speaker of this House, in my desire to see this Nation made secure against enemy attack. My opposition to this bill is based on my firm belief that, instead of adding to our security, it will actually jeopardize it. The old days when you could have citizen minutemen, ready to grab their rifles and rush to war at the call of a Paul Revere are gone, gentlemen. The UMT bill would give us the strongest force we could raise—to fight the war of 1812.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I am sure the gentleman desires to be fair in his statement in regard to the Pentagon and the stars writing this legislation. I may say to the gentleman that there was not a single "star" in the room when this bill was finally written.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I appreciate that. As I said, I realize that the language in this bill was entirely written by the committee. I am speaking of the program which it presents.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. May I suggest that the program is more in line with what was submitted several years ago to one of the committees of Congress by service organizations and patriotic organizations as being the appropriate UMT program.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That perhaps may be the case.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The gentleman made some comment that members of the Armed Services Committee in the most part received their knowledge of military matters through service on that committee, some having served 10 or 12 years.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I said some members; I know many members have served in the defense forces.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I know from my own personal check that approximately 20 members of the Committee on the Armed Services learned the hard way as you and I did, stood in the same line and sat in the same trench as you did.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman know that General Marshall does not like this bill? Nor does Anna Rosenberg.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Obviously they will not like anything in this proposal which they themselves did not recommend, and this is not precisely what they recommended.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I think the gentleman wants to have the RECORD correct. He mentioned a minute ago about the drafting of 18-year-olds. No one under the age of 19 will be drafted. The 18½-year-olds will become part of the universal military training plan.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. At some indefinite time in the future whenever it goes into effect. In the meantime they will be drafted and placed in service.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Not at 18 years.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. They cannot be sent into a combat area outside of the United States until they are at least 19.

Mr. BROOKS. I honor the gentleman's opinion and I honor the gentleman's experience. As I said earlier on the floor I went in with a group of 18-year-old men and I frankly and in all sincerity think they did a pretty good job. I was 18 at that time myself. May I ask the gentleman, if he feels they are so irresponsible and not fit, would the gentleman suggest that we not let them volunteer at 17 or 18, or strike out all volunteering below 19 or 20?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I certainly would not let the 17-year-olds volunteer. I think the 18-year-olds should be permitted to volunteer for noncombat branches of the service or for noncombat duty. I do not think any man should be sent into front-line combat below the age of 19.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I cannot sit here and let the gentleman indict the 17-, the 18-, and the 19-year-old boys who served in World Wars I and II. I commanded 1,500 men in this last war. The roughest, the toughest, and the most dependable men I had under my command were the youngsters. They were gallant and many of them were decorated.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If the gentleman commanded 1,500 men I presume he was pretty far removed from the men themselves.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I joined the Navy in 1917 as an enlisted man when I was 17 years old and on the 29th day of this month I will have 34 years as a reservist. I fought in two wars and stand ready to resign my seat in this body should this country go into World War III.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I served in the Army when I was 29 and I think I got a very good Army education in those years. I think that is as far as we ought to go, the same as we did in 1917.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

(Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to first state that those of us who were here earlier today heard one of the most soul-stirring addresses that at least I have heard in the 7 years I have been here from our colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. It is regrettable that the whole House did not hear her and we could not have adjourned at the end of her remarks and taken her advice and used the time between now and when we vote next week on our knees in prayer. No better advice could be given than she gave us.

I rise to address myself to two topics. First, as everyone in this House is, I am in favor of the draft. I am in favor of the draft in whatever shape it comes out as long as there is not in the draft any provision which will turn back the clock and restore the segregation policies which were once had in all of the armed branches of our Nation. When the Barden bill comes up I will vote for it. If it is defeated, I will vote for this bill, but I will not vote for either if the so-called Winstead amendment is in either bill. Without impugning the motives of our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] I do not believe that any more tragic backward step has been taken by any committee of this House in recent years. If the so-called Winstead amendment remains in the draft bill it will provide tremendous ammunition for the Soviet, would completely undermine our fighting machine, would destroy even before we attained victory any hope of a victory for a democracy. On the home front the virus of immorality is already seeping

into nearly every place in our Government and with the Winstead amendment in this bill would be the final proof to the world and to our citizens that immorality, un-Godlike, un-Christ-like, and undemocratic had at last taken possession of our Government. It would serve notice to 1,000,000,000 peoples of the darker races of the earth that this Government is a government of hypocrisy. The stench of corruption on the home front is already more than the nostrils of the average man in the streets can breathe. Our preachments may be high but our practices in America are descending to a shocking all-time low. There is no wartime FEPC. The public employment office of the United States Department of Labor continues to accept and fill discriminatory orders based on race.

Political bribers and narcotics peddlers are being given tender consideration in our courts but when United States District Judge F. C. Mize was asked to hear new evidence in the case of Willie McGee, he threw out the application with this shocking statement, "There must be an end to the litigation sometime." I demand that the House Judiciary Committee investigate this with a view of recommending his impeachment to the United States Senate.

As further proof of our immorality, prices are spiraling upward while wages are frozen.

The Office of Price Stabilization in New York is on the verge of degenerating into a political racket. I was told that in order to get qualified people appointed, I would have to place a little mark in the corner of their applications. This I refused to do. I was then told by the office of the State Democratic committee that they would have to O. K. the applications. But they would not do that unless they were first recommended to them by the county Democratic leader.

We are finding guilt in high places and yet those in command of those high places refuse to punish the culprits for undermining our American way. I consider this type of Winstead amendment part of the immoral picture of our Nation, and regardless of what side of the aisle we sit on or what section we come from, as the gentlewoman from New York said, we should place our Nation first; our Nation of the people, white and black; by the people, Protestant and Catholic; and for the people, Jew and gentile.

A few years ago I made a statement from this well in which I put the Nation ahead of my own personal and racial ambitions. Some of you who were here may recall that.

I think it is a tragic note that in this hour when we are at war—and we are at war—the note of segregation should again be injected in the draft bill. I trust that something will be done between now and when we start operating under the 5-minute rule here, I hope even by the gentleman who introduced it, to in some way withdraw it so that we will be spared the public controversy and the resulting bitterness which always comes from that type of argument and that type of discussion in this body.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a white man's war. It is the war of freedom-loving people to strike down tyranny wherever they find it. This is not a war of the Democratic Party or of the Republican Party. It is a war of our Nation.

There is a mounting tide of public opinion which is beginning to ask, "What are we fighting for?" The answer has to be given here in this well by us, Members of this House.

Segregation is already wiped out in the Air Force and in the Navy. The Associated Press went around looking for a gentleman from below the Mason-Dixon line who was serving in an unsegregated unit in the Navy. They found one on the *Missouri*, a Texan. They said, "How do you feel serving with Negroes?" He says, "I wake up in the morning and I say, 'Howdy.' How should I address him? We are going to fight together. I ain't going to hug him, I ain't going to kiss him, and I ain't going to marry him. What in the hell is all this about, anyway?"

Segregation is wiped out in the Navy and Air Force now. It was wiped out in Tokyo by the Air Force General Headquarters in one day. I dare anyone to stand up and say that our Navy and Air Force have been shaken and weakened by that action. I defy anyone to do that.

The only place where there is any segregation left, and it is disappearing, is in the Army. The only place where there is any low morale in Korea is in the Jim Crow Twenty-fifth Division. In all of Korea not a single Negro has been sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war except in the Jim Crow Twenty-fifth Division, where 32 have, and in all of Korea only 2 whites have been sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war.

What happens to morale when segregation disappears? In 6 months of fighting in Korea, more distinguished service crosses have been awarded to Negroes than in the entire 4 years of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to universal military training but in favor of the draft. I am opposed to universal military training on moral grounds and on religious grounds. There is not a single organization in our Nation of a religious nature that is not opposed to universal military training.

The Council of Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, the Catholic War Veterans, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the American Baptist Convention, the United Church Women of the National Council of Churches, the National Conference of Methodist Youth, the Church of the Brethren, the Southern Baptist Church, the Society of Friends, the Disciples of Christ, the United Lutheran Church, the Evangelical and Reformed Church, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the International Council of Community Churches the Mennonite Central Committee, the Student YMCA and the Student YWCA, all have voiced their disapproval of universal military training.

I am against universal military training because it will put the officer caste system in complete control of our Nation. We know there is no equality between the men and the officers. America was founded by pioneers who came from Europe to escape the arrogance and militarism of Europe. UMT means subservience not freedom. Orders must be obeyed or death is the result. Is this the democratic training to be given to high-school boys in peacetime that will make our democracy flourish?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. My own father was one of those boys sent here by my grandfather at the age of 15 years to avoid 7 years of compulsory military training in Italy.

Mr. POWELL. Absolutely true. It is in our history. One of the greatest and fondest and most beautiful dreams of our forefathers would be shattered by the passage of universal military training. Universal military training has no factual support. Name me any country in the world that has practiced conscription and by that practice has avoided war or with that practice has guaranteed victory. We have gotten along pretty good since 1776 without it. We have never known defeat. The very essence of democracy is freedom to fight and not compulsion to fight in time of emergency. This is an emergency. Our men will come forward. They will come from everywhere. They will do their share and we will win. We are going to win this war. We are going to win any war in which we have the right ideals. Weapons do not make a soldier, but it is what the soldier believes in his heart which will make him a good soldier.

You cannot force a man through universal military training to be a soldier. I am against universal military training finally, because it will suspend all civil rights. A soldier under universal military training cannot approve or disapprove of any legislation. He cannot write his Congressman. He cannot even call on him. He cannot have the right of trial by jury open to the public, knowing the charges, and facing his accuser.

Shall we allow the cloak of this emergency to shield the designs of those who believe in militarism and not democracy? Shall we say that reaction is loyalty and that liberalism is subversive and that segregation is democracy, and that a second-class caste system is communistic, or that Jim Crow is the American way? If that is so, my friends, we had better get on our knees and stay there and not even come back and vote next week. The hordes of Russia stand poised today. We will defeat them because our cause is right. But if our cause is not right, there is no power that we may build up which can defeat any enemy. But with right on our side and with God on our side we have won and we always will win.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it is with hesitancy that I speak on this bill today, after having served in the House of Representatives only a few months. My hesitation is increased when I realize I am to speak against the bill reported out by a great committee of the House of Representatives under the very able leadership of its chairman, whose patriotism and experience is so well known throughout the Nation. I cannot question the sincerity of any man who has spoken on behalf of the bill. The address yesterday of the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee, was evidence of the painstaking efforts and conscientious study that have been given to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I feel if this bill is written into the pages of history of this Nation it will be a new chapter in the recent but progressive road to complete regimentation of our people. In my opinion the drafting of the youth of the Nation should be continued in order to provide for the common defense of the Nation. But a bill to accomplish this objective in an emergency should not be used as a battering ram against the walls protecting freedom and the liberties of our people in peacetime.

What is here called universal military training is in fact peacetime conscription. This has been the prime objective of the high military command for years and has not been born of this emergency or any foreseeable emergency. The cry now of emergency is but an opiate to make the operation painless.

We have heard people state today that the adoption of this measure will build a great force that will, in the words of one of the gentlemen who spoke here, frighten Russia to death. If we are so naive as to adopt such a philosophy, we should delegate our power to the high-school graduates that we now seek to put into uniform.

In a show of force we shipped aircraft carriers loaded with planes to our allies in Europe. Russia built more planes to match them. We sent great stores of military matériel to Europe. Russia met that threat with increased production of instruments of war. We stockpiled the atomic bomb, and Russia perfected the atomic bomb. Frightened at the power of the United States? Yes. But frigthened into an arms race with us and not frightened to its demise.

At the end of World War II Russia was prostrate. This country was the greatest military nation in the world. But that great power was not a deterrent, but obviously an incentive to the creation of a war potential that is now casting its shadow into every home in this Nation.

It was my privilege during the Eightieth Congress to be counsel to a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures of this House. One of our assignments was to investigate propaganda and publicity in the executive department. One of the agencies we were called upon to investigate was the War Department and its effort to propagandize for universal military training. I should like to briefly call the attention of the House to some of the findings of the subcommittee which were later adopted by the full committee and transmitted to the House by the chairman of the committee, at that time the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

I should like to refer briefly to House Report No. 1073 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress and bring to the attention of the Members of this Congress the findings of that committee. I am reading from Report No. 1073, on page 1:

> The committee, after full consideration of the report as submitted by the subcommittee, upon motion duly made and seconded, unanimously approved and adopted the report as the report of the full Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The chairman of the subcommittee was directed to transmit a copy of the report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
>
> Your committee reports that, on the basis of hearings held on June 20 and July 16, 1947, the evidence shows that the War Department is using Government funds in an improper manner for propaganda activities supporting compulsory military training, or what is commonly referred to as "universal military training." This report summarizes our hearings on this phase of the inquiry to date and presents the conclusions arrived at following careful evaluation of the testimony and documentary evidence presented by and relating to the War Department.
>
> The use of Federal funds for the purpose of influencing legislation before Congress is unlawful under section 201, title 18, of the United States Code. We have, therefore, brought these matters to the attention of the Department of Justice, with a request that the Attorney General, at once, initiate proceedings to stop this unauthorized and illegal expenditure of public moneys. A copy of the chairman's letter to the Attorney General is made a part of this interim report.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Was there anything done about that?

Mr. BOW. Nothing was done, except that it was referred to the FBI. I understand that they made an investigation bearing out the findings of that committee, but still nothing was done about these expenditures.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that the War Department did not first initiate the universal military training program, but the service organizations of World War I, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other service organizations, along with the auxiliaries, first initiated the UMT.

Mr. BOW. I do not know who first started it. It has been propagandized by the War Department for many years, and I know that a great committee of this Congress found that they had illegally spent their funds, properly appropriated for other purposes, to propagandize for this fight.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It is a rather significant thing that the countries of Europe which adopted universal military training had to be saved by countries which had never adopted compulsory military training, such as England, Canada, Australia, and the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has referred to the service organizations having initiated universal training programs. I think for the sake of the RECORD we should realize, and I am familiar with the early programs as recommended by the American Legion, that they were somewhat different from the bill which we have before us.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; but it was a universal military training plan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] raised a question in regard to what happened in Europe in those countries which had adopted universal military training. I am sure the gentleman is aware today that there are more than 20,000,000 veterans in this country; and, if I may, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Does he believe that this country today is in fear of becoming miltaristic due to that fact? Europe probably has more veterans than we, of course, but I see nothing that indicates in this country today that this country is becoming militaristic. There are 234 Members in this House who served in the World War, and I am sure every one of them is proud of it. There is more isolationism in Congress today than there was when I came here in 1939.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the fact is, however, that the claim that this bill proposed by the committee was proposed by the veterans is not entirely correct. I am not prepared to believe that every veteran in this country is in favor of universal military training; as a matter of fact, many of them are opposed to it.

Mr. BOW. There are many who oppose it.

Mr. BUFFETT. The difference between the Pentagon program and the universal military training program submitted by the American Legion is that the American Legion is a private organization spending its own money while in the case of the Pentagon there is a law on the statute books specifically prohibiting any such activity, yet they went right ahead advocating it.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not wish to be understood as being unduly critical of the Pentagon; undoubtedly the average over there as to intelligence is about the same as in the House and elsewhere in the country, but the gentleman was speaking about the illegal use of funds. I want to recall to the gentle-

man's mind, and I am sure he will remember it, the fact that that book by John Roy Carlson—and there was so far as I know never a book published that was so critical, unfairly critical, of Members of Congress, so false. I do recall that a Federal judge in Chicago suggested that he would lie on anything for a dollar—500 copies of that book were sent to American camps by the War Department and paid for by the money appropriated by Congress for other purposes. I have the letter proving it if you want to know.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

I will be glad to yield further, but before I do I should like to continue reading from this report which was submitted to the Eightieth Congress, and I wish I could discuss it in detail, but time will not permit. However, reading again from the report:

> Your committee found that in some cases propaganda material prepared by civilians at the War Department followed a pattern unworthy of any department of the Government. We desire to quote, particularly, from one such paragraph, from the Outline for Veterans Radio Panels, which relates directly to the questions to which your subcommittee is directing its attention.

I now read to you from a pamphlet written and approved by the War Department and circulated throughout this country in trying to sell universal military training with funds appropriated to them for other purposes. This is the War Department:

> The great opposition to military training is generally not based on fact but rather on such generalities as democracy, morals, aggression, education, and pacifism. The chief opponents are parents, church groups, educators, subversive groups, and a large section of the public which does not think. Any attempt to sell a program of universal military training must be based on a thorough job of analysis and specialized thinking along the lines of objections of each of the opposing groups and it must establish refutation and motivation for each of the groups opposed.

I want to repeat that the propaganda put out at the taxpayers' expense to bring about this legislation charged that the chief opponents are parents, church groups, educators, subversive groups, and a large segment of the public that does not think.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The truth about the matter is the reason the people of this country are opposed to it is because it is repugnant to freedom. We are a great and a strong people because we are free.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. I took a poll recently in my district. I sent a questionnaire to 40,000 poll taxpayers and out of that 40,000 almost 75 percent were in favor of a kind of universal military training.

Mr. BOW. May I say in reply to the gentleman that I also sent out a poll to the people of the Sixteenth District in Ohio. I sent out 10,000 questionnaires. Every newspaper in the district published it. In my office as of today there are somewhere around seven to eight thousand answers. The majority of the people in that district, by not a large amount—it is rather close but substantial—are against any universal military training program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, the people want some sort of training before their men are sent into another war. The majority of them do not want a war at all. But if the boys must go, the people want them trained. Almost all of us have been in favor of some sort of training, but we do not favor training them through the military forces.

Mr. TEAGUE. I agree with that 100 percent.

Mr. BOW. I wish I might be able to read more from these documents. I commend them to the attention of the Members of the House.

I should like to say that this evidence, together with that presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] on the floor the other day, should cause everyone to ponder whether all of the threats to this Nation are from without or whether some are from within.

We are asked to defend the foreign policy of the United States, a policy of policy makers in whom the people of the country have lost faith. We have been asked to be blind to the mistakes of the past which have brought us again to the brink of war. We are asked to draft, to train, and to send out to die the youth of America in support of those who have been vacillating in decision and at times have shown lack of common sense and who have nurtured the crisis which creates this emergency. I say that we should clean out the State Department, make it worthy of its name, and many mothers and fathers throughout this land will then once more feel some security, and we might find some support for bills of this kind, but so long as policies persist that have brought us into this situation we cannot do it.

I say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, that I will vote for an 18½-year-old draft, with 6 months' training; I will vote for a UMT if it has an expiration date within a reasonable time, but if there is an attempt to place peacetime universal conscription on this Nation, I shall vote against the bill under any circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, there have been many statements in the last 3 days by the opponents of this piece of legislation that they do not want to draft 18-year-olds. I think it is time we set the record straight on that. I do not know of any Member of this House who wants to draft 18-year-olds, 20-year-olds, or any mother's son.

The question to be decided here is, Do we have to draft the 18½-year-olds? Prior to this bill I felt as many of you that we were not sufficiently utilizing the manpower pool in the 19- to 25-year age group. This bill now takes steps necessary to fully utilize this age group by reducing the mental and physical standards to the level of January of 1945. This bill, by reducing these mental and physical standards and eliminating the deferment of nonveterans who have a wife as their only dependent, increases the immediate manpower pool by 828,000 men. Despite this increase a study made by the Committee on Armed Services shows that additional men are needed which would result from lowering the draft from 19 to 18½ years. Such a manpower pool would permit the maintenance of an armed force of 3,500,000 men. In addition it would permit the release of many hundreds of thousands of veterans and reservists who in many cases have already given many years of their lives in service to their country. The question of immaturity of judgment of 18-year-olds has been brought to the floor in this debate, and as to some young men of this age I believe the question is justified. But, unfortunately immaturity of judgment is not something that lends itself to the simple limitation of age. For all practical purposes, therefore, an arbitrary line must be drawn. In this bill the provisions are such as to help give these young men full training and additional time to measure up to the demands of manhood by providing that no man will be placed in combat outside of the United States possessions before reaching the age of 19 years. He cannot be inducted until he is 18½ years of age, and then we must have a lapse of 6 months from that date before he can be sent into combat. The issue can be very simply drawn on this drafting of 18½-year-olds if you accept the fact that we need 3,500,000 men in the service to defend this country. You either vote to draft 18½-year-olds or you vote to leave in men in the reserves who have already contributed so much for their country. Personally I believe in equalization of sacrifice that each man share the burdens in protecting this Nation's liberties, and that the purpose of this bill proposes that.

There has been much criticism here today and in the last 2 days of our military leadership, and the questioning of their testimony before the Committee on Armed Services. It has always been a profitable and a popular political pastime to bait the brass, because there were more privates than there were generals. It is agreed that they are not perfect men, and neither are you nor I, but they are our military leaders, or qualified military leaders. If we cannot trust the Marshalls and the Bradleys and the Collinses, then we are defeated before the first shot is fired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. You know, I have listened to this debate now for the past several days and I quite agree with what the gentleman is saying. The criticism that has been directed at our military

leaders has been a very vigorous one, but I want to call your attention also to the fact that I recall in this House when these same military leaders were leading our forces in World War II, the same people who are today condemning the brass were on their feet time after time paying tribute to these same military leaders. I think we can go to extremes and I think that the criticism that has been directed at many of our military leaders here has been just a bit too forceful, because the same individuals a few years ago were glorifying these men who were leading this Nation of ours to great victories in World War II.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman.

I do not believe it can be said that any one age provides the best fighting men for a unit. What we are aiming for is a balanced force. We want the daring of young men tempered with the caution of the older combat servicemen. In the Air Force we used to have a saying in regard to fighter pilots strafing a target that we could tell by how low he got down on the target whether he was a young man, whether he was a married man, or whether he had one child or two.

We need a combination of all of those factors in developing a balanced fighting force.

Yesterday it was said on the floor of this House that the top brass of the Legion was for universal military training. The inference was left that the rank and file of Legionnaires were not in favor of universal military training. If you will indulge me for just a moment in another one of these references to personal experiences, I held what was probably the lowest elective office that a man can hold in the American Legion, that of a post commander. I want to tell you that the membership of my post, the membership of the post I belong to, the butcher, the baker, the merchant, and the farmer, voted unanimously for universal military training; and they were the rank and file, they were the general membership of the American Legion. I have attended these district conventions and these State conventions, and I have seen the same reaction in veterans every place I have gone. These veterans who have worn their country's uniform, who have sacrificed to preserve its freedom, who know what it means to be shoved into battle without adequate training, veterans who know the humiliation of Corregidor because this country did not have adequately trained, large, ready pools of Reserves, do not want their sons to go into battle as green shock troops. They want their sons and I want my sons to be trained adequately to deal with the combat decisions of the battlefield.

It is an easy thing as a Congressman to demand the necessary sacrifices of our people to protect their liberties at a time of Pearl Harbor, but the task of voting for these sacrifices of people for once before Pearl Harbor, when the draft was extended by a vote of 202 to 203, is immensely more difficult to perceive.

Then we had the invasion of Czechoslovakia and others to toll their warning. Today we have a nasty little war in Korea. If that war were the only war we could contemplate in the future, then universal military training would not be necessary for our country, but we know that if world war III comes, it will be sudden; it will be without warning. This Nation as the arsenal of democracy will be a primary target. We will have no allies capable of carrying on the fight and buying us time while we prepare, as we did last time. No one thinks we will have time to train these forces after war is declared. We had years before in the other two world wars, but now we shall need to be able to effectuate an immediate sweeping mobilization. The war will be unquestionably brought immediately to our shores by the long-range bombers we are told our potential attackers possess. When the enemies of democracy not only possess the means, but also are developing a stockpile of man's most destructive weapon, the atomic bomb, we will have to be able to meet this challenge to our survival immediately. There will be no opportunity for those who vote against this bill to go down into the well and change their vote from "nay" to "yea."

My deepest concern in this bill is that some of my dear friends in the House who believe as strongly as I do in universal military training will vote against it because here they see a commission proposed to develop a plan that does not exactly fit the picture as they see it. I must agree with them that, had I been the author of this bill, there are some changes I would have made. I dare say that if each of us had had our own individual way we would have 435 different versions of this bill.

I have yet to see a bill which has been passed by the Congress that I could not find something wrong with it, and find a reason to justify voting against it. And so it will always be in a democratic country, with so many diverse interests. It seems to me in deciding whether to vote for or against this means of providing a plan for universal military training that the question posed is: Do the good features for the furtherance of universal military training outweigh the bad features as each Member sees them in this bill? I think the scales clearly read that this bill will be of great benefit to the people of our country; that it is in the public interest. This bill of course does not set out the program by which our young men would obtain military training. It merely provides for a civilian commission which will prepare a plan to be submitted to the Congress. Do not impugn the motives of a still unborn commission. Do not prepare to believe the worst rather than the best of this Commission. Do not let cynicism displace faith. It has been said it is better to light a candle than it is to curse the darkness. Give this Commission a chance to work out a plan for military training of our youth. Before any program of this civilian Commission goes into effect it must be approved by the Congress. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has stated he will offer amendments which will provide that the Commission must return a plan within 6 months to the Congress. In addition the plan will be subject to amendment by the committee and on the floor of the House. We, the Representatives of the people, make the ultimate decision as to how our young men will be trained. It is congressional control, such as this, which gives further proof that this is not a Pentagon bill but is the result of months of study and creative thinking by the distinguished Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I seek this opportunity to say that the gentleman is making a truly excellent speech. I am listening to every word of it. I especially like the way in which the gentleman handled the question of age. So often in this debate, in my judgment, the question of what is the best age for an individual to enter into a long-range universal-military-training program is overlooked. I think that has to do with the individual, if the individual wants to go in at a time when it is best for him in his life.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, you who believe as I do that universal military training is the answer to the future safety of our country and that it helps to avoid the economic disaster of maintaining a large standing army, let not the opponents of the principle of universal military training so blind you that we see only the trees instead of the forest at this time when we are closer to winning our fight than we have ever been in our history.

Must we Members of the Congress live only for today? During this debate I have almost reached the conclusion that some Members think that UMT stands for universal mañana training. This program will require time and planning in its presentation to the Congress. It will require the initiation of preliminary steps prior to the passage of the bill. It cannot be put off until mañana. We must show the aggressors of the world that free men are willing to pay the price of remaining eternally vigilant to protect their hard-won freedom.

We must show them that we have profited by our past mistakes and not that one day we intend to go marching up the hill of sacrifice during a crisis only to come coasting down into the morass of complacency when the dictators still their cannon fire. Let us neglect our duties by forgetting yesterday's battles or tomorrow's threats, and you and I can be sure that our sons will be marching off to war unprepared just as their fathers and grandfathers did before.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman made a fine statement on the universal military training bill, but if I understand the proposal that has been submitted to the Congress it is a proposal to establish some unknown commission to write some unknown bill, is that right?

Mr. BENTSEN. It will return to the floor of the Congress and to the com-

mittee for its consideration and amendment and passage if the House so desires.

Mr. TACKETT. May I ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman understand this bill does provide that the commission to be established will then submit to the Congress its ideas for universal military training?

Mr. BENTSEN. Yes.

Mr. TACKETT. Will Congress at that time have authority to amend the legislation?

Mr. BENTSEN. Yes, sir; according to the statement that was made at the opening of today's debate by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that he would offer an amendment in committee to provide just that.

Mr. TACKETT. Would this amendment be submitted to the whole House?

Mr. BENTSEN. Certainly, on Monday.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. I believe the gentleman is doing a disservice to many Members of the House who do not completely agree with this bill by intimating that we condemn our military leaders. I, for one, believe that we have the finest military service in the world and that we have the finest military leaders, but I do not believe I would be acting in the capacity that I should to come up here and blindly follow any person, regardless of how much I respect him.

Mr. BENTSEN. There was no attempt to impugn the motives of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, whom I have not heard attack our high command on this floor. The remarks were addressed to those who had been beating the high brass in the last 2 days.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman feel that the Congress should have the right to criticize when a brass is wrong?

Mr. BENTSEN. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

(Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the chairman of the great Armed Services Committee made the statement he did. He insinuated that it was advisable for certain people to keep their seats and keep their mouths shut. I regret that he is not on the floor at this time because I would like to have him present as I present my views.

I am grateful to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, for giving me this time, because the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] would not give me time. My interpretation of his action is that unless a man is for what he is for and speaks his language, he does not want him to speak. I remember 2 years ago, when I was fighting the military pay bill, he would not let us have any time, because he knew we were opposed to his bill. Yesterday he promised me 30 minutes to speak. I did not get it. I called him this morning, and he said: "You are one of the first ones to talk today." Thanks to my good friend, Representative SHORT, for this time. It seems to me he does not care to know what study we have made of the bill before the House. I am not impugning his motives, but I wonder why he denies me time to present my views.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will my young friend yield to me?

Mr. SUTTON. I refuse to yield at this time. I will yield later. I wonder why the chairman of the great Armed Services Committee in his recommendation to the Ways and Means Committee does not want combat veterans on his committee, with the exception of a minor group. He has 5 on the Democratic side out of 19. Is it that he cannot control us? Is it that he does not have faith in the combat boys, or is it that he still wants to dominate, and if you do not agree with him he does not want you to say anything about it?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the combat boys of World War I and World War II know just as much about the armed services as CARL VINSON does. There are several boys in this Congress that I would take the word of before I would take the word of CARL VINSON. The men with records like TEAGUE, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, AYRES, and POTTER, who have fought for their country and who shed their blood for this country—do you think they are not capable of speaking? Not to say anything about by own combat service, and I am proud of my record, just as proud as the other 233 boys who went into the service.

And my own record, I do not yield to him or to anybody else in loyalty to America. I will place my record up against his in speaking for the people of my district, the people who honored me to represent them in this my second term in Congress, who sent me up here to speak for them. They did not send the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] up here to speak for them, and he does not speak for them or for me. Any time he thinks he can speak for them let him come down to the Seventh District of Tennessee and run against me or my successor.

Mr. Chairman, when I asked for this time I did not ask for it to impugn the motives of anyone; I asked for this time to give to Members of this body what little knowledge I might have, in a helpful way, not in a destructive way, but in such a way that would help the defense of this country. After the time I spent in the service, with a plate in my head and part of my shoulder gone, I think I may contribute a little, because of the service I have seen.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, in impugning the motives of the military unless I think they are wrong. I condemned the brass 2 years ago on the military pay bill. I thought I was right then; I still think I was right. All you need do is observe some of them in the Army and Navy Club on Saturday nights and you will know what I mean. You do not even have to go out of Washington, just go down to the Army and Navy Club and you will see what I have in mind.

I believe in universal military training, but I do not believe in militarizing this whole country; I do not believe in the military taking over this great democracy of ours. As long as I am a private citizen, as long as I am a Member of Congress, I am going to speak out against the military taking over; and, Mr. Chairman, as strong an advocate of UMT as I am, I will not vote for this bill. Several of us have gotten together in the last few days devising a plan, a plan on which the Members of Congress can decide as to whether or not they want it, and it is a plan for universal military training. It does not set up a commission to come in and tell Congress what to do and let the military control them; it is a plan that has been worked out. It is a plan that has been reported by an Armed Services Committee, not this one, but another one in 1947, with one change. I think it is the plan that was devised originally by Perry Brown of the American Legion, and it is the plan that the American Legion of the United States endorsed years ago.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. Not at this time.

This plan was introduced the first of this year by Senator RUSSELL. It was S. 1 in the other body.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. Not at this time; I will in a moment.

This bill was placed before a subcommittee; there were many hearings on it. It was scuttled, however, by the Defense Department; so we got our heads together and just this afternoon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] dropped that bill into the hopper, and it will be offered as a substitute. I would like to outline the bill briefly. First, I would like to say that it is the American Legion bill; it will have, I am sure, the complete endorsement of the American Legion. The American Legion, of course, sent out a telegram this morning, not knowing that the Teague bill was coming up, endorsing some form of universal military training, because they are interested in universal military training. But, Mr. Chairman, this plan which will be offered as a substitute, introduced today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], I should like to outline for you.

This is the outline of the bill:

A. NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

1. Composition:

(a) Five members appointed by President and approved by Senate. No member of Regular services (active or retired) shall serve. Only 3 members from 1 political party. There is a military member though. Chairman appointed by President from civilian members.

(b) Civilian members will serve for 3 years. Permanent and full-time.

(c) Executive director appointed by Commission.

2. Powers (subject to President's direction):

(a) Establish policies and standards to carry out this program.

(b) Police the carrying out of those policies through system of civilian inspection which

cannot be denied access to agencies being inspected.

3. National Security Training Advisory Board (sec. 108):

(a) Composition: (1) Ten to 25 members appointed by the President (3 of which shall be military men designated by Secretary of Defense). Chairman appointed by President. Length of service prescribed by President. Temporary (per-diem basis).

(b) Powers:

(1) Advise Commission on moral, religious, recreational, educational, and similar phases of program.

(2) Undertake investigations and studies along these lines for Commission.

B. NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

1. General: (a) Members of the Corps shall be organized, administered, and trained by training agencies as provided herein, in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission (sec. 109).

2. Service (sec. 111):

(a) Type: (1) Active duty and inactive duty training on an alternative program following that period.

(b) Certificates: (1) After active duty: certificate of completion of basic training.

(2) After alternative program: Discharge from corps and certificate of discharge.

(3) Types of discharges: (a) Dishonorable or bad conduct: When assigned to military training, only on basis of Code of Conduct; when assigned to military training, where sentenced by civil court for 1 year or more.

3. Discharge (sec. 112):

(a) Recall to active service:

(1) Discharge from corps does not prohibit calling to duty when member of Reserve or Regular forces.

(2) Bad conduct or dishonorable discharge does not prevent man from being reinducted for all his training due under this program upon recommendation of military.

4. Pay and allowances (sec. 113): (a) Thirty dollars per month while on active training and usual transportation, and so forth, allowances.

5. Uniform (sec. 114): (a) Distinctive insignia prescribed by Commission.

6. Dependency (sec. 115):

(a) Basis of payment of allowance:

(1) Period: Active duty training.

(2) Amount: Without regard to pay status as follows:

a. One dependent, $50 per month.

b. Two or more dependents, $65 per month. No deductions for these amounts made from trainee's pay.

(3) Cessation: May be terminated if trainee a. w. o. l. for 30 days.

(4) Authorization: Local board investigation is basis for authorization.

7. Death of trainee (sec. 117): (a) Usual allowances, but shall not be eligible for burial in a national cemetery.

8. Trainee liability for Government property (sec. 119): (a) A. w. o. l. expenses and loss or damage to Government property may be deducted at rate of $15 per month from trainee pay.

9. Protection of morals and welfare (sec. 123):

(a) No houses of ill fame to be maintained within reasonable distances of trainee camps.

(b) No one may supply trainees with intoxicants.

10. Training agencies (sec. 124):

(a) The Commission shall formulate programs and designate Federal departments and agencies as training agencies to conduct such programs under its direction and control.

(b) Training agencies will be directly responsible for all training operations.

11. Training program (sec. 125):

(a) Period of training: One year or its equivalent in basic and alternative programs.

(b) Basic training: Four months (unless sooner terminated by enlistment in Regular forces) although may be extended for hospitalization (with consent of trainee) or to make up a. w. o. l. or other such time.

(c) Alternative program—to follow basic training:

(1) Trainee may enter program of his choice subject to quotas and standards of military involved and approval of Commission.

(2) Types:

a. Eight more months of active duty with the corps (continuous).

b. Voluntary enlistment in Regular services (including Coast Guard).

c. Enlistment in National Guard or Organized Reserve of Navy or Marine Corps.

d. Enlistment in Organized Reserve of Army or Air Corps.

e. Entrance into one of the academies.

f. Enrollment in Navy or Marine Corps officer program.

g. Enlistment in Reserve and entrance into ROTC program with agreement to accept a Reserve commission upon completion.

h. Enlistment in Naval Reserve and entrance into Merchant Marine Academy or Navy accredited State Maritime Academy and agreement to accept a commission in Naval Reserve on completion.

i. Enlistment in Reserve and entrance into technical or specialist training at college (as approved by military) and agreement to accept Reserve commission upon completion.

j. Enlistment in volunteer Reserve for 6 years with provisos that—

(i) Subject to maximum of 6 months' active duty training during the period, not more than 1 month of which will be completed in any 1 year.

(ii) This is the last alternative to be used by the trainee and then only due to circumstances beyond his control.

k. Any other programs established by commission of equal importance and obligation on the following persons:

(1) the Secretary of Defense must be consulted if they are offered to those who received military training.

(ii) those who have not received military training (primary intent).

(3) Failure to enter upon or complete alternative program (sec. 126): May be recalled by Commission for an additional 8 months' active duty.

(d) Training credits (sec. 127): (1) The Secretary of Defense or the Commission, as appropriate, shall prescribe a system of training credits to be applied in the event of transfer from one alternative program to another.

C. REGISTRATION, SELECTION, AND INDUCTION

1. Agency: Selective Service shall administer all matters of induction (registration, examination, classification, allocation, delivery, records, etc.).

(a) Local board authority: Same powers as under Selective Service as to dependency determinations, deferments, allocation for training, etc. (sec. 130).

2. Registration (sec. 132):

(a) Basis:

(1) Every citizen or alien with intention will register as follows:

a. With passage of this act: All between 17 and 18 years.

b. Thereafter: After 17th birthday.

The exact age groups to be called and the order shall be determined by proclamation of President.

(b) Exemptions (as in Selective Service Act of 1948): (1) Members of Regular forces, military academies, foreign diplomatic officials, and aliens not intending to become citizens (sec. 6a of SS).

3. Induction (sec. 133):

(a) Liability:

(1) Every person registered who is not subject to induction under any other provision of law (takes care of age conflicts with draft) and who is not exempted under this law will be liable for training until 20-years old.

(2) Absentees from country: Liable from 18 to 26 for this training.

(3) Not liable for draft: Anyone 17 up to 20 years old not liable under Selective Service may volunteer for induction. But, those 17 years old must get parents consent.

(b) Exemptions and deferments (subsection (3) on):

(1) High school student: If 18 years, he is deferred until graduation, failure, or 20 years of age (whichever occurs first).

(2) Hardship, disability (mental or physical), or national interest: Deferred by Director with approval of Commission.

(3) Armed-force standard: No one will be inducted for military training unless meets Armed-force specifications for training (does not preclude other training).

(4) Facilities availability: President can postpone or defer to meet this problem.

(5) Previous military service: No one will be inducted who—

a. Served or shall serve 1 year in Regular forces.

b. Serving at present with National Guard or Organized Reserve (unless he fails to complete his enlistment, and then he is liable until 26 years).

c. Serving in one of the military academies or senior ROTC programs (provided he completes 2 years of such service).

4. Service (sec. 134):

(a) Military: Each person shall be able to get into service of his choice (provided quotas and standards as established by Secretary of Defense to keep balanced forces permits).

(b) Nonmilitary: Persons found ineligible for military training can request training in nonmilitary program of his choice (subject to quotas and standards established by Commission).

(c) Conscientious objectors:

(1) Definitions: As in Selective Service Act of 1948 (sec. 6 (j)).

(2) Combat objections only: Elect training in nonmilitary program.

(3) Objections to participation in any form: Does not state specifically.

(4) Administrative procedure:

a. Determined by local board who shall be exempted on this ground.

b. Person can appeal to an appeal board who will refer to Department of Justice. Department of Justice holds hearings and recommends to appeal board, but appeal board need not follow in making its decision.

c. There will be a register of conscientious objectors.

5. Records (sec. 137): (a) Each trainee for 6 years after completion of basic training or until discharged from the corps (whichever times is greater) will need to keep his local board informed of his address, status in training program, and completion of training program.

6. Former institutional charges (sec. 141): (a) Any person who has been sent to jail or corrective institutions shall still be liable for this training.

7. Financial control (sec. 143 and 144): (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums to the Commission as may be necessary to enable it to perform its said functions. It shall report semiannually to Congress on all expenditures in detail.

8. Implementation of program (sec. 146): (a) Secretary of Defense and Commission will recommend to President the time and rate of implementation of the program, taking into consideration that Congress does not wish for this to interfere with the present build-up of our Armed Forces.

D. CODE OF CONDUCT

1. This consists of the Articles of War and Manual of Courts Martial especially devised to take into account the nature of this program.

Mr. Chairman, there are two more pages of an outline, but I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will fully explain the plan in its entirety. The bill has been introduced this afternoon. I hope you will get it, look at it, and think it over. It is a program for universal military training.

There are three schools of thought in this Congress. First, there are those who believe in extension of draft and nothing else, there are those who believe in extension of draft and a program of universal military training, then there are those who do not believe in any universal military training at all. I believe in extension of the draft and a universal military program at this time. If it is not needed now, then put it aside until we do need it, but let the Armed Services Committee bring in a program.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Let me say to the gentleman that I honor him, I entertain an affectionate regard for him. He does not need my advice, but I have been here a long time. Young men have been my special interest. Let me appeal to the gentleman that he delete from his remarks the reference he made to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and I give this explanation. The gentleman is a college classmate of mine. He has been my lifelong friend. I have not yet had the opportunity to use any time but have rather stood aside and let him use it to yield to people who he thought had a superior claim than I

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the admonition my friend has given me.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman consider please deleting those remarks?

Mr. SUTTON. I thought it over, in fact, I weighed my words for a long time. I do not like a man slapping me in the face; in fact, when a man hits me I will hit him back. That is as much Irish as there is in me.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. In justice to the chairman and in his absence——

Mr. SUTTON. That is not my fault.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right. Is it not a fact that rather than refusing to give time it was a question of the order in which the gentleman should speak?

Mr. SUTTON. It certainly was.

Mr. KILDAY. Now, I have been sitting beside the chairman practically all day, and during that time the gentleman from Tennessee has spoken to the chairman on many occasions about time, and I certainly never heard him refuse the gentleman. I heard him tell the gentleman a number of times that he was not able to put him on then, and we now still have on our list and not reached, who were scheduled for today, four Members other than the gentleman from Tennessee, who will not be reached today, even though they have been waiting.

Mr. SUTTON. I will say to the gentleman as far as that is concerned, that is a closed issue. What I am talking about now is a plan for military training, a plan that is recognized as one that the American Legion wants and a lot of veterans want, and I hope you get the Teague bill, and look it over. I think we should approve the new plan. I hope that every Member of this august body will thoroughly study both of these bills before casting their vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, on two occasions in the years that have gone this House extended the privilege to me to say something about the rules of the House and our conduct on this floor. Of late and for some time the rules of the House have been violently violated on both sides of the aisle not only by the new Members but by the older Members, including myself. None of us has the right to allude to any Member on this floor by his first name. You can allude to the "gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Brown or Mr. Smith]" or "the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]" or "the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]." It is a distinct breach of the rule to refer to any Member by his first name, as Carl or Nick or John. It is distressing to hear the rules violated because it has a tendency, I think, to lower the dignity and respect of this body before the American people. The people speak in this historic Chamber.

Another rule which is violated every day, unintentionally, of course—and I do not intend this as a scolding but just to bring it to your minds—is that when we rise to speak here in the well of the House and say "Mr. Speaker" or "Mr. Chairman," many Members add "members of the committee," or "ladies and gentlemen." That is a breach of the rules. When we are in the Committee of the Whole, as we are now, we refer to the presiding officer as "Mr. Chairman." When we are in the House we refer to the presiding officer as "Mr. Speaker." Both of them, in their respective capacity, represent this body, without addressing anyone else. When we add anything else, we are adding what is superfluous and a clear breach of the rules.

Let us obey the rules of the House.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, America has descended from the mountain tops of achievement into the valley of decision. We have some stern choices to make, and it behooves us to make them as American freemen.

On the one hand we have the modern Genghis Khan, enthroned behind, not as some would have it, the iron curtain, but behind the grinning skulls of 300,000,000 of his own people, his own kin, sacrificed to the anachronistic savage lust for power of this modern leader of the Tartar hordes of Asia.

On the other hand we have the United States of America, bled white financially by three foreign wars, all of which were largely none of our business, tied hand and foot by the iniquitous coalitions of the United Nations and the Atlantic Pact, and now faced by another world war because we lost the peace gained in victory through our modern brand of unrealistic American diplomacy.

However, Mr. Chairman, situated as we are between the rock of Scylla on the one hand and the pool of Charybdis on the other, I am convinced that our immediate principal menace lies in Washington here, and not in Moscow. On March 19 I spoke before this House, describing the horrible conspiracy which has just about succeeded in changing America from a constitutional Republic into a fascistic, militaristic power state. I stated that the last step in that metamorphosis was the complete militarization of America. We are witnessing that final attack today. Things are not always what they outwardly seem, and this UMT program is one which means something quite different from what it says.

We are herein asked to turn our military fortunes over to a junta, composed of a modern Don Quixote, leading his forces in all directions at once; our back conscious Machiavelli of the State Department; the hero of Pearl Harbor, who never fought a battle, and our swivel-chair Boadicea.

For the past few weeks we have been witnessing the machinations of this motley group in the other body, seeking to place the final stamp of destruction upon the constitutional right of Congress to dictate the policies of war in this country. Remember the attempt only lost by six votes, and this group is still attempting by every artifice to regain their lost advantage.

These bemedaled heroes would have you believe they won these wars almost single-handed. What of the taxpayers who raised billions to finance their efforts; of American labor whose manifold skills gave them the tools, and above and beyond all else, what of the matchless bravery of the American GI's who have always risen to the call of duty, and have always sacrificed their lives freely for their beloved country? Freedom and its maintenance is everybody's job, and military leaders will have to go further than they have to become worthy of the tools we have given them.

Mr. Chairman, I am from the State made noble in this Union by the great name of William E. Borah. Would that he were here by my side to plead once again the cause of America for Americans. Changing times demand new remedies. I am satisfied that were he speaking today, he would not now advocate a total policy of self-containment. Neither do I. I am sure he would support the Hoover plan. So do I. We need to be strong militarily, but I want that strength mainly expended and retained within the confines of this hemisphere. I am opposed to the United Nations and the Atlantic Pact. No mongrel army shall take the lives of my two sons if I can avoid it. One served 4 years in the last war, and our beloved country may have him again in its own service, but I

shall never vote for him to serve in any other.

Let us get some new and younger blood into our Army command. Let us have the strongest Air Force on earth. Let us strengthen our Navy, and make it a quick striking force. Let us not forget that we cannot have these things and business as usual in America. All the extraneous padding should be cleaned out of the Pentagon. Put the denizens of that school of conspiracy into tents, and you may have more real American war effort as a result.

Finally, let us have more thought and less noise in America. Let us keep America free. I am not concerned about European quarrels. They have been having them for the past thousand years, and will doubtless continue for the next five hundred. The mills of the gods grind slowly, and the nations of Europe still have plenty of criminal things to expiate. Let us see to it that we do not join that gruesome march to meet an unfavorable destiny by doing the wrong things at the wrong time.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the legislation which is now before us, the universal military training bill.

I was a member of the American Legion legislative commission which had a great deal to do with the drafting of the legislation which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] referred to not so very long ago. When I came to the Congress I introduced, at the request of the American Legion, the American Legion bill for universal military training. I have introduced that same bill early in this session of the Congress. I feel that it is a logical thing to have universal military training. I think that it is something we definitely need. I am going to discuss it more at length before I conclude my remarks; but now I would like to digress to say a few words about the draft portion of this bill.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] has ably said, no one wishes to pass upon a bill which takes young men away from their homes. And no one likes to see things of that kind occur. We do not like to do it, but it is a question of what we have to do.

Our ancestors who fought in the Revolution were not so emotional about this country's soldiers being young. One of my ancestors fought in the Revolution when he was only 15 years of age. That is a sad thing to think about, that anybody would have to fight at that age, but it is not an age which was impossible to utilize in the country's welfare when the country needed it.

I have listened carefully to the debate that has taken place on this legislation and it seems to me that the facts which have been given to us by the committee thoroughly justify the bill which is now before us and that the age level set forth in the bill is justified simply because there are not enough young men who can serve our country in any other age bracket. Those are just the facts and you can argue all you want about it. Those are the clear and crystal facts as presented by the committee. No one has stood here in the well of the House and presented to the committee any facts to show that those figures given to us by the committee were in error. Therefore, I intend to support that portion of the bill.

Now, returning finally to the universal military training portion of the bill, I am going to say a little bit more about that before I take my seat.

I think the Reserves of our country are important and I think they must be helped by the presence of universal military training. We have seen our Reserve program not what we would like to have it. I do not think it can ever be what we would really like to have unless we have UMT. I think one of the most important points about UMT is that we should have it because it will give us a workable Reserve, thus providing a maximum defense at a minimum cost to the Government and at a minimum sacrifice to its citizens called for service.

I think UMT may give us one more chance for peace, because I think it does give us strength in this country, which will give other people reason for hesitating before launching a world war.

Another thing that I think important is that this legislation will give some reassurance to our allies overseas, and let them know that we are doing the best we can. Of course, I think that they should already see that we have done our best, but this is a bill involving an additional personal sacrifice by those who are called. It should reassure our allies and it will help them to try to resist the things on their own doorsteps.

Another thing that is important is that it will save time and lives if world war occurs.

If we get into the higher age bracket in the draft, and have a lower age bracket in UMT, it will make it possible for those younger men to have some training, and therefore we will be able to mobilize with trained personnel very much more rapidly. We might otherwise have to mobilize rapidly without proper training. General Eisenhower has estimated that a young man who has had basic training has a three times better chance for coming out than a man without basic training. As a man who has served both as an enlisted man and as an infantry platoon leader in World War II, I think the percentage ought to be 10 to 1 instead of 3 to 1, but we will take General Eisenhower's estimate of 3 to 1. Personally I think it would be about 10 to 1, from my own personal observations in battle. I have seen men come in without proper training and I have seen them killed and wounded by my side.

President Jefferson said many years ago:

> We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens and make military education a part of education.

That brings out the next point that I would like to make. UMT will give you a classification system. You will know where those young men can fit into the military picture if world war does come. Much sifting and classification will have already taken place because of training under UMT, and because of observations in that program as to the abilities and limitations of each particular trainee.

Another thing that is important is that UMT will give us a well or a storehouse of trained personnel throughout the country which could be used for civilian defense. There will be a scattering of young men throughout the country who have had training, and they will be valuable in handling mobs, emergencies, and things like that. They will be able to take responsible positions, if we do have a situation, as we may have, where we are bombed ourselves.

Another thing which is extremely important is in regard to the cost. We have heard testified before the House of Representatives that it costs about $10,000 a year to take care of the ordinary housekeeping costs of maintaining the average man in the armed services. It will cost much less than that to take care of the UMT inductee. Therefore, we will save a tremendous amount of money. As a matter of fact, that is one of the chief reasons for UMT, for it will make it possible for us to have a country which, over a long period of time, can be mobilized rapidly with trained people at a minimum amount of expense.

Finally, I would like to say that the UMT inductee would make a smaller personal sacrifice than an ordinary draftee, because of the shortness of the term of service.

There are many things we could talk about tonight, concerning this particular bill, but the time is growing late. In closing, I am just going to make a few personal remarks about the way in which legislation is brought to the floor of the House.

My own feelings are essentially the same as those of other veterans who served in World War II who are Members of the House. We have heard it said that we should have the universal military training bill that the American Legion has proposed. I think that there is much to be said for that but I would like to read a telegram which I have received this afternoon, a telegram from the American Legion Security Training Committee, from Mr. Perry Brown. It reads as follows:

> Request by cable from Rome to forward following message from National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., to you:
>
> "Recent tour of Korean battlefront and American installations elsewhere in Asia and Europe confirms belief universal military training would have prevented untold casualties, saved many American lives and will strengthen our future defense against communism. The American Legion urges support for universal military training and is strongly opposed to any amendment that would defer it or separate it from present bill."

That comes from the national American Legion commander to myself by cable, and I think I can read into what he said there something which I would like to point out concerning the passage of legislation.

Let me say that I have been here only 2 years, but my experience for the most part has been one of great frustration, as the majority leader can vouch for. I have gone to him almost with tears in my eyes feeling that we were

leading our country right straight into bankruptcy, that we were not thinking enough of the welfare of our country or doing enough from the standpoint of defense. It has added many gray hairs to my head. I have come to learn, however, that in a group of 435 Members, one has to give a little and take a little. One has to compromise to get anything passed. That realization has come slowly to me but it has recently allowed me to be a better Congressman and to serve my country more effectively. Personally, I would like to see enacted the bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. But I say quite frankly that I do not believe that the House of Representatives can logically digest such a bill on the floor of the House, without its having thorough study by the committee. It is a big bill; it is a bill of about 65 pages, if I remember correctly, and it would be a hard bill to digest on the floor. Much as I would like to see that bill pass, however, I am going to go along and try to get the present legislation passed; for in my opinion we need the present bill urgently at this time. I am prepared to give a little and take a little, and we will probably get a little more legislation passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate my friend on his very courageous and effective speech. My purpose in asking my friend to yield to me was to confirm the telegram that he had read from the American Legion. I have in my hand the original cablegram sent by the national departmental commander, Erle Cocke, to both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and myself. This is the original that I received in my office a short while ago. I would like to have that fact incorporated in the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## FLORIDA ORANGE JUICE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like, for a minute, to take the House away from wars and rumors of wars. What I shall say is hardly news to the Members of the House. But in order that the press and the public may know the reason for the sudden bloom of youth, the fresh vigor, the alert step, and carriage of the membership, I want to point out the availability of fresh orange juice from Florida for the Members of Congress in each of the two cloakrooms.

Orange juice dispensers and juice, the modern fountains of youth, are made available to the Members of Congress through the work of Florida's Governor Fuller Warren, the Florida Citrus Commission, individual producers, and the Florida delegation in Congress. In particular though, I must single out the work of our colleague, BILL LANTAFF, who more than anyone else conceived and carried through this idea.

On behalf of the delegation, may I say that we hope each of you enjoys to the fullest this token of Florida's friendship for you.

## HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. I may say that after conferring with the majority leader it is expected that general debate on the pending bill will be finished tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] is recognized for 7 minutes.

## CRIME

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed many important problems during the short history of the Eighty-second Congress. At the present time we are faced with the problem of how best to protect these United States from the threat of Communist aggression. There is no doubt in my mind that the best Americans are found right here in these Chambers in spite of our disagreements, and none of us will ever deliberately do anything to endanger the security of our country.

Not so long ago, a committee of Congress—the Kefauver Senatorial Investigating Committee—made the public conscious of a cancerous growth in our society, namely, organized crime.

But what will result from these revelations? Some individuals will no doubt go to jail, and probably we will introduce also some remedial legislation. Does anyone believe, however, that crime in this country will come to an end, or that it will be measurably reduced? Frankly, it will not. The criminals we eliminate will be followed by other criminals with perhaps better defenses to protect them against our law-enforcement agencies.

For many years I have studied the problem of juvenile delinquency and crime prevention. As a matter of fact, I founded a crime prevention agency in 1936, which is still in existence and doing a noble job in the city of New York.

We all know that crime is not confined to any particular race or nationality. It is a social disease due to many causes, such as poverty, bad housing, poor environment, lack of family unity and discipline, neglect of the parents, estrangement between the parents, and emotional disturbances.

I have felt for a long time that society is to blame for the large crime rate, and that the United States Government has neglected the problem from a preventative standpoint. The most important question today affecting mankind and our country in particular is why do we have criminals? What is wrong with our schools, the neighborhoods in which we live, our associations and society in general?

We spend billions of dollars to fight crime by means of our prosecuting staffs, police forces, and penal institutions. But what are we doing to try to prevent crime and curb juvenile delinquency? The only investigation I know of in this connection was by the Kefauver Senate committee on the possible influence on juvenile delinquency of so-called crime comic books. Obviously, the problem goes far deeper than that.

To get to the roots of this problem, I am asking the House of Representatives to appoint a fact-finding committee to conduct, without regard to politics, a full and complete investigation and study of the causes of crimes against the United States and of other crimes affecting the national health, welfare, and morals, and of methods of preventing such crimes. The investigation and study should include, together with such other matters as the committee may deem appropriate, first, examinations of criminal records of persons whether such persons are in or out of prison; second, examinations of State and Federal penal institutions to determine whether new legislation can be enacted to regulate these institutions and to prevent recidivism, or repetitions of crimes by the same offenders; third, examinations of the causes of juvenile delinquency—including the relation of local neighborhoods thereto—and of the effect of schools thereon; and, fourth, the preparation of legislation providing for the establishment of a permanent Bureau of Crime Prevention under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of the United States.

In carrying out such investigation and study, the committee should conduct hearings in areas which have abnormal rates of crime, and persons and public and private agencies having information pertinent to the investigation and study should be invited to make such information available to the committee.

I honestly believe that the future of our country depends on how well we do the job of raising our youth. With a background of two world wars within 25 years, and a third in the offing, what has the youth of today to look forward to? What is his thinking? How many more Hitlers, Mussolinis, Stalins, Costellos, or Adonis' will there be among them in the future? We cannot deny the fact that crime is on the increase, and with it the cost of fighting it. But more important than dollars and cents is that we are building not young men and young women with love in their hearts and charity for others, but Frankenstein monsters which some day will lead this world to destruction.

Before it is too late, let us retrace our steps from the beginning of our society to the present. Let us find out where

we failed our youth that they became enemies instead of lawful and beneficial members of our community.

I believe that an honest and sincere investigation into the causes of crime will lead us to ways of preventing it, and in the long run save our taxpayers a great deal of the money which goes into fighting crime. But most important of all, I believe that a properly organized Bureau of Crime Prevention will make our youth better citizens of tomorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TOLLEFSON, for 1 week, on account of important business.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2615. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Medical Society Bulletin.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made before the Chamber of Commerce of Camden, Ark., by Rear Adm. M. F. Schoeffel, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, United States Navy, on March 27, 1951.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by a high school student.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRUMPACKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a telegram sent her by the American Legion Security Training Committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. WOOD of Idaho) was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances and include in one an article and in the other an address.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. SIKES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Dr. Griffith.

Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered recently by a former Member of the House, the present Governor of Connecticut, Hon. John Lodge.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men I have ever met, whose nobility of character for years has been an inspiration to me and to many of our colleagues who know him, is James Patrick McGovern, an outstanding lawyer. He also writes poetry with beauty and effectiveness. His messages and his poems are edifying. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a beautiful poem written by Mr. McGovern entitled "Resurrection."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include resolutions recently adopted at a mass meeting held in my district by the American-Lithuanian Council. These resolutions are worthy of the attention of all Members. I know they set forth the views, hopes, and ambitions of Americans of Lithuanian descent in relation to the early regaining of the independence and freedom of the people of Lithuania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three editorials from the Christian Science Monitor on the subject of grain for India.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 6, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

358. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the Third Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to section 12 of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948, Public Law 883, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

359. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the First Quarterly Report to the President by the Director of Defense Mobilization, entitled "Building America's Might"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

360. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property located at Decatur, Ill."; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

361. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Texas City Channel, Tex., with a view to determining if the recommendation regarding a protective structure on the north side of the Texas City dike should be modified in any way at this time. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 16, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

362. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 26, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean, with a view to determining the effect of the Federal project improvements at the entrance to the river on the shore lines contiguous to the entrance, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 8, 1945, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on November 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

363. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $6,421,681,000 for the Department of Defense (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

364. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, Department of State, transmitting the Fourth Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

365. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excluded as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the

"Decentralization of Federal activities. The committee has disallowed the Budget request of $20,000,000 for financing a program of decentralization of 19,000 positions covering the period to June 30, 1952. The proposal was presented as a means of helping to relieve the serious space problem existing in the District of Columbia and adjacent area due to the expanding defense program.

"The question of decentralization, as well as dispersal, is now pending before the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress. It is the opinion of the committee that an appropriation should not be provided until an overall plan has been considered and basic legislation providing for a comprehensive program is enacted. The budget plan considered by the committee contains numerous legislative provisions for which authorization should be secured in the usual way before an appropriation is granted. Also, the plan is incomplete in that information is not available as to where a majority of the 19,000 positions will be transferred. As presented to the committee, the activities selected, positions to be transferred, and locations tentatively selected, cover only 4,842 positions."

"Defense Production. It would appear to the committee that if the reasons for our embarking on a program of national defense as given by the President on several occasions are sound then they are sound for all segments of our government. This nation has been in an emergency since the end of the war, but all agencies of the government resumed business as usual, disregarding the varied and continued threats to our security.

"Now comes the time, when everyone is asked to make some sacrifice in the interest of strengthening the nation. Individually, such sacrifices, principally of comfort and luxuries, will be gladly made. Collectively, however, these sacrifices are not assumed so readily. The executive branch, itself, is included in the latter category. All agencies it seems, are willing to assist in the defense effort provided they get additional funds and staff therefor and provided they can continue to carry on their regular activities. It appears to the committee that being, as we have been, in an emergency situation for the past several years, much of the money now requested for national defense would have been unnecessary had these agencies themselves, during this period pointed their activities toward national defense instead of going all-out for a resumption of normal peacetime functions.

"It is unrealistic and wholly unreasonable for anyone to assume that it takes 2,300,000 Federal civil employees to govern us during a normal emergency, and then when a greater emphasis is placed on the security of the country and on the development of its capacity to defend itself a new army of specialists must be recruited to perform the added task.

"One way for Russia to accomplish its objectives without spending a ruble is to allow us to spend ourselves poor-poorer than we now are. Our economy can withstand only so much borrowing, and that maximum is not too far away.

"Our Federal Government, already too large, should not be permitted to grow larger, often on the pretext of having some connection with national defense. Such additional employees as are directly needed for national defense are to be transferred to defense activities, together with such funds as have been heretofore appropriated for their salaries and expenses.

"Language is contained in the bill, which makes provision for such transfers from regular activities of each department and agency as may be required to carry out national defense activities assigned to that department or agency. The committee expects that, in preparing estimates for fiscal year 1952 for activities under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, or other defense activities the Bureau of the Budget will instruct all departments and agencies of the Government to adhere to the policy recommended herein of absorbing the costs of such activities, or of otherwise contributing to defense efforts."

2. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military training and service bill (pp. 3510-50).

3. COPPER IMPORTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 3336, to suspend import taxes on copper until Feb. 15, 1953 (pp. 3503-7).

4. EMPLOYEES' LOYALTY. Reps. Velde and Busbey, Ill., criticized the President's employee-loyalty review program as now established (pp. 3551-3).

5. FORESTRY. Received from the Interior Department a proposed bill "to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3554).

6. EDUCATION. Received a semi-annual report from the U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange (H. Doc. 108); to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 3554).

7. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 9 (p. 3554). Legislative program for this week, as announced by Majority Leader McCormack: Mon., D. C. bills (including daylight-saving time) and 3rd supplemental appropriation bill; Tues. and until disposed of, reading of manpower bill for amendment under 5-minute rule. Rep. McCormack stated, "From now on we will have legislation constantly coming up" on the floor. (pp. 3509-10.)

## SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Mon., Apr. 9:

8. DISPERSAL. The "Daily Digest" states that the Public Works Committee "met in executive session to consider S. 218, providing for construction of Federal buildings outside but accessible to D. C., and voted unanimously to request that its Subcommittee on Buildings draft a revised bill and report, based on a dispersal program consisting of 4 sites with 1 permanent building to provide office space for 5,000 employees, including necessary utilities and a bypass highway around D. C., with the necessary access roads. The dispersal and decentralization programs should be sufficient to permit demolition of World War II temporary buildings in D. C. and vicinity." (p. D258.)

9. R.F.C. The Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee voted to report favorably S. Res. 76, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, relating to RFC (p. D258).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

10. TAXATION. H. R. 3574, by Rep. Granger, Utah, to amend section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income tax treatment of sales of livestock; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 3554).

11. MINERALS. H. R. 3588, by Rep. Baring, Nev., to establish the Office of Federal Minerals Coordinator; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3554).

12. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3580, by Rep. Hagen, Minn., to amend section 3A of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 to grant certain benefits to such officers as other Federal employees; and a similar bill by Rep. Hagen, H. R. 3583; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3554).

H. R. 3581, by Rep. Hagen, to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 3554).

received a subpena duces tecum directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the ninth day of April, 1951, at 9:45 o'clock a. m. as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Joseph P. Kamp* (Criminal No. 1788–50), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And to a resolution adopted by the House in the forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted.

"*Resolved*, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place or from the custody of the Clerk, any papers, was denied by the House but court afforded facilities to make certain copies of the papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of a subpena duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JOSEPH P. KAMP, CRIMINAL NO. 1788–50

To RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk, United States House of Representatives, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.*

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at District Courthouse in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 9th day of April 1951, at 9:45 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Joseph P. Kamp*, Criminal No. 1788–50, and bring with you:

1. Transcript of proceedings of June 6, 1950, before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the United States House of Representatives.

2. Transcript of proceedings of said select committee relating to defendant Joseph P. Kamp, or to the issuance of committee subpenas, or to both subjects, held on June 14, 1950.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

Dated: April 3, 1951.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By HELEN M. MCINTOSH,
*Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 180) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Joseph P. Kamp* (No. 1788–50, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duces tecum was issued by the chief justice of said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 9th day of April 1951, at 9:45 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

*Resolved*, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

*Resolved*, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Capitol.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in order to accept membership on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 181) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this for the purpose of securing information as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District day, which I do not like to dispense with in order to give the committee an opportunity to call up its bills. The daylight-savings bill, if favorable action is taken, would have to be taken up on or before April 29. There are two bills on the calendar: H. R. 2612, the daylight-saving-time bill, and H. R. 3297, a bill authorizing the appointment of the Director of Civilian Defense. The third supplemental appropriation bill of 1951 is also set for Monday. It is quite probable that the consideration of those bills, or at least two of them, will take a considerable part of Monday's session, if not the whole session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will be fortunate if we do not go into Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it would be unfortunate if we go into Tuesday. Let us hope that that situation will not prevail, because I think the 5-minute rule on the manpower bill will start on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are going to finish the deficiency bill before you go on to the manpower bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, of course. I am proceeding on the assumption that there will be the usual fine cooperation and that we will dispose of these matters on Monday, but if not, of course, we can continue them until later.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We are always willing to cooperate to expedite the business of the House, but we also have to face facts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have always found that we have the cooperation of the gentleman in matters concerning the operation of the House, just as we cooperated with my friend when he was the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Certainly; I agree with that.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of those bills, the manpower bill will be taken up for consideration under the 5-minute rule, and it will continue until it is finished. If it is completed before Friday, then of course the program for Friday will be undetermined.

April 14 is Pan American Day, and each year on that day we have speeches. However, April 14 being Saturday, the probabilities are that the observance of that day will be advanced to either Thursday or Friday, probably Thursday. While I canont definitely announce what day it will be, I should like to put the Members on notice that the strong probability is that it will be Thursday, but in any event not later than Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not suppose that would intervene before the completion of the consideration of the manpower bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. The consideration of the manpower bill will proceed with that understanding.

There is one further observation I should like to make. From now on we will have legislation constantly coming up. While I as majority leader like to please every Member as far as is humanly possible, the same as the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Indiana did a few years ago, it presents many difficulties as the bills start rolling out of committee, and considerable embarrassment. I hope Members will keep that in mind, so that speaking engagements or official trips in the middle of the week will not be carried out. It will be just impossible to arrange a program from now on if Members are to have speaking engagements on Monday nights or Tuesday nights, and so forth. I hope the Members will keep that in mind.

We always try to cooperate on Monday because on Monday we can legislate and if there are any roll calls we can agree that they shall be taken up on Tuesday, so that there will be no loss of time. However, outside of Monday and Saturday, I hope Members will keep that in mind. I particularly hope that members of committees or subcommittees that are going to travel, if there are any, will keep in mind that from now on we will have a steady program.

Of course, we have to realize that time passes and July will come soon. There is a hope and ambition in relation to that. I am only expressing my personal opinion, but I would regret very much if the Members of the House were not given a vacation. We are entitled to a vacation, although very few of us have one when we are away from here. We are compelled to take one around the latter part of September or in October, and then come back again in November.

I have hopes, but I cannot guarantee that some other plan will be arrived at, but still that is all a matter of getting the essential part of our legislative business through in time. I might also say for the benefit of the membership that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I have agreed—of course subject to the unanimous consent of the House, which has never been denied—that if there are any roll calls on Monday, I shall ask unanimous consent that they go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. In which event we may meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday, is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, there is a strong possibility that if there are any roll calls on Monday which will go over to Tuesday I will ask the indulgence of the House to meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to have this question determined now. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, if I cannot find out about committee meetings, then I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

[Mr. JENKINS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will permit me to yield time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to address the Committee now?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I can never deny my friend from North Carolina anything.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

For the last few days we have debated an issue which has been presented to the Congress for the sixth time since I have been here. There is no such thing as a painless draft act. It deals with human beings. It places the responsibility of service to their country upon human beings. It simply cannot be carried out without causing some disorder in the economic set-up of our citizens. It inconveniences many people. But the matter of giving service to our country is a matter that we can all be proud of. There are 234 men in this body who have seen service in the different branches of the service of this country.

It is common knowledge that individuals usually respond to whatever their duty becomes when the facts are presented to them as they exist. For some 150 years or more this country has had no long sustained military policy. In my opinion, this committee has spent more time on this draft bill than any other draft bill that has been presented to the House in the history of the country. We did it for that reason. We were trying to work out for this country, for the preservation of our freedoms and the protection of them from a military standpoint, a program on a long-time basis.

There is very little difference of opinion in regard to the present draft act. We have listened for the last few days to the arguments, pro and con, on the controversial issues in this bill. There has probably been some English conversation used here that has been used by the propaganda machines of the Soviet nation to try to convince the other nations of the world that we are trying to enforce upon the world an imperialistic design of government. The Soviet nation has used every means to try to destroy the confidence of other nations of the world in this country, by saying that we have imperialist design in our minds.

There have been several speeches made on this floor indicating a fear that we might become a military nation because of the adoption of one of the provisions in the title of this act before the Congress. I do not at all share that opinion and have said so on many occasions.

I think if you will look at the structure of our Government you will readily arrive at the conclusion that it simply cannot happen in this country unless we have a different way of electing our Commander in Chief, who is a civilian, unless we destroy the two bodies of the Con-

gress; and, in my opinion, that will never happen in this country. Also, we have at the head of the Defense Department civilian control. Not only that, but today there are more than 20,000,000 veterans in this country who have seen service at one time or another; and, as I said before, 234 Members of this House have served in the Armed Forces; so at any time they could comprise a majority if there were any desire or if there were anything to this claim and this argument that this country could become a military government. We could take over and control it if such an ideology were ever implanted in the minds of those who serve here today in this body. It simply just does not exist in the American mind, and never will, in my opinion.

It is always easy to criticize, of course, someone or somebody; and to criticize the Department of Defense at a time like this is, in my opinion, very serious. I do not mean by that that they should not at all times be subject to the control of the civilian government, which they are, but to condemn them when they have a responsibility of carrying out and protecting you and me and every American citizen gives only to the communistic countries propaganda for their own use.

I believe this country today, the American people, have made up their minds as to the job before us. For me there is but one policy—that is the American policy. That, once adopted, and what it means down through the years, is the important thing to me; whether you be Republican, Democrat, or something else, to me there is but one policy—Americanism. To be an American today is the desire of every human being, probably, outside the continental limits of the United States. Those who have traveled know that to be a fact. To defend that policy it is necessary to provide means and methods, and the responsibility falls upon the Armed Forces of this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield very briefly?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield, briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that the objectives of all of us are the same and that we differ only as to the means and methods?

Mr. DURHAM. That is exactly what I was going to say, that the only difference is in the means and method and the approach to the solution of this problem.

We are faced today, regardless of the opinion of some, with a deadly atheistic ideology that is not going to be contained within its own borders, as has already been demonstrated by its actions since World War II. In my opinion it will continue regardless of the present personnel that directs that deadly atheistic type of ideology; whether they died or whether they live, America is going to be faced with the responsibiilty that faces it at the present time of trying to keep free people free so that the peace-loving peoples can express themselves, so that they can worship God as they desire, speak what they think, read what they care to.

Mr. Chairman, the Defense Establishment of this country is a fact-finding body. It is necessary for it to process information. It is the responsibility of this body to finally process it to a stage of action so that it will become effective, and also to provide the force and the necessary means to carry it into action. Why should that establishment be criticized when it offers to the committee or it offers to the Congress information necessary for us to carry out and design and process legislation for the defense of our country?

No businessman would think of conducting his business without some type of analysis of the situation that exists in regard to his business. If he did otherwise he would not be successful. So it becomes necessary and incumbent upon the Armed Forces of this country to analyze throughout the world what we are supposed to defend and what we expect to defend.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is this not something analogous to the situation we have frequently in a lawsuit? You have a judge who presides. There are technical problems which present themselves in the case. Therefore, experts are called in. I have been engaged in those kind of lawsuits where mining engineers and hydraulic engineers are called in to help the court to evaluate the facts and understand the problems; but finally either the judge or jury decides the case. In the situation which the gentleman is discussing so ably today a committee listens to the evidence, it understands it and then the members use their judgment and apply their common sense, finally offering a policy which we hope the Congress will approve.

Mr. DURHAM. That is exactly what the Committee on Armed Services and the old Committee on Military Affairs have done here over the past 12 years in formulating draft acts and other legislation.

On yesterday I notified my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, that I expected to discuss for a few minutes the measure which he expects to present to this House next week, just exactly what the Barden bill does and what it does not do for the defense of this country in the present emergency. As he said here on the floor of the House in discussing it day before yesterday, he took the bill as we reported with the exception of three changes. He changed the service date from 26 to 24 months; he changed the age limit from 18½ to 19; and he struck out the UMT provision. The figures that were presented to us show definitely and very plainly—and figures are factual, they necessarily have to be—that it cost $10,000 or thereabouts to keep a man in service for a period of 12 months. So, it is just mathematically true, regardless of the argument, when you put a man in service for a short period of time, he becomes an expensive soldier. Although a period of 3 months sounds to be reasonably small, with a force of 4,000,000 it would cost us many millions of dollars more, and I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina wants to be as conservative as I do in the spending of funds. The change in the age limit from 18½ to 19 was arrived at after the committee had gone over all the figures that we could possibly secure, all of the pool of men that we could possibly scrape from any place in the barrel, with about, at the present time, more than 600,000 or close to that number of reserves already called out for active duty, many of them up to the age of 40 years, many of them with 3, 4, and 5 years of service. In my opinion it is mandatory on this Congress that we relieve those men as soon as possible. To do that it is going to be necessary to go to 18½. Six months' delay would mean about two more years for the reservists in this country, regardless of what each individual thinks about it. It just works out that way. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], who is one of my closest friends and always has been, served on a great football team at the University of North Carolina, which is my home, Chapel Hill. He served on one of the finest teams in this country and won national recognition and when anybody went around his side of the line, they usually found out he was there. He admitted he was no military expert, to which I agree, but has offered a bill on military matters which, if adopted, the defense establishment would have to operate under. I believe his proposal to be unsound and for that reason I oppose it.

He admitted that he was an experienced legislator, which he is, and I will add to that that he is not only experienced but he is able. So it is with a little bit of reluctance that I would challenge what I believe to be his best judgment, as I know he is as honest as I am about matters of this kind.

He comes from the Albemarle section of North Carolina, where white men first placed their feet in this country. For more than 150 years before the Revolutionary War those people there fought tyranny. They fought Blackbeard, they fought the pirates, centuries before the Revolutionary War. So his part of the country is just as patriotic as any other part. It is with some hesitation that I disagree with him.

For more than 30 years now this country has discussed back and forth this subject of universal military training. It has been before practically every body in this country. It has been discussed by not only the American Legion but clubs, church circles, and other groups in this country. It has been discussed thoroughly, in my opinion. So this claim or challenge or charge that the Committee on Armed Services placed this provision in this bill simply because they wanted to tie it onto the draft bill, and felt that they would not get it otherwise, is not well founded.

Personally, I think it is time this country was making up its mind what its military policy on a long-range basis

should be. It is my definite opinion, based on service myself in the First World War and the experience I have gained as a member of the Committee on Armed Services for the past 12 years or more, that if we expect to continue our traditional military policy, placing a large measure of dependence upon preparedness for defense on our Reserve units and the National Guard and on other organized units, we must make it possible for them to be able to achieve the degree of preparedness that modern warfare requires.

I am honestly convinced that we cannot do this unless we have some system of military service and training such as our committee has brought to you in the measure now under consideration.

We had less than 600,000 troops when the Korean operation began, so we can readily see that if it had not been for the organized Reserves in this country we would again have found ourselves in the desperate situation in which we have always found ourselves before.

This also offers a far-reaching military program. As has been demonstrated here in figures by the chairman and many others, and I am not going to go into them in detail, the bulk of the Reserves ordered up here are mostly veterans, many of them married, and many others with high positions of responsibility in business or industry who could ill afford to lose their jobs or leave them. The universal military training program, if and when adopted, or some such plan that is set up after the drafting of men has ceased, will induct around 500,000 or more for a 6-month basic training course yearly, so we can readily see that we can create a pool in the 6-year period required by this act by having in Reserve status 3,000,000 or more men.

I think that is necessary because if you get the number of Reserves like we held after the last war and like we held after the First World War, we simply do not carry out a Reserve program which is efficient and which is in being when an emergency happens. Whatever conditions might exist in the future, we would not have to disrupt the men as we have been doing during this emergency, by taking men with families and those men 40 years old or more. This would immediately give us a ready force of men after a short refresher course or period of training to fill the ranks of our divisions and other units. Heretofore our Reserve units have suffered because of a lack of interest primarily due to the lack of equipment, training facilities, and supervision by our Armed Forces. If the guard and Reserve units could always be brought up to 75 percent or 80 percent of the trained strength, which they would be under universal military training, then those units could be called up and put into service in a short time. We are all aware of the trouble we have had in the past. It is my considered judgment that the lack of such a system has carried us through the dreadful expereince of rushing understrength units into action in nearly every emergency we have faced in this Nation for the past 30 years or more. Universal military training and service is not only the most effective and democratic way to meet our military needs, it is also the most economic way. It makes it possible to shift a substantial part of the responsibilities for national defense from our forces in being to a reserve of trained civilian manpower. The annual cost of maintaining a man as I have said before in the Military Establishment is $10,000. The annual cost of maintaining a man in a state of readiness in Reserve is $524, and in the National Guard it costs $623. That is a considerable difference. It is true that the National Guard and Reserve Corps are not strictly comparable to the situation of maintaining a man in the standing Army, because it is impossible to evaluate the support the Reserve components draw from the Regular Military Establishment in terms of overhead, training facilities, hospitalization, and other factors.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the difference in the cost of keeping a million men under arms, or keeping the same number in the Reserve, runs to several billion dollars a year. The cost of training men in a separate universal-military-training program would be about $2,900 for a 6-month training program. This would give him the basic military skills which would enable him to provide effective service in the Reserve in any emergency. It is also important to recognize the great waste which is attendant on the present system of quickly expanding or contracting our military forces with each shift in the international tide today.

Universal - military - training service would assure an orderly flow of trainees into our posts, camps, and stations on a regular basis. It would not be necessary to open and close the stations with all the costs that accompany each shift. In the current expansion of the Army it has been necessary to reactivate many camps, and if I may especially call the attention of the gentleman to this, camps which were shut down only a short time ago. A few examples will show how costly this process of reactivation is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. On yesterday the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], made the statement that he intended to submit a certain amendment to his committee on next Monday. I wonder if the gentleman is prepared, or if the chairman of the committee is prepared, to present that amendment in the form he intends to submit it so that we might all consider it before the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that sometime during the debate today I will present the amendment to the House and have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly what we need in order that we may know how to act when the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee if he has any more amendments in the nature of all-day suckers that he is going to offer?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] I have not finished reading his statement made yesterday. After reading it, probably it may be necessary to make some corrections in the conclusions that the gentleman uttered on the floor.

Mr. GROSS. I will say further to the gentleman that I think he ought to offer an amendment that will prohibit the taking of Reserves back into service within 24 hours after they are let out. I hope that might be done in justice to this heartwarming story that we have read about the Reserves.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that I think is important in regard to the adoption of some type of universal military training.

There has been a great deal of criticism directed against the new program for the deferment of college students. It has been felt by many that the deferment will be so broad as to create an aristocracy of brains and wealth, made up of youths who will escape military service at the expense of the rest of the Nation's youth.

This criticism underlines one of the essential differences between Selective Service and universal military training. In Selective Service, the emphasis is on deferments and exemptions; in universal military training, the emphasis is on having all young men assume a common and equal obligation for the defense of their country. Exemption from this obligation is confined to those who are prevented by mental or physical disability from rendering any useful contribution to the military establishment, no matter how far standards of acceptability are lowered.

It is possible to apply this democratic principle of universal obligation under universal military training without impairing the industrial, technical, or educational preeminence of our country. The same is not true under Selective Service to anything like the same degree. Here is why: Selective Service represents a device for calling men into the Armed Forces for extended periods of active duty. They must face the prospect of being away from their civilian pursuits for roughly 2 years. Moreover, the lack of any adequate reserve program makes it necessary to cut across a broad age range to secure enough men to defend the country. An indiscriminate withdrawal of men under such circumstances could have a most destructive effect on the Nation's economic and cultural life, particularly if the present emergency lasts for many years.

Who in this body says it will not last that long? The argument today that we must not adopt a long-range program simply does not reason out to good sound judgment, in my opinion, because we have faced an emergency since 1939 and are not out of it today. Suppose we

have to draft men for another 20 years, and who can say we will not?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder if I understand this bill correctly in that these programs do not run concurrently, but end-to-end in other words; is that correct? Or do they run concurrently?

Mr. DURHAM. That is true; they do not run concurrently. It goes into effect only when the drafting of men stops.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is my understanding, and I think it must be the opinion of many Members here that these programs will run concurrently.

Mr. DURHAM. You simply could not run the two concurrently, because at the present time you have a complete draft.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct; and as I understand whatever UMT program might be subsequently adopted by the House could not take effect until the draft for the armed service was finished; is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is making an excellent speech. I should like to add just one thought or observation. Under the bill the UMT provision, of course, is separate from the rest of the program. The UMT program would be handled under a civilian board, whereas the draft law is under the military.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. And a different set-up would prevail.

Mr. HINSHAW. But that was not my point; my point was that the two do not run concurrently, but end-to-end.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I think we might add to what the gentleman has said in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from California that while it would not be feasible to put the universal military training program into effect until the emergency is over, nevertheless, under the bill it could be done. The President, for example, could defer from military service all those between 18½ and 19 years of age and permit the training program to begin. It could begin even before the emergency was over.

Mr. DURHAM. I hardly see how it could possibly be done unless, of course, we come to a position in this emergency where we do not require the present pool of men, which is about 800,000, who become 18½ each year and it will require this figure. If you reach a point which did not require all in the pool, then the President could put UMT in operation under this bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I agree that that would be true, and it would be very difficult to put it into effect as long as men are needed for service; but it could technically be done before the emergency is over if perchance the President came to the conclusion that there were enough men in the pool between the ages of 19 and 26, by using those between the ages of 18½ and 19.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; he could do that, but you would not have enough men unless you dropped down below the 18½-year age limit to get your personnel.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's clearing up something which has been bothering me for a number of days since the debate started on this bill. The gentleman from California just said that the UMT program would not run concurrently with the draft program. The point I am making, however, is whether after the draft is dropped and the UMT is started you will not have an army operating for about one-quarter of what it costs the Government today. In other words you will be doing away with the GI benefits, with the emoluments, and the good pay which the soldiers now enjoy. You will be substituting a UMT program for the great majority of the young men in military service.

Mr. DURHAM. The 6-year period of Reserve duty, after 6 months training, will provide approximately 3,000,000 men, which is a good force in being, in my opinion. Of course, if you face an all-out emergency, that is different, but for ordinary peacetime conditions that is a reasonable number.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. My contention is if we have an armed force we have to pay for it. We cannot let go those emoluments, those GI benefits that Congress has fought so hard to give the young men in the armed services.

Mr. DURHAM. Of course, I do not think this country can stand a $70,000,000,000-a-year program for the Armed Forces for many, many years. That is what disturbs me. It disturbs me because of the fact it simply is not reasonable to think that our economic system can stand it. What I am thinking about, what I want to do, and what I desire to do is to get some type of plan that will have a force in effect that we can use when we have to use it without being so expensive to the American taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In reference to the subject of cost that the gentleman referred to a while ago stating it is costing many millions of dollars to reactivate camps all over the country.

Mr. DURHAM. That is necessary.

Mr. GROSS. What happened to the more than $40,000,000,000 that were appropriated for housekeeping expenses or allegedly spent on housekeeping expenses in four fiscal years?

Mr. DURHAM. What years is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. GROSS. After the last World War, after World War II.

Mr. DURHAM. These are camps that became necessary because of the expansion of the armed soldiers that were moved out entirely and had to go back in there and take over because we had to have some training facilities. If we had a force in effect like provided in this military training plan these facilities would have been kept. Of course, I do not know what plan we will adopt, but I assume we will adopt a plan that carries basic military training. We should adopt that.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that the buildings and other facilities in these camps were allowed to deteriorate?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; they were built out of pine lumber primarily.

Mr. GROSS. Yet we appropriated billions of dollars for them.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman does not expect an old pine barracks to last 40 years, does he?

Mr. GROSS. It has not been 40 years since the end of World War II.

Mr. DURHAM. It has been about 10 years.

Mr. GROSS. It has been about 5 or 6 years.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Congress should know that practically all of the housing facilities at the time we got into the war or immediately thereafter were temporary propositions.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Why should not those buildings have been kept up? Did you not take them in after Korea broke? Have you not had soldiers themselves putting in window glass, puttying windows, and painting buildings?

Mr. DURHAM. Everybody disbanded and went home after the last war.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I was a member of the subcommittee that visited the Sampson Air Base this last week end. We found there that in a matter of 3 or 4 years the main beams of the buildings had completely rotted and it will require a vast sum of money to rebuild them. It is simply the elements taking hold of the timber and destroying it.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is, therefore, both understandable and necessary that selective service be concerned with the maintenance of a balance between those who are called into the Armed Forces and those who are needed to keep the home front from collapsing. It is equally understandable that this differentiation would provoke bitter resentment among those who are called upon to leave their families and risk their lives while others stay at home to push forward their regular careers.

The existence of universal military training will infuse such vitality into the National Guard and the Organized Reserves that it will not be necessary to draft men for prolonged service, except when an acute threat hangs over the country. A man can be called up for 4 to 6 months of training without the necessity for the elaborate system of industrial, agricultural, technical, and ed-

ucational deferment that exists under selective service.

Army training to all young men in the year between 18 and 19 represents the best answer to the problem of national defense. It assures that the burden is equitably distributed over all our young men. At the same time it guarantees maximum strength for our country in its industrial, technical, and educational aspects. It is the American road to survival in the explosive world situation we may have to face for the rest of our lives.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to outline to the committee some of the reasons why I am supporting UMT and why I hope this committee will vote down the substitute to be offered by my good friend from North Carolina, not that I do not consider his judgment and his belief that he is approaching this on a sound basis, but I do believe that this committee has worked out for this Congress and for the Armed Forces, for the protection of freedom, the best manpower bill that we can possibly present to you. The chairman, in my opinion, has offered and is going to offer a good amendment which will give this body and the other body the right and the opportunity to amend and work out a long-range program of service in this country.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. By virtue of the fact that the bill amends existing law and hence is not an original bill, except in the report by the committee, where the language of the committee bill we have on the floor is properly placed in substitution for language in existing law, a great deal of misapprehension has arisen among a number of people in the country who merely read the bill itself and do not have the benefit of the Ramseyer rule report. Now, one of the things which I believe I understand perfectly but which I think is misunderstood by many of the people is the fact that this bill is confined solely to the young manhood of the country and in nowise affects the young womanhood of the country. Is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. Correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is one of the misapprehensions of fact that has existed in several places in the country. The other one is, and arising from the same cause, I believe, that the Senate bill as amended by the House, or as the Senate bill was presented to the House, would permit the drafting of labor. I understand the terminology of the original act and the present bill. It is my belief that it in nowise whatever does provide for the drafting of labor; is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly our bill does not.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Regardless of what the Senate bill may have provided.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad the gentleman made those statements categorically, because the other side has been presented. Where it has come from, I do not know.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his splendid explanation of this bill. I regard the gentleman now addressing the Chamber one of the most outstanding men in Congress.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman what he thinks about the recent order issued by General Hershey wherein he makes a distinction between college students because some happen to make a little better mark than the others. I have not seen a single Member of Congress or anybody else who approves that order. I certainly hope before this bill is completed next week someone will offer an amendment, and that it will be adopted, to do away with that order.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman has justification for his concern.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not a fact that Mr. Hershey explained this proposal to the committee, that the committee drafted the bill to make it possible for this plan to be inaugurated, that the report itself, which has been before this Committee all week, explains what the plan has, and that the plan had the complete endorsement of the committee at the time it was considered?

Mr. DURHAM. At the time it was considered; I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask if it is not a fact that the committee altered the Senate bill so as to make possible that particular plan, and made a change actually in the stipulations of the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. That is true.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while the distinguished gentleman from California was making a statement before our committee I made this statement, which appears on pages 507 and 508 of the hearings:

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this observation, that I think it is highly important also to defer as many men as we possibly can with brains and who are going ahead with their education. At the same time, we cannot defer everyone. And the fact that these men are deferred does not necessarily mean—I mean the fact that some of them are not deferred—you have to have an age limit somewhere. It does not necessarily mean that they are not going to ultimately complete their education. I know of numerous instances where boys were taken, when they completed high school, into the service and who spent as many as 2 and 3 years or longer in service, but who had the determination to come back and complete their education.

Now, many of them made better students than they would have made because they were impressed with the seriousness of the proposition when they were about to lose the thing. It was dear to them. While I think it is regrettable that we cannot defer all of them—and we are trying to make it up to them, trying to take them as late as possible by fixing the age limit at 18½ and then giving all of this broad leeway here to General Hershey and the President to defer those that are making good in an educational way. But we have to get some men into the armed services, and we cannot just take all of these men who are not able to go to college and not take any of them who might be able to go. While I agree with what the gentleman says in large measure, I cannot see how we can absolutely fix this thing where nobody will be hurt and yet at the same time build up our armed services.

I do want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that what we had in mind largely was that they should be handled in a common-sense way on that?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not believe we expected this thing to be issued as it appeared in the press.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. The Senate, as you recall, just blocked out 75,000 students, who would have been selected probably by some agency downtown. I would vote against the bill instead of voting for such a provision as that, because if we remain in this emergency 10 years you would have an entirely selective system of education.

It is a difficult problem to work out, I will admit. It is one of the most difficult problems. I have 11 colleges in my four counties, and it is one of the most difficult problems that faces us because we all realize it is going to be necessary to try to keep your scientific and your technical presonnel in the colleges of this country. It just must be done. Somehow it has got to be done.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. During the course of the testimony which I was privileged to hear before the gentleman's committee, and I appreciate that very much, General Byers made two statements, which I think are of great importance. With the gentleman's permission I would like to read those two statements, which are not very long—if I may.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman may read them.

Mr. HINSHAW. The statement is as follows:

We feel we are responsible to furnish to the youth of the Nation the best possible trained officers that we may get them, and we feel we should be very derelict in our duty if we did not plan to take 4-year college men to lead these boys, rather than use the emergency of taking those that happen to come into officer candidate school.

Then he says further:

The officers'-candidate-school graduate was a very, very sound, small-unit leader. He had been thoroughly trained in all elements of detail and performed small-unit leadership in an outstanding degree but his utility beyond that was in direct proportion to the education which he had had before he started the OCS.

Mr. DURHAM. There are, of course, 210,000 in the ROTC at the present time

in the colleges of the country, which is quite a large number of potential officers and the services desire to enlarge the program which I think is sound.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] in complimenting the gentleman from North Carolina on the great work he has done in this field. I have great confidence in his opinion. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and I promise I will not take up much of his time. The question is along another line. Existing law provides as follows: Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations, any persons between the ages of 19 and 26 shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for the purpose of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

The period of service prescribed in subsection (b) is 21 months. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], for whom I also have great respect, called to the attention of the House the many instances where the military had shown disregard of the mandate of Congress. I have investigated and find that the Army is not carrying out the clear mandate of Congress in the matter of accepting enlistments in the Army of men in the draft brackets. The minimum period of acceptance, generally speaking, is 3 years. There have been a few Reservists accepted for less than 3 years, but very few. There are many boys in this country who want the privilege of volunteering, want to go ahead and do their part, serve their 21 months or 24 or 26 months. They want to be volunteers without being penalized for it. They want the law passed by the Congress to be observed by the military. The military, generally speaking, does not accept them for less than 3 years. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know whether I can explain it; of course it is a regulation which has been adopted, based on the best opinion, for the services of the different branches of the Army and Navy. At the present time you must realize this of course, that the Army is facing difficulty in getting men. The Air Force is a branch of the service that the boys like to get into, and the Navy is another one that the boys like to get into. Both of those branches of the service have had plenty of volunteers. But when you have to get down into the ditch, and have to do the walking, and the drudgery that has to be done as a foot soldier, the man is going to try to get into another branch of the service. They can change the regulations and they can change the period of service to 3 years or 4 years or whatever they want to under present law.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is the very point I wish to make. The Army needs these men. They are going into the Marine Corps and the Navy, and while the Congress of the United States has said, in the last act that we passed, that if those boys want to enlist for the same period for which they would be drafted, they would be given that opportunity, that is not being done.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman feels just like I do. Certainly I do not think we want to stop all volunteering. You cannot say to the Air Force, "Here, you are not going to take any more men," and you cannot say to the Navy, "You are not going to take any more volunteers." I would not agree to that. To me that would be very destructive. That is what we are faced with. It is just like having a good football team in South Carolina, and a sour one in North Carolina. The boy wants to go to South Carolina because they have a good football team.

Mr. RICHARDS. There is no competition at all in this respect. To join the Marine Corps they have to sign up for 4 years, I believe.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. But this law would help to get men into the Army. It says men shall be accepted for enlistment for a period of 21 months. The Army has refused to let them enlist.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield at this point—you will find at page 30 of the bill S. 1 the provision under subsection (2) that the man can within the ages of 18 and 26 be accepted for that particular obligation.

Mr. DURHAM. We took all the reserves and all the reserves at the present time are in for 21 months.

Mr. RICHARDS. That does not meet the proposition at all. It is a separate section of the bill. That section says that they will be given an opportunity to volunteer for induction. That is entirely different. But existing law says, "shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for the same period that they would have been called." The same provision should be in this bill and it should be observed by the military.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like somebody to answer my question.

Mr. SHORT. I would like to say to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] there is no answer to your argument and your logic. I think it is rather manifest that the military has deliberately circumvented the clear intent of Congress.

Mr. RICHARDS. It seems so.

Mr. SHORT. That is the reason I do not want us to fall under military control in this Congress. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is to be congratulated for having pointed this out. It is only one of many instances in which they have circumvented the clear intent of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], and I think the chairman of the committee has promised him 12 minutes also.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. GAVIN. For just a moment.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is a very able member of this committee. Will he admit that the Department of Defense has absolutely refused to adhere to the directive of Congress in regard to allowing men to enlist for the same period that they would be drafted?

Mr. GAVIN. I was not listening to the gentleman's discussion, and the chairman of the committee could probably better answer that particular question.

Mr. VINSON. I was going to suggest that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] could give the explanation of that, as he is fairly familiar with it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is true that the Army has refused to accept enlistments for a 21-month period, but the reason they have refused is because the Congress in the past has, by legislation, extended the enlistment period of those now in the service for a period of a year. So, if they accepted enlistments for 21 months, and subsequently the Congress has exercised its authority and extended the enlistments for a year, the result would be that those men would have been acting for a longer period of service than under the draft.

Mr. RICHARDS. I agree that men in all categories face the chance that Congress will extend their period of enlistment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is taking too much of my time. I decline to yield further. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman from Georgia kindly yield me that 15 minutes now?

Mr. VINSON. I yield the gentleman 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently for the last 3 days to this debate on the reorganization of selective service and universal military training. A great deal of the time has been used to attack and criticize the military, the brass, rather than to discuss the issues which are before the House. In my opinion, more propaganda has been developed for the Communists than has happened around here for the last 5 years. It is easy to criticize our military leaders, but a few years back when they were leading the American forces to great victories we heard great tributes paid to them from the floor of this House. It would appear now from what you hear, that if this legislation is passed an effort will be made by the military to take over the civil functions of our Government, Prussianize and militarize the youth of this great Nation of ours. That is simply ridiculous; nothing is further from the truth.

I want to call your attention to the fact that General Eisenhower—who is the upper brass, and who received the greatest ovation any American ever re-

ceived from the Members of this House a few years ago right in this House—he represents the military; General Eisenhower represents the upper brass, and he is the exemplification of all that represents everything that is military in this Nation, however, today Members on both sides of the aisle are greatly concerned that he will not be their presidential candidate. By that I mean both sides, Republicans and Democrats, would be glad to take this top brass as their candidate for President in 1952, and let no one tell you otherwise. Both sides are afraid that they are not going to have him for their candidate; both sides are worried now as to how to make overtures to get the upper or the top-level brass for their candidate. If he were their candidate, Republican or Democratic, a great many of you would draw a great sigh of relief and satisfaction that you had a good man, and let no one tell you otherwise. So all this talk about what the brass would do to this great Nation of ours is far from the truth, and we should confine ourselves to the issue before the House and not these attacks as to what the military would or would not do under this proposed legislation.

What I desire to talk here about today is the troops-for-Europe question. It has been discussed here momentarily but little or no attention has been paid to it. I am of the opinion that this issue of supplying troops for the defense of Western Europe will be raised in connection with the pending legislation. I desire to offer for your consideration a few brief comments thereon.

This is a complex and a difficult problem which has engaged the efforts and the attention of the American public for an extended period. While I do not claim to be an expert on the matter, I have made a close personal study of the issues involved over the past several years. During and since World War II I have given this matter close study. I have had the good fortune during the past 3 or 4 years of making several visits to the European Continent. My views and conclusions with respect to the conditions existing there have been previously made known to the House, and I shall simply invite your attention at this time to my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of January 22 and February 26 of this year.

As you all know, American troops reached the continent of Europe during World War II in September of 1943, when elements of General Eisenhower's North African Command landed at Salerno. The operation was a difficult one, and the Germans were much better prepared for our forces than had been anticipated. As a result the outcome was for some days in question and the casualties of our American youth were terrific in their effort to fight their way in. However, we obtained and secured a foothold on the continent of Europe from which we were able to exert substantial pressure against the German military machine. Our major landing was, of course, in Normandy in June 1944 after we had amassed one of the largest land, air, and sea forces ever seen. Again, the cost not only in matériel and supplies but in American youth was very, very heavy.

I would simply remind you at this time that our present position in Western Europe was not easily gained and we should, in my opinion, consider most carefully what we shall do before we abandon it. We fought our way in, we are dug in and we should stay in. We pulled out of Italy in 1948 and we then had a difficult time for fear the Communists would take over. We had 50,000 troops in Korea a little over a year and a half ago, but we pulled them out. So Joe Stalin says: "For the glory of the Soviet Union he moves in."

So what? It has cost us now 55 or 60,000 casualties to fight our way back to regain that which we held because somebody was not thinking right when we pulled out. Now we are in Europe, we are dug in and have a foothold, and we should stay in.

After the termination of hostilities in Europe and Japan, there was, as you know, tremendous pressure brought to bring the boys home. Public sentiment, reacting after almost 4 years of war, demanded speedy demobilization without securing results commensurate with our sacrifices and military achievements and without any thought as to the future position of this country in world affairs. I regret that there was not more prudence and fortitude demonstrated in meeting the popular clamor at that time. As a result we demobilized our Army, our Navy, our Air Corps, and largely destroyed our military machine within a year after we had achieved such costly and hard-won victories.

Two years after the end of hostilities in World War II, the beautiful dream of permanent peace and friendly relations with the Soviet Union and its Communist satellites began to fade away. We slowly woke up to the fact that we had been fooled, trapped, and betrayed and that the glib assurances and facile promises of the Russian rulers were worth exactly nothing. The Communist assault upon Greece, the threats against Turkey and the unjustified closing of our corridor into Berlin all showed us the stern realities we had too long neglected; however, we once again sought a painless solution and we took the easy way out.

We were told on eminent authority from the floor of this House to pump some $22,000,000,000 into the economy of Western Europe so that the Continent would be revived economically, made secure for democratic government, and constitute a military stronghold against possible Communist movement or aggression. Some of this money, certainly in its initial phase, was well spent in relieving malnutrition if not actual famine, due to the drought in Europe in 1947, and restoring the productive capacity of the mills, transport systems, and factories destroyed by war. However, much of it has been relatively of little use, and, as I have stated before, any real recovery or rebuilding of Western Europe must come from the people of that Continent, not as the result of our generosity, no matter how much we spend. We were told, possibly in all sincerity, that if we simply furnished goods and materials at the expense of the American taxpayers, Europe would become not only prosperous but would reform its archaic institutions so that those countries would have a genuine democratic basis. Of course, most of these results have not been attained and we should have known at the time that they would not be. For example, after 3 years of talk, land reform in Italy has been barely started. Taxes in that country are still collected chiefly from business activities or consumption, and very few wealthy people in Italy make any commensurate returns of income taxes, while the American taxpayer is paying through the nose to carry this tremendous load, and while in Italy they make but the slightest attempt to impose and collect taxes, that, is from the wealthy people of the country. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

France emerged from World War II in better condition physically than after World War I, but with strong socialist movements which succeeded in nationalizing their banks, their insurance companies, their public utilities, and certain automobile companies, in addition to the railroads and the telephone system which had previously constituted a chronic burden on the French national budget. These socialized industries have simply followed the same pattern of overexpanded payrolls, inadequate initiative, and constitute a greater drain on the limited and poorly collected tax revenues of that country. In Britain we have subsidized socialism to the *n*th degree. We put about $5,000,000,000 into Britain in the last 4 or 5 years. American money, supplies, materials, and food have made it possible for the intellectual theorists to carry out their doctrinaire scheme of nationalizing and socializing not only the coal mines but the entire rail and highway transport system and now even the iron and steel industry. I feel that our continuing and misguided generosity in this respect has simply prolonged the agony and increased the hardships of the British people by continuing an inept, unworkable arrangement, which would have otherwise fallen of its own weight. When it became apparent that the vast expenditure of funds under the Marshall plan for priming of the European pump would have only a limited effect, we were presented with the idea of a North Atlantic Pact. Whether you like it or not, you are in the North Atlantic Pact.

Now, to make my position clear, I voted against the British loan for $3,750,000,000. I voted against UNRRA. I voted for ECA on one occasion in 1947, but I voted against ECA ever since. I voted against the reciprocal trade treaties, the Export-Import Bank, and I voted against appropriations for the MDAP. So, no one can say that I have been friendly toward the give-away spending programs in Europe, but now our backs are up against the wall. What have we done with this pump priming and this MDAP? We pumped $22,000,000,000 into Europe. We have made it a going concern. We have rehabilitated the coal and the steel industries in the

Ruhr and the Saar Valleys. It is now the second greatest industrial area in the world. It has tremendous industrial potentialities.

The nations of Europe are rehabilitated. Now what do we want to do? We want to pull out and let Stalin & Co. move in piecemeal, pick these countries off one at a time and, in a year or so from now, solidify his gains. Then, whether you like it or not, you will have trouble. So while we are in we should stay in. It would, in my opinion, be a drastic mistake to pull out. There are certain advantages in a scheme such as the North Atlantic Pact, but the whole assumption and purpose of this plan was to have the United States underwrite the defenses of Western Europe. We bought this plan too and set up in London one of the largest and most complicated headquarters which I have ever seen. The branch offices in Paris and Rome are likewise sizable. Under this organization and the military assistance program which has implemented it, we have been trying to purchase the security of the Western World by furnishing technical assistance, materials, and considerable quantity of arms. However, up to now, the results have been rather disappointing. As I reported on my trip from Europe in December 1950, there is no effective military force which can prevent the Soviet Army from marching to the English Channel and to the Pyrenees as rapidly as they can travel. Our forces in Germany, while individually capable, are insufficient and too greatly dispersed. Our forces in Austria are handicapped for defense by the terrain and lines of communication, and there is throughout a lack of adequate tactical air support, and technical troops such as engineers.

Anyone who looks at the problem which faces General Eisenhower will conclude, I believe, on the basis of simple arithmetic that the defense of Western Europe against possible Soviet aggression will require not less than 35 and possibly 50 trained and well-equipped divisions. Likewise, a simple examination of the facts will show that there are nowhere nearly that number of troops presently available.

The French have made some effort and, in my opinion, could make a great many more efforts toward the building up of an army of at least 20 divisions. The Italians have planned for an army of 12 divisions, but they are short of equipment, and it will be quite some time before their effective strength is anywhere like that amount.

The story elsewhere in Europe is the same. So far as I know, there are only two strong anti-Communist forces in Europe at the present time. One of these is the Yugoslav Army, which is fully occupied in defending that country against the surrounding Russian satellites and possibly a direct Russian assault. The other is in Spain. Aside from these, the best prospects, indeed, the only prospect I can see for building up an effective Western European defense in the near future lies in rearming the people of Western Germany.

I am glad to note that at long last the administration has decided to act under the authority granted in Public Law 697 of the Eighty-first Congress by recruiting some 2,500 displaced persons from nations now behind the iron curtain. However, that is only a drop in the bucket. Our real source of manpower lies in Western Germany. Unless we exploit it, our efforts will, in my opinion, come to naught .

The matter of rearming Western Germany and utilizing the potential military strength of Spain is not a new topic for me, and I shall not repeat what I have heretofore said in favor of both of those proposals. In my opinion, they are not only desirable but absolutely essential if we are to have an effective force in Europe. I am unable to understand why our State Department has not exerted a greater effort and made more progress along these lines. While I have no great confidence in their efforts, and never have, and maybe never will, after I observed their operation on three or four trips to Europe, it may be that with the settlement of the outstanding economic issues between France and Germany and the much belated recognition of Spain, some substantial progress can be made.

At this time, as I have said, we are confronted not with a theory but a condition and a number of very hard facts. We must either strengthen our defense in Europe on the prospect that under General Eisenhower's leadership the nations there will make a real effort to develop their defensive capabilities and that our State Department will permit and encourage the participation of Spain and Western Germany, or we must get out of Europe and stay out.

As I said, I have been against all the giveaway programs. I have been fighting the one-worlders, the do-gooders, the intellectuals, and the "giveawayers." So my record is clear. But my observation now is that in the situation that we are now in I am willing to go the last mile with General Eisenhower because the General has told us he would look the situation over and in 6 months or a year, if cooperation were not offered by the countries participating in the Atlantic Pact, he would come back and tell us. If the countries at that time will not cooperate, after we put in a certain number of divisions, then I say we ought to get out and stay out and let them go it alone.

But now that we have fought our way in and we are dug in, let us not turn over a great rehabilitated Europe to the Soviets to exploit and give us trouble later on.

We ought to give help to Turkey. We ought to give help to Yugoslavia. We ought to give further help to Greece. We ought to give help to Spain. They are all anti-Communist, and they are the only ones that will fight.

There are some of those who contend that we could, from the North American Continent, defend our Nation and defeat Soviet Russia. I wish I could share their view, but I am unable to do so. One of the great prizes for which the Soviets with their patience and long-range cunning are striving is the industrial area of northern France, Belgium, and the Ruhr. If they gain these resources and that assemblage of industrial plants and technical skill, we shall be faced with a very formidable foe indeed.

As I stated in February, if these territories are occupied, the people of those countries will cooperate. You will cooperate any time when you have a bayonet in your back. Those who fail to do so will either occupy a mass grave or be deported to some slave-labor camp in Siberia.

Quite aside from our moral obligations and our sympathies and any humanitarian feelings we may have, we simply cannot afford to let the Russians take over the industrial areas of Western Europe. There are others who have contended, with somewhat more basis, that Western Europe can be defended without the utilization of American Ground Forces. A plausible case can be made out that by sea power and air power alone, we can render sufficient assistance to Western European nations; and that they will themselves supply the ground armies. This, certainly, would be desirable and after a time it should become possible. But right now it is not feasible. I know of no competent military authority who believes that at this time sea power and air power alone can protect that vital area. As for ground forces, as I have said before, there are not yet sufficient numbers. In short, unless we retain and strengthen our existing forces there, the defense of Western Europe will be seriously weakened, and the moral effect upon our potential allies will, in my opinion, be very serious if not disastrous.

There is an obvious popular appeal in furnishing only air power and sea power. It is a clean, fairly comfortable type of warfare, in which the casualties are far lower, and for which we would probably not have to draft nearly so many American boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. May I have an additional 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHORT. I am sorry, I do not have the time to spare.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman.

Unfortunately, however, I cannot believe, especially in the light of our Korean experiences, that air power and sea power alone can be decisive, any more than I would want to send American troops into combat without adequate air support.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman know that air power has not been used in the way it was intended to be used in Korea, by going behind the Manchurian line and cutting off the sources of supply?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; I fully realize it has not been and that is exactly what we do not want to happen again. We do not want to handicap General Eisenhower. We do not want to put him in a strait-jacket. We do not want to

handcuff him and shackle him and put him in the same position.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman is saying that our war in Korea has not been fought by utilizing every weapon that we had, I entirely agree.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly. I realize it has not been fought with every weapon; however, for your information, it might be interesting to you to know that we did try to build a great defense program back in 1948, but the administration cut us back from $17,000,000,000 to $14,000,000,000. Then the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, cut it back more. He cut back the 70-group Air Force to 48, mothballed the fleet, canceled the carrier, skeletonized the Marine Corps, cut back the ground forces, and then when we did go into Korea we had our boys going over there to fight tanks with carbines.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is what I am talking about. We have not been able to use our Air Force to the maximum effect.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly; I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi; and certainly we do not want to shackle General Eisenhower in Europe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this time. Please permit me to continue.

If we learned any military lesson from our campaigns in Europe and the Pacific during World War II, it is that success in battle depends upon well-trained units and the closest possible coordination of all arms and services at the decisive point. And, as I just stated, even though in a technical sense, air power and sea power might do this task, the effect upon Western Europe of withdrawing our Army would be more serious than I care to contemplate. The popular will to resist communism would be weakened, if not destroyed and the Russians and their satellites would take over the remaining countries there, one by one, just as they took over Czechoslovakia in 1948, and endeavored to take over Italy and France.

My conclusion is that from a military point of view, we must augment and strengthen our defenses in Western Europe at this time. We must recognize, of course, that there are limitations to our capacities, and we should face the prospect, as I hope the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council have, that we may find after a time that we can no longer carry the load we have assumed. Certainly the burden on the American taxpayer is heavy, and I regret exceedingly that we must maintain such a large standing army at such terrific cost. Further, in my opinion, these efforts will come to naught unless in the interval, our State Department will use the time thus gained in order to obtain and organize effective allied armies in Spain and Germany.

Therefore, it is my belief that at this time the Congress should take the following action: (a) authorize by law, a definite strength for the size of our Armed Forces; (b) permit the dispatch of troops and units, within such strength of the types required, to Europe, without placing General Eisenhower in a straitjacket—in other words, allow reasonable flexibility in meeting problems as they arise; and (c) place a definite time limit on this program, so that we will have an opportunity to reexamine it after reasonable period has elapsed, say a year and a half.

I have no more assurance than you that this program will work; but I feel that it is our best, indeed our only hope, for protecting our security and striving to avert large-scale war under present conditions. I therefore urge you, without regard to your opinions as to past transactions, or any overoptimistic estimates of the future, to support the program of strengthening our military position, and increasing our troop strength in Europe. We must, within the limits of our resources and economy, and without destroying our economy through inflation and bankruptcy, build up a strong, well-balanced force, organized and disposed in the best manner possible to meet the threats to our security. Military strength alone cannot solve our problems in the absence of real statecraft and wise diplomacy; but I hope that this House—with the understanding and support of the American people—will provide the essential means for our national security.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have purposely waited until the last day of general debate and until after other Members of the committee and of the House have had an opportunity to express themselves on this legislation which is of so great importance to the welfare of the country and such an impact upon the lives of many of its citizens before undertaking to give expression to my own thoughts on the subject.

From the arguments which have been made to date, it is apparent that the major objection and criticism of the proposal comes from the minority Members of the House. As a Member of the minority my convictions on this problem are so deep that I feel I must express them, even though I may stand alone in the position which I have taken.

The security of our country and the welfare of millions of its youth cannot be hammered upon the anvil of political partisanship. By this I do not mean to imply nor create the inference that partisanship has dominated the thoughts and deliberations of any Member of the House but it is obvious from many of the expressions which have been voiced in this debate that a genuine and widespread lack of confidence in the administration, both political and military, prompts many to approach this problem with grave misgivings. Frankly, I, too, share these misgivings, but the only alternative is to deny to the military authority to continue the draft for service and refuse to take the initial steps necessary for a long-range defense program through a system of universal military training, with the consequence that our national security may be placed in grave peril.

Admittedly, we are faced with a choice of two evils: the granting of this unprecedented authority to an administration whose competence, both political and military, is seriously questioned, or to withhold the authority with the obvious likelihood that our national security may be placed in jeopardy and the terrific price again be required to be paid in dollars and lives which past experience has shown to be inevitable.

The choice is not an easy one; either course is fraught with grave consequences but between two evils, I choose the former with great reluctance. The choice is made with some degree of confidence, based perhaps upon hope, that times may change the complexion of the administration and the military. The foreseeable future offers no reasonable expectation that times will remove the need for a strong Military Establishment to protect this country.

It is quite apparent from the discussion on the bill so far this week that the major criticism has been centered in that portion of the proposal with respect to establishing a program for universal military training. There seems to be little, if any, disagreement with the need for extension of the draft for service. Consequently, my further remarks will be devoted to a discussion of some of the objections that have been raised.

It is quite understandable that a discussion of a proposal such as this should generate a degree of feeling and expression of emotional outburst. Although a pattern for universal military training has been recommended for three decades by many of our most outstanding and earnest citizens who are concerned about the costs of our national defense and the effectiveness of the Military Establishment, this is the first time that such a legislative proposal has been considered by the House. The proposal itself is contrary to all of our historic traditions. It is contrary to our concepts of the American way of life. It involves disruption of all American homes. It involves interference with the lives of individual young men. It provides for regimentation under military auspices and training of a military nature. It entails substantial costs in money. It carries the seeds of a military autocracy. All of these are repugnant to the American thought. Therefore, it is entirely natural that the feeling of the Members should be one of resistance to embarking upon a program such as this for the first time in history, especially when coupled with the thought that it is to be administered by an administration which lacks the confidence of the people.

This reluctance I feel, however, generates basically from the emotions of the heart rather than from the dictates of the mind. It is not necessary for a person to be in a high position or in the inner councils of Government for him to realize that the world is in a desperate situation. With hundreds of thousands of men engaged in conflict in Korea, the peace and stability of the world is threatened in many places throughout the world, all of them stemming from the ambitious designs of a ruthless godless handful of dictators whose power is great and whose cunning is sinister. So long as this threat remains it is imperative that this country preserve its national

security in the most effective means. This can best be accomplished by the expansion of its own defenses and, at the same time, giving assistance and leadership to the other countries of the world who likewise are threatened with the same danger. Only the blind and unreasoning person would deny this fact. Therefore, it is quite natural that there should be emotional expressions when our mind prompts us to do something which our heart and instinct tells us is wrong or undesirable. I am sure the public and posterity will forgive us.

There are those who say that we should defer consideration of a permanent training program until after the need for service has ended and the world picture has clarified materially. It is the same old argument as has been voiced in years past. The arguments voiced this week are the same as those we heard a decade ago when this country again was faced with ruthless aggression by lawless, irresponsible, and godless persons. It has voiced many, many times in the past; it is the argument of not trying to repair your leaky roof while it is raining, and always when the sun shines refusing to make repairs because temporarily there is no need for it. In my opinion there is no time which is more appropriate to give consideration to such a program than right now when we in Congress and the public generally are feeling the realities of war, the full impact of mobilization, of disrupted homes, of manifold economic dislocations and of high taxes and of high debt.

What are the alternatives? We all admit that the country cannot bear the terrific financial burden of a large standing army, as a permanent policy. Most of us recognize that in the future it is unlikely that there will be time for us to prepare and equip our citizens for the Nation's defense as has occurred in the past. Scientific progress has wiped out the walls of protection previously given to us by the oceans around us and the air space overhead. We cannot be sure what, if any, allies we may have in case hostilities are begun by this gang of brigands who are bereft of reason and recognize only the power of force. The time is no more appropriate than right now for us to give thoughtful consideration to a permanent program which will provide the country with a degree of defense which our economy can well support without serious interference with the normal pursuits of life. This bill does not establish the program of training itself, it simply sets in motion certain machinery for the development of a program subsequently to be approved by this or successor Congresses, entirely in keeping with the wish and will of the people at all times. The program may be changed at any time by the Congress. Control of the nature of the program and its continuance remains constantly within the hands of Congress and there is no dominating voice or veto coming from either the military of the Chief Executive.

Argument has been made that this bill should be divided into separate titles, one dealing with the draft for service and the one dealing with draft for training. I, too, feel that it was a mistake at the beginning to have the two phases of this problem, both of which are common to our national defense, to be interwoven in such a fashion as to make it difficult for the Congress to understand or to give expression to its views on the two issues involved. This objection, however, is one which relates to the form of legislative contents, rather than the substance of the legislation itself. It is a criticism of the mechanics of legislative processes rather than the contents of the legislation. As the bill is now written, it is entirely possible for the issues to be drawn by appropriate amendment by which the Members can voice their position for or against the program for military training. Consequently, now that the legislative process has progressed to this point, with the two matters interwoven in the fashion in which they are, I feel it would be a serious mistake for us, at this late date, to try to completely revise the bill so that two matters can be treated separately and distinctly. The opportunity for expression and for decision on the major points of issue can be resolved without splitting the bill into its several titles. In taking this position I recognize that I am not entirely consistent with previous attitudes on the subject; however, I am more interested in obtaining affirmative action on these two proposals than I am in the legislative niceties of statutory draftsmanship.

Complaint is also made that the bill contains no numerical ceiling on the over-all size of our Military Establishment. With this complaint, I concur completely. Historically, the Congress has insisted on controlling the size of our Military Establishment by imposition of statutory ceilings on the number of people within the components of the various military services, except during actual wartime operations. Whether this ceiling should be fixed at 3,200,000, 3,500,000, or 4,000,000 is of no great consequence but it is of the utmost importance that some ceiling, within those numbers, be imposed and by the imposition of them, the Congress is in a position to control the size of our Military Establishment and indirectly control their deployment, which leads me to another major objection voiced to the bill.

Argument has been made that there is no limitation upon the area or the places where troops might be used and that, therefore, the Congress has lost control of our national defense and failed in its constitutional responsibility. Even though this country has engaged in a formal pact with certain countries of northern Europe with respect to our common defense, there remains strong resistance to the implementation of this commitment by the sending of troops abroad.

First let me emphasize that it is my firm conviction that the control of our Military Establishment should always remain with the Congress. Any responsible Commander in Chief should welcome the opportunity of sharing his responsibility with the Congress in making decisions of such grave consequence as sending military forces abroad into foreign areas. It was a mistake of the gravest sort for the President to have taken the position that it was within his right to send troops to Europe to implement the North Atlantic Treaty without consultation with or approval by the Congress. However, the proposal to place statutory limitations upon the use of our Armed Forces carries with it consequences of such grave implications, that I fear that great harm might be done by it. Unforeseen situations develop with such suddenness and rapidity in these modern times that it is conceivable any rigid limitation on the geographical use of troops would impair the Nation's security. No one, except a dozen men in Moscow, knows what the future holds. Can we afford to take a chance by tying the hands of our military? I think not but it seems to me that control by and responsibility of the Congress is reasonably safeguarded through the imposition of a numerical ceiling on the over-all strength of our Military Establishment, and, too, we must remember that the Congress always, through the power of limitations upon appropriation bills, retains the control of our Military Establishment.

Therefore, strong as I am of the viewpoint that the people, through Congress, must always keep a dominant hand upon the size and use of our Military Establishment, as between writing into this legislation a restriction against the use of troops in any particular area abroad which runs the danger of seriously undermining our national security, or of relying upon a numerical ceiling and the appropriation authority of Congress to regulate the problem, I think the course of wisdom prompts choice of the latter.

Another factor must also be considered in connection with this matter. What psychological effect will such a restriction have upon our present allies and the other members of the North Atlantic Pact? Already we hear reverberations from foreign capitals regarding the Senate action a couple of days ago in its treatment of this same problem. Such a course will be completely misunderstood abroad—it will give discouragement to our friends and encouragement to our enemies.

Now the final major objection to the proposal is that the program for military training contains no termination date. To my mind that is one of the advantages of the program and one of the strongest arguments in its favor. It is to be a permanent program, designed to develop a large reservoir of civilians who, at one time during their lives, have had some minimum of military experience by way of basic military training. I can think of nothing which would be more of a guaranty against this country becoming militaristic than that each of its citizens have had some military experience and some short period of their life spent under military control.

The real danger of a system of permanent universal military training as I see it, and the major argument against it,

from my viewpoint, is that by adopting it and once it is in force and operation it might cause the country to acquire a sense of false security in the belief that since all of its citizens have had military training, therefore, it need not look to the other phases of a military establishment which are so essential to an adequate military defense, such as a standing army of adequate size, modern implements of war and equipment, airplanes and guns and tanks, and so forth. However, that is a problem for the future to deal with and is not of immediate concern.

But the reason why, in my view, the training program should have no termination date but rather should be permanent is so that every American youth can plan his life in such fashion that this period of training can be worked in a period most suitable to fit his program of life. With a termination date in the training program then it would be the tendency for each individual to defer fulfilling his obligation or making plans to meet it in the hope and perhaps expectation that some future Congress would fail to extend the law. The public interest is amply and completely safeguarded at all times under the terms of this bill with respect to the continuance of a training program. If at any time a majority of the Members of the Congress representing the will of the people feel that the need for a training program no longer applies, they can suspend all further inductions into the training program by simply passing a concurrent resolution which does not require the approval of the Commander in Chief or President.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a happy decision that prompts me to support this legislation. Instinctively I rebel against the regimentation of the military, against the thought of universal conscription either in wartime or in peacetime. What idealism I still retain after years of public service prompts me still to shun a move such as this but the realities of the modern world, the actualities of recent history, and the evidence of hostile or imperialistic action on the part of the Kremlin, prompt me to support it.

As between choosing conscription for national defense, of giving every citizen some degree of training, or following the only other course through which our national defense can be maintained, that of having a large standing army of professionals at a vast and terrific financial cost and of maintaining a reserve force of substantial size, I prefer the former: a small well-trained professional Military Establishment and a tremendous reservoir of trained civilians.

Mr. Chairman, there may be some who hesitate and equivocate on this proposal, there may be some who counsel delay, there may be those who voice fear and apprehension for the effect that this program will have upon our moral and civic life, but as for me, I am ready to act, I am ready to decide now and for those actions and those decisions I am ready to answer to my country, to my conscience, to my posterity, and to my God.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED].

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I wish it had been the opportunity and privilege of every Member of the House to listen to the learned discussion which has taken place during this debate thus far on both sides of the aisle. I also wish it had been their privilege to be present to have just heard the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New Yosk, a member of our committee, who I believe is admired and whose views are respected by every Member of the House.

I have listened to the statements made here today and the debates that have taken place in the last few days; I listened to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] and his very fine remarks, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and after listening to them and to the remarks of our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and possibly others from the other side of the aisle, I have arrived at the conclusion that this bill is going to receive considerable support from both sides of the aisle, and that this is a bill which I believe, when it finally comes out of the House, will not only represent the views of the majority of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, but also will represent the views of a majority of the American people.

As has been said during these debates, a Member of the House has to be close to his people. He is naturally close to his people. Sometimes we have to advocate measures, in order to satisfy our conscience, which a majority of our constituents might not at that particular time endorse. But, ordinarily, realizing the fact that we are their representatives, we try to represent their views—the views of a majority of them—as far as we can conscientiously do so.

When this bill came before our committee I wondered about the advisability of reducing the draft age below 19. If you will pardon a personal reference, there have been other personal references made during these debates, so please pardon me for making a personal reference.

I had three sons in the last World War. One of them was taken into the Army immediately after he graduated from high school, and served as a GI in Europe in the Third Armored Division of the First Army. He was wounded twice in Germany. My eldest son served in the Navy in foreign service, both in the Pacific and Atlantic areas, for several years. My second eldest son was in the Army and served in the Pacific, on Saipan, for a considerable period of time. So I realize the heartaches of the parents of America when they consider the thought of their 18-year-old boys being taken away from home and sent into combat areas at such a tender age. I consulted with our distinguished chairman about that matter, and considered it, and I probably never would have persuaded myself to vote to reduce the age below 19 if I had not been convinced by what my distinguished chairman said and by what General Marshall and others said when they testified before our committee that we had to do that if we intended to make the pool large enough so that some of these deserving Reservists, many of whom had reached an age beyond which the present draft or this bill and who were in service, some with a family back home who had put in years of service in the last war, could come home. It was obvious that it was necessary for us to reduce the age limit if they were to be brought home within a reasonable time, so I agreed to support the bill reducing the age to 18½. But I want to say that I agree thoroughly with what has been said many times on this floor, to the effect that the average 18-year-old boy has not the discretion that a man on the front lines should have. It is heart-rending for me to think of the number that we have at that age and younger today. We did, however, place in this bill a provision that no 18-year-old boy could be sent into a combat area outside the territorial limits of the United States or its territories or possessions, and I think that when we did so we placed a very important provision in the bill.

I know that when you talk to many of the generals they say there is not much difference between boys of 17, 18, 19, and 20, and that some of them at 18 are just as mature as others at 20; yet we know a boy who is not quite mature when he reaches 18 is certainly a little more so when he reaches 19, and that on the average boys of 19 and 20 are more mature than those of 18.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Would the gentleman state to the Committee that the Defense Department proved beyond doubt that they had to have our 18-year-olds?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I could not say that to the gentleman from Texas; I could not say that they proved beyond doubt. I say after listening to General Marshall and others who testified before our committee, and after conferring with our chairman and other members of the committee who have been in Congress much longer than I, that I decided it was necessary as far as my own vote was concerned.

I would like to state one reason why we have reduced these standards for induction. I called on selective service headquarters to give me as nearly as they could the percentage of young men subject to the draft who had been rejected for all reasons. They did submit to me a list of the various States and the percentage of rejections for the months from the 1st of July through October of 1950. You would be astounded at some of the figures.

In one great State of the Union the percentage of rejections was 60.7 percent of all examined for mental reasons alone, and that included many boys in high school, as brought out by our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. In my section of the country, the southern area, the average for 12 States was 34.9 of rejection for mental reasons alone. The physical rejections were very small—around 5 or 6 percent. In areas all over the United States the percentage of rejections for mental reasons alone ran to approximately 20 percent—I believe it was 18.7 percent to be

exact. That is all in the record of the hearings. Those figures were introduced by me in the hearings. So we concluded that in order to make this pool sufficiently large these standards of induction should be reduced to where they were back in January of 1945.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to congratulate my distinguished friend for putting those facts before the committee. That is, in my opinion, the reason why the selective service part of this bill certainly must be passed. May I also ask the gentleman, who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, whether he would not think it proper that we amend the bill now before the House to provide that the pool of eligible registrants between the ages of 19 and 26 shall be exhausted before we start drafting the 18½-year-old boys?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I think his suggestion is a very worthy one to be considered, worthy of the serious and deliberate consideration of the Members of this House, but I want to say also that we should consider on the other side of the picture the way we have this bill written a man does not have to speculate as to when that other pool is going to be exhausted. He does not have to sit back and wonder: Well, how long will it be before I am going to be called in. "Should I continue to pursue what I am doing now or what should I do?" Under the way we have it written, he knows when he becomes 18½ years of age, unless he is deferred, that he is going to be called into the service of his country. He does not have to speculate.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is right in his contention that many are being rejected because of their failure to pass the mental examination. But, can the gentleman explain to me the paradox of rejecting these thousands of young men on the one hand because they are not able to pass the examination, yet on the other hand deferring 75,000 men a year because they happen to be intellectuals.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Well, I will say this to my colleague that we do not have any provision in our bill to defer 75,000. That is in the Senate bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman will admit, though, that it has been proposed again and again by competent authorities.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Yes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Intellectual authorities.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I hesitate to ask the gentleman this question because he has been very fair, calm, and collected in his discussion of this matter. I cannot understand why the system whereby the people were drafted in 1917 and went to war and built up manpower enough to beat the world is not just as good now.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Well, I respect the views of my colleague from Massachusetts very highly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement concerning deferment for mental causes. I have heard from people in some parts of the United States that today some of these young men, smart alecks, if you please, have discovered that if they commit a misdemeanor they could be deferred, so they have committed misdemeanors for that purpose.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Well, I do not know about that.

Now I have some other things that I want to discuss. In our investigation and hearings which, as has already been stated, lasted over a period of months, we also found that in the high schools of this country—and we are all anxious for our boys to receive a high-school education; we think they are certainly entitled to that—over 120,000 graduated last year after they became 19 years of age, and we did not think it was right to take a man out of high school in March or April or May when he was going to graduate shortly thereafter. That is why we placed the provision in the bill that a man in high school in his senior year, who was pursuing his course satisfactorily, should not be drafted before his 20th birthday or his graduation, whichever should come first. We tried not to discriminate against anyone in this bill. We did defer all the members of ROTC senior units, and we did have a provision in here that would defer a man to the present academic year before he was to go, if he was called, and we had another broad provision in here under which it was announced a day or two ago that a method was going to be devised whereby a mental test would be given and then in addition to that men in their freshman year, in the first half of their class and in the first two-thirds in the sophomore year and three-fourths in the junior year might be deferred.

There is a great university in my home town, the University of Alabama. I naturally have the interest of that institution at heart. I have the education of the youth of this country at heart and in mind. I know we need to preserve all the brains and technical skill we can. At the same time, as I said a few moments ago when I asked the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to yield, and read from these hearings, the thought occurred to me that we might be giving them too much leeway, that there was no limit to the deferments they might make.

After listening to General Hershey, for whose views I have a good deal of respect, I wondered how that provision would be put into effect and whether we would ultimately, without intending to do so, while trying to preserve the brains and skill of this country, yet make too much of a discrimination between the man who is able to go to college and the one who is not; because when I look at this proposition of service to our country, I do not think that just a temporary interruption in a man's education always means that he will not come back and finish.

If you will pardon another personal reference, may I say that three of my boys were in the service for a period of years. Each came back and completed his education. Two are practicing law in Tuscaloosa now. The other took a master's degree out in California but is now back in the Navy, and has been serving in Korea and Japan.

So while it might interfere with a man's education, we do not want to discriminate too much, because when a man has the determination to get an education in these days he can do it. How many of you know men who worked their way through college? I am looking at one of my colleagues right here, from Alabama, who deserves all the credit in the world. If a man wants hard enough to get an education, he usually finds the way to do it, even though it is delayed.

As far as the universal military training part of this bill is concerned, he would lose only 6 months. Five hundred thousand men will be taken away from their education for a period of 6 months' training, and then placed in the Reserves. Any man who will let 6 months of basic training interfere with his college education just does not want an education.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I congratulate the gentleman on his three fine sons, and also on his son who went into the service at 18. I believe the gentleman has presented a very convincing argument, that perhaps the boys of 18 are too young to be drafted. My question is this: If they are too young at 18 to be drafted, why should we permit them to enlist and be turned over to the military under their sole jurisdiction?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Does the gentleman mean, Why should they be permitted to enlist at 18 or under?

Mr. AYRES. That is right.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. One of our greatest States in this Union is known as the Volunteer State. When you find a man who is adventurous enough and feels that he is mature enough to enlist, we have always given him that privilege. But I cannot see as a matter of logic from that, that we should say, "When you boys become 18, we are going to force you to go into the service whether you want to or not."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. We know that many 18-year-old volunteers have made excellent soldiers. The Marine Corps particularly would testify to that. As the

gentleman says, some 18-year-old boys are mature and some are not. The boy who volunteers is the mature 18-year-old. If he is not, he has no desire to volunteer and his parents will not let him. But when you put out the dragnet you get the mature and the immature at the same time.

Mr. DEGRAFFENREID. I agree with the gentleman.

So in regard to the educational matter I have been bothered more by that in connection with this bill than anything else in the bill. My distinguished colleague from Texas has offered an amendment which, if adopted by the House, would leave it to the local boards, as I understand it, to fix the matter of deferments just like they are handling it now. I suggest to the Members of the House that the proposed amendment is certainly worthy of their serious consideration.

Another amendment, if we do not adopt that one, which I think could be seriously considered by the House, would be, in addition to the ROTC units that we are deferring, and in addition to the statutory period of deferment to the end of the academic year, to place a top limit on the number, say from 300,000 to 400,000, who in addition could be deferred, and put some limit on them beyond which they could not go. That is simply a matter for the Members of the House to consider.

To get down to the UMT part of this program. We are all in favor—or practically all of us—in favor of continuing the draft. We may not all agree it is necessary to go below 19. Some of us may think we ought to go to 18. But we all realize the seriousness of the situation today. Therefore, there is not too much discussion or debate here about continuing the draft. I want to say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that regardless of what you advocate here today I know you are sincere in what you believe. You may be right. None of us knows when he is right or when he is wrong. But I believe you certainly are sincere. I say to the gentleman from Missouri I regard him very highly, as he knows. I know he is sincere in everything that he has told the House. I know how he loves freedom and how he loves liberty. I know what is in his heart. I admire him and respect him. But I say to you gentlemen that we are now in probably as serious a time as we have ever been in. Universal military training is something I have always believed in. I have always believed we should have it in some form. I myself am not afraid of this country being Prussianized. I believe we had over four and one-half million men in the armed services in the First World War and probably over 13,000,000 men in the Second World War. I do not see any danger now of this country becoming militarized or Prussianized. I do not believe the people feel that way about it. But I do believe that the people of America today are more concerned about our lack of preparedness and our failure to prepare, than they are about us becoming militarized or Prussianized.

Certainly if you are really for universal military training with the concessions that have been made here, as our distinguished chairman stated yesterday that this plan to be brought back by the Commission could be amended on the floor of the House, and could be rejected or accepted, you will find that acceptable. So we on the committee have never contemplated that any Commission which was later appointed could just write any kind of a plan they wanted to and come up here and jam it down the throats of the Congress. We never had that in mind at all. To show you we were thinking about the importance of the civilian in America, we have a provision in the bill that this Commission must be composed of three civilians and one member from the Reserve and one from the Regular Establishment. I believe that a provision is written in the bill which provides that the chairman must be a civilian.

So we had that in mind and we always thought that regardless of the provision of this concession which was made here yesterday about being permitted to make amendments on the floor of the House, that we would have some distinguished members of that Commission to help us in submitting a proper plan.

What would you say, for example, if the former distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. Wadsworth, would happen to become a member of that Commission? It has never been our idea that we would just have some mediocre men on that Commission. Of course, we have no way of knowing just who would be appointed to the Commission, but we always had in mind that they would come back to the committee with a plan. From time to time they would be consulting with various members of our committee, and particularly our chairman, about that plan. You know they would be getting his advice and suggestions, and the advice and suggestions of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and the gentleman on the minority, and when this plan came back to the Armed Services Committee it would have their views already in it, to some extent. Then, when we got through talking about it, before we ever brought it to the House, we would have a conference with them and talk it over. Then, when that measure finally comes to the floor of the House, it will represent the combined views of the members of the Commission and of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Does the gentleman believe you will ever have a better Commission than you have already had, and does the gentleman believe you will have any better information than you have now? Does not the committee have sufficient information right now to go ahead and write a universal military training bill?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] that we know if we write a bill now it is not going into effect now. If the plan goes into effect 2 years from now, it might be well for us to consider and deliberate about the plan for the next 2 years. It would be well for the Commission to consider it quite a while and for us to consider it quite a while.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Can the gentleman think of any more important job that a man could be appointed to do than to figure out a sound, long-range military policy for the United States, to secure its citizens and its institutions? It is obvious that we can command the best talent in the United States for this job. The President, I hope, will select such men. They will be available to him.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I cannot. I say to the members of the committee we have to face this matter of universal military training sooner or later, and we might as well face it today. Sometimes we might be a little better off if there was some reason for acting than if we try to act on it after we get back into a period of complacency. The able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], in presenting this matter before the committee the other day made the statement that we had demobilized too rapidly after the last world war. I agree. But why? Because we had all gone back into a spirit of complacency; because every time Russia makes a threat against us we get serious and say we are going to do something about it. When the troops start losing ground in Korea, and I pause to call attention to the fact that I read yesterday our casualties last week were over 1,400 over there, but when these things happen we say we have to do something about it. Then the next thing you know, Russia starts talking about peace and makes some flimsy, friendly gesture, and we get right back into the same spirit of complacency that we did when we demobilized too quickly after the last World War.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman has made a good point. It seems to me that the danger of Prussian elements in a universal military-training program need not be feared in America. It is inherent in our national point of view. I do not want to take too much of the gentleman's time, but I simply wish to concur in his general proposition regarding the distinction between the Prussian type of military training and the kind that undoubtedly would be evolved in this country where our tradition is contrary to the Prussian point of view. In other words, it was not the fact that training was universal which made Prussianism the odious thing that it was. It was rather the philosophy of a national leadership devoted to dictatorial power which produced terrible results. The democratic ideal in America will be embraced in a universal type of training if we hold on to the basic ideals of this country. And if we should lose those ideals nothing would save us anyway.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Arkansas. I cannot yield further at this time, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say in conclusion that we have heard lots here today and throughout this debate about what happened in past years, the mistakes of the past, and all that; and I admit that there have been many mistakes, but let us remind ourselves that here we are in April 1951 facing the future and it is our responsibility to prepare our country for what we face.

We have got to get behind something and somebody; we have got to unite on some plan; we have got to have a fixed plan that cannot change from day to day. I tell you right now that we should have confidence in our present military leadership, in General Eisenhower, General Bradley, and these men who successfully led us through the last war. If we have not, in whom can we have confidence? We are not going to have any others. If we destroy the confidence of the people in them we destroy their confidence in the men who have got to lead us through the next war if we have one. It is illogical to do that.

When General Eisenhower came over here I had met him once when we went over to the Pentagon a year or two ago, I sat at table with him and had lunch. But I never knew the man really until he addressed the Members of both Houses of Congress and then came before our committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee and submitted to questioning for a number of hours, then that night talked to the American people. I listened to him again, I just had not had enough of what he had said and I listened to him again when he talked to the American people over the radio. I want to tell you that that man inspired a feeling of absolute confidence in me and I felt that he was one man who could successfully lead us should we be forced into another war.

He accepted the responsibility which he has today not because he wants it, for he has had all the honors any man could possibly want; he accepted it merely as an act of patriotism to try to keep us in or restore us to peace. It is just too bad if we cannot get together under his leadership.

The day after he got through here I picked up a paper and read either an editorial or article which said that General Eisenhower in what he was doing was simply the tool of Dean Acheson. I laid the paper down; I felt discouraged; I just felt that now, what America needs is a real leader and she has one in General Eisenhower, and can we not all get together on any one thing?

He says that the way he outlined is the way to preserve peace, and I believe with the experience that he has had we should follow his suggestions of leadership. Talk about a military dictatorship and people being afraid of it and afraid of being Prussianized, why, as one gentleman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, said here today, there is not any man in America more popular with the people of America than General Eisenhower right now. I agree with what he said about that. What the people are afraid of is that we are going to continue to stay unprepared.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not being critical at all, may I ask the gentleman if he thinks that General Eisenhower or someone else determines whether we shall take part in war?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I do not think anybody has a determination of whether we take part in a war; I think it largely depends upon what Russia does.

Much has been said about UMT. I do not care exactly what plan of UMT you work out, I believe we must have some meritorious plan of UMT to secure the future. If we are for UMT let us support the bill, let us go on record as being for UMT or being against it.

Now, as to what the local posts of the Legion and veterans think about this matter, let me say this: There has been some talk about it being supported by only those higher up in the Legion. Here is a latter from Chilton County Post, No. 6, of Clanton, Ala., not written lately but back in March, asking me to support this measure in full, requesting that I support it as a one-package proposition. Here is a telegram from George Huddleston, Jr., department commander of the American Legion at Birmingham, Ala., supporting it. My son is commander of the Farley W. Moody Post at Tuscaloosa, Ala. I know they are for it. Here is a letter from the auxiliary ladies of the Farley W. Moody Post, No. 34, of Tuscaloosa, Ala., requesting that I support the universal military training bill now on the calendar.

I have others here, including the telegram from the national commander. As far as I am concerned, I believe the people of Alabama as well as elsewhere hate to see their sons drafted, but I want to tell you one thing right now and that is that I believe the majority of the people of Alabama, the people of my district, are in favor of some plan of universal military training. I do not believe they want their sons to go into combat when they are not properly trained.

Now, we talk about expenditures. General Marshall told our committee, as has already been stated, that if we establish this UMT system, within a period of 2 years after it is established he has hopes of reducing our standing Army below what it is even now, although we might be somewhat in peril at the time, but if things got no worse, because then we would have a trained reserve ready to take the place of the standing Army. So it is bound to save money, as our distinguished chairman and others have told you. If you want economy, it seems to me you should be for this bill, if you want preparedness you should be for it, if you want our youth to have a chance to survive in any combat which may come, you should be for it. They ought to have combat training which is provided in this bill, that is the basic training provided in this bill, because any man can become a combat soldier whether he is at the front or not. The front lines will not mean too much in another war. The man in a cobbler shop a thousand miles from the front or hundreds of miles from the front may be an infantry man in the next minute in the event of a paratroop landing. So they all need training.

I want to tell you that this great committee, led by my distinguished chairman, has done a good job. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] may be something in the nature of a Sherman tank when he comes up here to put stated, but whenever he tries to put through legislation, as I believe was through legislation here in the House it is not because he is trying to hoodwink or fool anybody, it is because he believes it is for the best interests of his Nation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Would it not be much more feasible, in view of the many arguments the gentleman has made, not to draft 18-year-olds at this particular time because we cannot have a UMT and a drafting of 18-year-olds both, but rather, increase the draft age perhaps to 27, start your UMT program with the 18-year-olds, as they move into college or as they proceed through high school, or as they work into the National Guards or otherwise?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I have not given that question enough consideration to really be able to answer it. At the present time I think we have about as good a bill as can be worked out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering Senate bill No. 1. The title of the bill is to provide for the common defense by extending the draft law with certain modifications.

The second subect in the bill is to establish for the first time in the history of the United States compulsory military training, referred to in the bill as universal military training. Its correct designation should be compulsory. In its present form, I shall vote against the bill. The gentleman from North Caroline [Mr. BARDEN] has introduced H. R. 3364. This bill deletes compulsory military training, provides for induction at age 19, the same as in existing law. It provides for a maximum service of 24 months instead of the 26 months provided in the measure now before us. I intend to vote for the Barden bill.

I am not opposed to extension of the draft and sincerely believe that in the present world condition it is necessary that we do this in the interest of national security and defense.

Wartime conscription is one thing; peacetime compulsory military training is quite another. One is a wartime necessity; the other is far from being a necessity.

To establish universal or compulsory military training in America is to import an Old World disease. It involves the regimentation of our young men. Such a policy would serve in the end to mili-

tarize our economy, against the wishes of the people.

In the long run, it would lead to military domination, to the Prussianizing of our Government. That is something the proponents have been trying to accomplish for 28 years.

I do not believe our Joint Chiefs of Staff, as a policy-making body, have evolved into a Prussian-style general staff. Neither do I believe that the responsible members of that body are seeking or even desire to control our Government and our economy.

I do believe that compulsory military training would open the way. It would present the opportunity. It would, I believe, be the seed from which might spring the growth of American militarism; a growth which would strangle our free enterprise system, our free political institutions, and, finally, our essential liberties.

It seems that recent statements on this floor, to the effect that already the military is planning to take over in wartime all important functions of our Federal Government, were based upon a single document. It was a handbook, outlining prewar policies of the German general staff, and was circulated among high ranking officers in the Pentagon.

This book, I am told, revealed how the German general staff planned to take over in wartime all administrative, judicial, and legislative functions of government and dominate absolutely all economic activities of the German people.

I do not think that the men who lead our Armed Forces took this outline of German general staff policies seriously. They must have known all about those policies long before the book was circulated. All of our high ranking officers are students of the art and theory of war.

However, the fact remains that this book was required reading among our military leaders. It demonstrates the magnitude of the temptations which even the ablest and most patriotic of those men in the Pentagon would face, should compulsory military training create a favorable field here, for Prussianized thinking.

In view of these facts, this bill, together with selective service law improvements, looks entirely too much like an effort to cram compulsory military training down our throats, by forcing us to accept it as an integral part of necessary wartime conscription.

Legislation to strengthen the draft law, and legislation for compulsory military training, if we must give the latter any consideration at all, should be handled in two separate bills.

Compulsory military training presents a definite threat to our free institutions and our personal liberties. Until 1940, the year before World War II, this country never accepted peacetime conscription. We did so then because it was plainly evident that a World War was only a few months away. At that time, compulsory military training was not even seriously considered.

Neither Congress nor the people liked either of them. I do not think they like them now.

It is my conviction that the people of the United States know, by reason of their common sense, that extension of the draft, from time to time as needed, can serve all the requirements of national defense. They know that the draft can serve these requirements, even in the event of all-out war.

Furthermore, it is my conviction that the people of the United States actively abhor universal military training, because they know history has shown that compulsory military training has never won a war for any country.

Those countries where compulsory military training was in effect, have been forced to depend for victory upon nations which had rejected military training as repugnant to free men.

Conscription and compulsory military training are ideas which have their roots in the quarreling nations of Europe, and not in America. While we have accepted conscription solely as a wartime necessity, we have always regarded compulsory military training, and its attendant evils of regimentation and possible militarism, as hateful and contrary to our traditions.

The advantages of this policy are manifest in the military record of our Republic since the day of its birth. These advantages are manifest in the rise of the United States to world prominence and power unparalleled throughout the history of the earth.

I should not neglect to say that these advantages are apparent in our record thus far in the Korean War.

In spite of all the political difficulties put in the way of our far-eastern high command, almost unaided except by half-trained South Korean troops, they have prevailed against an enemy far greater in numbers. There is reason to think they will continue to do so.

It may be said that our traditional hatred of peacetime conscription and compulsory military training grows out of the fact that many of our ancestors came from Europe to America to escape long years of military training. My own father was sent to this country from Italy, in 1854, when he was only 15 years old, to escape compulsory military training.

My grandparents sent him to this country because they knew that compulsory military training would keep him in army camps for seven of the best years of his young manhood. Even in those days, many Europeans hated and feared the consequences of the very things now proposed for America in this bill.

In conclusion, I think I should point out that those of us who are conservative enough to oppose this proposal may be attacked by so-called liberals. We may even be called reactionaries.

But let me say to you that opposition to this proposal marks us, not as reactionaries, but as conservatives in the sense that we seek to conserve the freedom of our young men from regimentation and to preserve our free institutions and the essential liberties of the people.

Let us strengthen our selective service law, sufficiently to fulfill all of our military needs, but let us reject any and all proposals for compulsory military training, which would open the gate to the very evils against which we are mobilizing today.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the very distinguished Committee on Armed Services has presented to this body a bill which has two distinct and separate aims: First, the drafting of young men for active service in the Armed Forces in such numbers as the Defense Establishment deems necessary to meet the contingencies of this very grave moment in the world's history; second, to establish a formula under which there shall be what is termed universal military training.

I have the highest respect for the eminent gentlemen who make up this powerful and important committee and for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] who has long been its chairman. I am sure that each of them has nothing but the highest sense of obligation to the people of this great country and that each is making every effort to secure legislation which acts in the best interest of the United States.

I would call attention, however, to the fact that there is a wide and vigorous difference of opinion among the members of the committee over this bill—differences not of a political nature, but of deeply considered judgment. I do not recall any such cleavage except in the matter of the President's request for House agreement in the appointment of a military man to the office of the Secretary of Defense. When the majority of this House last fall took the responsibility for setting aside a law passed in 1947 after the most careful consideration of and with unanimous agreement to the basic principle enunciated by the wise men who established our unique form of government—that in these United States control of military power should be in civilian hands—this country was laid open to a course of action, the second step of which is being presented to us in Senate bill 1: Control by this same military of the education of our youth.

Do the people of this country want this step to be taken or do they believe, as I do, that there is a better way—an American way—to set up even at this late date a method of military instruction under civilian control that originally was considered one of the essentials of freedom?

Mr. Chairman, there is no one in this House who desires a true and constructive peace more sincerely than the Representative from the great Twenty-second District of Ohio. My constituents have suffered tragically, not only from both World Wars but also from the Korean battles. They desire peace as never before. They insist that war begets more war and that we must find the sure road to peace. They recognize that it is the United States which must lead the world out of the darkness and chaos of war into a climate in which peace may be born and grow to full maturity.

Wars do build wars—of that there is no doubt—but until the fanaticism, the greed, the selfishness of nations can be held in check, until these have been

curbed sufficiently to permit peace measures to replace them, there seems to be no other method possible save that of material, visible strength.

But that should not mean the abandonment of fundamental principles indigenous to our unique national structure.

Do not misunderstand me.

I do not come before this House asking for disarmament, but I do come before you to insist, so far as it is in my power, that our methods of procedure and the formula set, give this great country a strength that will be recognized throughout the world as invincible and be in keeping with our true belief and faith in the principle of freedom under God.

To me it is not in keeping with the tradition of the Committee on the Armed Services to submit to this House a bill that confuses issues and methods as does S. 1. On the very face of it is the implication that the Congress' emotions can be so played upon as to bring about results which could not be accomplished were the membership not thrown off balance.

Every Member of this House knows that emotion and considered thinking do not go hand in hand. Anger another deeply, and most will lose control, saying and doing things they will regret all of their lives. Pour the miasma of fear over the people until their breath is shortened, their sight impaired, and where is their sanity of judgment?

It has long been the method of the party in power to create an atmosphere of fear which beclouds the vision and saps the courage of many men and women. The cry of "wolf, wolf" has long been heard in the land—so long that we no longer have confidence left in those in whom we should be able to trust implicitly. There is great possibility of fatal tragedy in this, for any thoughtful person knows that the world stands upon the edge of a burning caldron into which a sudden misstep could plunge mankind. What the United States does at this time may be the deciding factor in the future of our world. Such steps as we take should not be taken in confusion of mind under emotions largely resulting from fear.

Whatever we do, if we are to build the strength we, as a Nation, must have to lead the battle against darkness, must be clearly understood by the people and decided by them. This measure as proposed is not clear nor is it forthright, proposing as it does to achieve the enaction into law of a procedure whose far-reaching implications are beclouded and certainly are not understood.

I reiterate what I have already said: that action taken under stress of emotion cannot be sound, a false move on the part of the United States, not out beyond our borders but right here in the very center of government, may tip the scales toward defeat of the principles for whose protection and development this Nation was born. When emotion runs high among the people, it is the duty of government to so clarify every action to be taken that thinking can be freed and sane judgment can be attained.

This, Mr. Chairman, this legislation as presented to this great body does not do. Indeed, it would seem to have the unwritten purpose of making confusion rather confounded. As the representative of nearly a million people, I must protest this method. I must do all that lies in my power to insist that the administration be not permitted to use double talk. It is failing the people of this country whose representatives we are.

My confidence in Americans is very great. I believe that they can be depended upon to act with sanity and judgment, once they know all the facts. It angers me deeply to have those in high places treat them and treat us as if they—and we—were children, to be cajoled or frightened into obedience.

Yes, the world is an armed camp with spurts of war now here, now there. It is no more than common sense to build a practical and material strength that will preserve our free way of life and make it possible for us to be successful champions of freedom. Is this, therefore, a moment for us to take a second step away from the basic principles of civilian control of our Armed Forces and our educational processes and so weaken the very sound basis of our national structure?

Once upon a time there were minutemen—there was a militia. Every man had his gun and knew how to use it. Every boy was taught the skill required, either by his father or his uncle or someone in the village who knew how to teach him.

You cannot tell me that the citizens of this country are any less ready to learn the necessary skills and to see that their sons, too, know them.

This is no longer a simple process, this knowing how to use the weapons of self-protection and the defense of freedom. It takes more complex methods of procedure, just as the whole mechanics of living have become complex beyond belief. But surely that does not mean that every man cannot find free ways to accomplish these purposes. I believe that a way can be, must be found to develop in every youth growing into manhood, a deep love of his country and understanding of his responsibility to her institutions, to her future; to take his part in her life, in her strength, in her progress. I do not believe our search for a way to do this is helped by this legislation as introduced.

Let me remind you that the terms used are in themselves deceptive and disturbing, "universal military training." What is universal about it? Where is there any recognition of the fact that for every soldier at the front today there must be at least eight trained men behind it in a line, a part of which, at least, is right here in Washington? Where is there provision for the men who do not qualify for that front-line job? Is there any reason why men with flat feet or broken ear drums, with a leg gone, but with minds that work—often overtime—why these and others should not be trained in skills with which to serve, with which to man those millions of positions behind the men of the line? If it is to be universal training where is the title covering these?

A IV–F is not a pariah, Mr. Chairman. If we are to fortify the road to peace, if we are to be ready for all contingencies, we would need all of our manpower, and we would need to have every man know his own strength and how to use it for the best interests of his country.

But I see nothing in this bill, Mr. Chairman, that would insure us such training. I believe that those things pertaining to what is inaccurately called universal military training should be separated from the bill and an eventual bill be brought to the House which would face issues squarely in words every American will understand. I have no doubt of the action our citizens would want once they face the reality of America's need of them and the world's need of America's strong leadership in the difficult but no less imperative battle to retain freedom on the face of the earth.

Feeling as I do, that our responsibility as citizens and as the representatives of the citizens of this still free country is to clarify issues and give to the people that upon which they can form sane and sound judgment. I am particularly glad that the debate of these days has given to those in authority, a clearer concept of the method that must be used as Americans' will to express themselves in the real interests of Americans.

The announcement by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that he now proposes to bring in an amendment which will keep the principles of universal military training, but will do no more than set up a commission to bring in a detailed blueprint of the what and how as envisaged by the administration, for both Houses to pass upon, increases one's belief and confidence in the democratic processes as we understand them. I am convinced that the people of this country are already facing up to the cold realization of life, and that they are taking hold of whatever sound methods are put before them, supporting them with a renewed loyalty and a greater patriotism than has been theirs in many a long day.

The draft title of the bill undoubtedly will be amended in various particulars next week. It has been my opinion that changes might be made at this time which would make it mandatory for the Selective Service Board and its branch boards to consider the many elements that must be maintained if the country is to weather what will at best be hard sledding.

Up to this time there has been little evidence that Selective Service has any broad national picture or that there is true cooperation with the many vital nonmilitary services. To give you an example: The farmers of Ohio, the growers of vegetables under glass and other such, have had their trained men literally snatched from them by draft boards whose sole viewpoint appears to be industrial and urban. One of my own constituents, when he was refused deferment for a highly skilled greenhouse man, was told: "We don't need your vegetables, we have more in storage now than we need." Have we?

Perhaps now—but what of 6 months or a year from now? Greenhouse men take a lot of training just as do dairy farmers.

That the armed services have no common plan for recalling reservists units has been a source of many grave injustices and much bitterness. Neither of these are conducive to high morale or a cohesive service. This, of course, is not part of the legislation before us. I speak of it merely to emphasize the need of a more thorough Nation-wide plan fully understood and supported by the people to use our not-so-great manpower to the very best possible advantage and in such wise that the spirit of every service man and civilian worker will be fused into an invincible though intangible strength—to defend this country and to uphold freedom in the world.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, too often, when we debate controversial and far-reaching legislation, such as the bill before us, we are apt to ignore the basic principles which have always motivated us as a Nation. We become enmeshed in the technicalities, we are swayed by the pull-and-tug of conflicting interests and emotions, and we lose sight of the very principles which have served as our guideposts since the day this Nation began.

Let us not, as we make the momentous decisions involved in this legislation, forget the basic principles governing our approach to the Military Establishment which have guided us since the days of George Washington.

Those principles can be briefly stated. They reject the idea of a huge standing Military Establishment in time of peace, with its tremendous cost and its dangers of military domination, and they contemplate a comparatively small standing force, large enough to meet the immediate threats to our national security, backed up by a large, well-trained citizen Reserve or militia, ready to spring into instant action when danger approaches. As expressed in War Department Circular No. 347 on August 25, 1944, our policy calls for a professional peace establishment—no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements—to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen Army Reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace.

Mr. Chairman, our action on this bill will decide whether we are to continue to follow the principle of a small standing force backed by Reserve units, or whether we are to embark upon the principle of a huge standing force—a policy which has led to the eventual ruination of every nation which has adopted it.

If we here reject the provisions of this bill calling for the establishment of a universal military training program, then I I say, Mr. Chairman, that we have rejected the principle of a citizen army and that we have embarked on the road to a permanent, huge standing force which will wreck our economy and lead eventually to the domination of our country by the military men who control that force.

Why do I say this?

If we reject universal military training the only known method of insuring a strong, well-trained Reserve force, then we have only two alternatives. We can decide to take the risk of inadequate preparedness, and we would be blind, indeed, if we failed to recognize in the world around us a danger which calls for the utmost in preparedness, or we can protect our lives and liberties by authorizing and appropriating funds for a huge standing force. Without the strong citizen Reserve that UMT will eventually provide, we must do one or the other: take the risk of inadequate preparedness and, in the process, encourage the aggressor or establish a standing force large enough to meet any eventuality, and such a force, Mr. Chairman, will not require 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 men, but it will require a force in being at all times into the foreseeable future approaching World War II strength.

For these reasons, I am struck by the inconsistency of some of the amendments which are proposed to this legislation. I refer partciularly to those which would strike out the UMT provisions of this legislation and those which would limit the size of our Military Establishment.

If we strike out the UMT program, Mr. Chairman, we cannot, if we have the security of this Nation at heart, put any effective limitation on the size of our standing forces. If we strike out UMT, we will have killed, for all practical purposes, our Reserve establishment. It will wither and die on the vine for lack of manpower. With a weak and ineffective Reserve establishment, with our entire reliance placed upon our standing forces, who would dare tamper with our national security by imposing drastic restrictions upon the size of that force? Without a soundly conceived Reserve establishment, 10,000,000 men in the standing forces would not be too much for minimum security.

I do not want to leave the impression that we will not require a relatively large standing force during the uneasy period which lies ahead. Our lack of well-trained Reserves, caused by both the lack of a universal military training program, which is the fault of Congress, and the lack of a sound Reserve program, which is the fault of the Pentagon, will require a much larger force than would be necessary if we had both a working UMT program and a sound Reserve program in operation. When these things have been accomplished, and I am hopeful that Congress and the Pentagon will both move swiftly toward that end, we can then think about the reduction of our standing force. In that connection, I think it is the responsibility of Congress, if it provides the means to bring about strong Reserve forces, to set limits upon the size of our Military Establishment. Until we have those Reserve forces, however, I believe we must recognize the need for a larger standing force than would otherwise be necessary.

As part of my remarks, I will include correspondence which I have had recently with the Secretary of Defense concerning the principles which underly our Military Establishment. I hope that the members will find time to read them. The Secretary, briefly, reaffirms the principles which I have stressed. You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary states that universal military training "is the only practical way to hold down the size of our force on active duty, keep the cost of our defense program within reasonable limits and insure the strengthening of our democratic traditions against any danger of military domination."

MARCH 14, 1951.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My correspondence reflects much confusion in the mind of the average citizen over the kind of Military Establishment which will be required during the uneasy period which lies ahead. Recent congressional debates, I believe, demonstrate the depth of that confusion.

The need for a strong national defense organization is generally taken for granted, but there is a great fear on the part of many that a very large Military Establishment will cause serious economic difficulties, particularly if the present situation prevails for some time to come. I believe you yourself have warned against a possible letdown in civilian morale if we build such an establishment and have no immediate use for it.

Much of this confusion, I am convinced, stems from a lack of understanding of the basic principles upon which our armed establishment rests and, in many cases, from an ignorance of the very existence of such principles. In the present situation, for instance, many people believe that an increase in our armed potential must necessarily result in the creation of a large standing army, draining away our substance and lessening the capacity of the Nation to produce. Faced with the dilemma of how we are to survive if we do not build up large forces and how we are to preserve our society if we do, many are led to rationalize themselves into the belief that the need for large, trained forces does not exist, or that we must risk postponing their creation until the crisis is upon us. They forget, or do not know, that there is a third method—a method which many of us have assumed is the basic principle guiding our military policy today.

I refer to the "general principles of national military policy to govern preparation of postwar plans" laid down by you when you were Army Chief of Staff in War Department Circular 347 on August 25, 1944. This circular rejects the principle of a large standing army and accepts "the conception of a professional peace establishment (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinformed in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen army reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace."

In spite of the fact that the Army has failed to develop a sound reserve program in the postwar years, it has been my assumption that this principle still governs our planning and that we are relying upon this concept to provide trained forces quickly, should war strike, without having them constantly under arms during what may be a long period of tension. Naturally, our standing force—the professional peacetime establishment—must be increased in view of the world situation, but I have assumed that we cannot increase it to a size large enough to meet any contingency and, therefore, our major reliance must be placed upon a citizen army. If such an army is well-organized, well-trained, and ready to spring into action in case of war, I believe you will agree it represents almost as effective a de-

terrent to the aggressor as a large standing army. In addition, it would not constitute such a drain upon the economy.

My purpose in writing, therefore, is twofold. First, to clarify my own thinking, I inquire whether the principles set down in the above-mentioned circular still govern our military planning. If they do not, I would sincerely appreciate learning what principles now form the basis for national policy in this connection.

Secondly, in either event, I strongly urge you to call to the attention of the American people, at the earliest possible time, the existence of basic principles governing military planning during this period, spelling out those principles carefully so that all may understand. It is difficult for ordinary citizens, and perhaps soldiers do not appreciate this, to distinguish between the various components which make up our Armed Forces and to fit them into their logical place in an over-all scheme of things. I have no doubt that the American people, if they are given the opportunity to understand the basic reasoning behind our military policy will find it much easier to support the sacrifices necessary to give that policy full meaning. It seems to me that a general clarification of this whole matter, Mr. Secretary, would be invaluable at this time.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
*Representative in Congress.*

---

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, March 19, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. BYRNES: The thoughts you set forth in your excellent letter of March 14 are fundamental precepts in the planning of our Military Establishment. The Department of Defense is completely committed to the thesis that our force of troops on active duty should be held to the smallest number consistent with our security and that this force should be reinforced in time of acute danger by the calling to duty of well-organized and well-trained National Guard and Organized Reserve units.

The policy enunciated in War Department Circular No. 347 on August 25, 1944, has always represented the military policy of our country. It is still our policy. However, it has become tragically apparent that we can never hope to have a trustworthy citizens' reserve of adequate dimensions unless some provision can be made for a regular flow of trained young men into these civilian units. It has been the lack of such a dependable flow of trained manpower that has prevented us from going as far as we would have desired toward transferring responsibility for our national safety away from our forces in being to the National Guard and Reserve.

In order that we may give more effective expression to our historic policy of shunning a large professional Military Establishment without exposing our Nation to possible annihilation at the hands of an aggressor, the Department of Defense is currently urging the Congress to enact a permanent program of universal military training and service. This is designed to do the very things you stress in your letter as important to a soundly conceived national-defense program.

It will enable us to build up the expanded force we need to meet the immediate threat to our security. At the same time it will infuse real vitality into our Reserve components so we can count on them to take the field swiftly and effectively whenever the need arises. With such a program, we will be assured of the greatest protection for our country at the smallest cost in men and money.

The Senate has already passed the universal military training and service bill by a vote of 78 to 5. I hope the House will approve a bill that makes the same enduring contribution to security as the Senate. I am convinced such a measure represents the only practical way to hold down the size of our force on active duty, keep the cost of our defense program within reasonable limits and insure the strengthening of our democratic traditions against any danger of military domination.

In the course of the hearings on the bill, all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the civilian officers of the Department of Defense have sought to give the clearest possible picture of the philosophy underlying our advocacy of universal military training and service. I recognize that there is still great confusion on many basic points, and you may be assured that I shall continue to do everything in my power to explain exactly what it is we hope to accomplish through this approach to national security.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rarely take the floor of the House. Today, I think, is the first occasion I have asked for time in several weeks. I am going to use a number of quotations in my talk, all of which are well documented and will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, human memory can become exceedingly short in the heat and fury of battle—even in the heat and fury of a parliamentary battle of ideas and policies such as we are engaged in here this week.

Memory is especially short, under the stress and confusion of controversy, when it comes to recalling the background and origins of the conflict.

Yet sometimes it is extremely important to make the deliberate effort to remember. Sometimes that remembering helps define and clarify the very issues at stake.

With that purpose of defining and clarifying the issues, I want to quote a brief statement to you. I ask you to listen closely to these words—and now I am quoting:

> The realities of the situation are that if such legislation (that is, universal training legislation) were enacted tomorrow it could not possibly be put into effect at once. In view of the demands made on our military forces by the Korean aggression, it is clear that we could not possibly make available the installations and trained military manpower to put a universal training program into operation at this time or in the immediately foreseeable future. Accordingly, it does not seem to me immediately necessary for the Congress to enact universal training legislation.

That is the end of the quotation.

This line of reasoning is not new to the Members of this House. It has been offered during this debate by those who see no reason for hurrying or being hurried into a decision of this importance. I doubt, however, whether this position has been as well or as briefly stated by anyone on this floor. It states the case concisely: There is no immediate necessity for enacting UMT because UMT cannot be put into operation "at this time or in the immediately foreseeable future."

But it is not primarily the clarity or the common sense logic of this statement which prompts me to place such emphasis upon it.

The significance of the statement I have just quoted is that these are the words of the President of the United States. They were contained in a letter—in duplicate letters, to be exact—under date of August 29 of last year. These letters were addressed to the chairmen of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

In consequence of these letters—and that was their clear intent—work on UMT legislation was abruptly halted in both committees.

In the Senate committee, that work was then at an advanced stage. A bill, endorsed by the American Legion, was ready for final action. We have the word of Chairman JOHNSON that—

> It was then in its fourth revision; all controversial matters had been ironed out satisfactorily. (Senate hearings, p. 24.)

Later, Senator JOHNSON said, relative to the President's letter:

> We had a bill ready and ready to report it, and at the request of the Commander in Chief we withheld action. (Senate hearings, p. 213.)

The bill was not so far along in the House committee. But early this year, in commenting on the President's letter to the committee, the distinguished chairman said:

> That simply means this: In going down to this age of 18, with world conditions as acute as they are and as uncertain as they are, probably everyone who is drafted, of whatever age for many, many days and possibly several years in the future probably will be called right into the service and there won't be much opportunity of any set-up of the universal miiltary training. (House hearings, p. 132.)

Now there is another statement I would like to call to your attention.

When the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee reconvened on January 10 of this year to resume consideration of draft and manpower legislation, Chairman JOHNSON reviewed this bit of past history. Then he added this most signiffcant statement:

> Now the over-all picture has changed so that I think it is obvious that we have more important things to do than debate standby legislation for the future. (Senate hearings, p. 24.)

His very next sentence appears to explain what he meant by "more important things to do." He said:

> Our present national emergency makes it imperative that we look to a program sufficiently realistic to meet this country's immediate needs.

Let me sum up the situation as it stood when the two congressional committees convened after the start of the new Congress. With the worsened situation in Korea; with the President's earlier an-

nouncement of plans to send more troops to Europe, and with every indication that substantially more manpower must be mobilized for active military service, there was certainly nothing to change the position on UMT taken by the President in his letter of August 29. And there obviously were "more important things to do than debate stand-by legislation for the future."

How does it happen, then, that we find ourselves where we are this afternoon—embroiled in just such a debate on stand-by legislation for the future? How does it come to pass that we find UMT legislation now on the must list? How does it happen that this controversial issue has been tied to a piece of necessary legislation—the draft-extension bill—with a mandatory deadline of July 9? Above all, how does it happen that the UMT provisions now before us, and the UMT provisions already adopted by the other body, are not those of the original Legion-sponsored UMT bill so near approval in the Senate Armed Services Committee last August and reintroduced in both Houses this session? How does it happen the current bills are substantially different?

These questions are important because the answer is important. That answer not only tells why we are in the situation and confusion we are in here today, but it clarifies and sharpens up the real issues now before the House.

First. Because one man has claimed full responsibility, and has claimed it in the almost defiant statement to the House committee—"I am not admitting it; I am telling you; I did it"—I shall name that man. And because he is a military man, first, last and always, even though he holds a supposedly civilian post, I am going to phrase my answer to the questions I have raised in military analogy.

Perhaps both he—and the American people—will understand the import of that language.

We are today embroiled in this issue, under pressure of an arbitrary dead line, under pressure of administration demands and warnings for just one reason.

That reason is that Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, has decided that now is the strategically proper D-day for establishing a firm beachhead in the United States for his brand—and the Pentagon's brand—of permanent universal military and national service.

General Marshall acknowledged—under sharp questioning by the Member from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]—that the Marshall bill combined and intermingled the two things, draft extension and UMT—so that "it is practically impossible to separate" them—House hearings, page 24.

He acknowledged before both committees that he was joining the two items under the stress of the present emergency, because of a fear—and I am quoting—"that we will once again throw aside all our military power whenever our sense of urgency subsides"—Senate hearings, page 24. He made it plain that he doubted whether UMT would be adopted if postponed. Here are his very words:

> I am strongly of the opinion that if you ever divorce this phase (that is, UMT) from the bill we are sunk again. (House hearings, p. 25.)

Then he went on to say this—and mark these words well:

> I do not want us to delay to get into this law. I want to get going. (House hearings, p. 25.)

There you have it.

General Marshall wants the beachhead established now—under the covering barrage of necessary emergency draft-extension legislation.

There, Members of Congress, are the marching orders.

Second. The situation even has its humorous aspects. It is obvious from the record that the general took members of his own army, both in the Pentagon and in the Congress, completely by surprise.

When General Marshall announced the new approach—the beachhead strategy—to the Senate committee on January 10, Senator MORSE, who was by no means adverse to the strategy, expressed his surprise. Senator MORSE said, addressing the general and the committee:

> Unless there is something wrong with my ears, I recall distinctly in recent days, in answer to questions that I put to members of the Military Establishment before our committee, they testified that they did not favor going ahead with it (UMT) at the present time. * * * I think the chairman will share my view.

General Marshall assured him that now, at least, there was nothing wrong with his ears:

> You heard correctly. * * * Here is a proposal that combines the present emergency with the future enduring program. (Senate hearings, p. 26.)

And it certainly appears that the general caught his own Defense Department flat-footed. As a result, a lot of midnight oil was burned in the Pentagon, getting the new law ready for the Congress to rubber stamp.

When Secretary Marshall appeared, Monday, January 10, before the Senate committee, he did not have the bill ready. He said it would be in form later in the week.—Senate hearing, page 27.

The following Monday, in answer to a query, Assistant Secretary Rosenberg said:

> We will have the bill surely this week. (Senate hearing, pp. 153–154.)

The next day Chairman JOHNSON very sharply rebuked the Defense Department for the delay, commenting, caustically:

> We have something else to do besides practice. * * * They—

Meaning the Defense Department—

> have had since last September to get the bill ready.

Secretary Rosenberg explained, apologetically:

> We are working on the bill, drafting all night tonight. (Senate hearings, p. 215.)

Later, on January 23, when General Marshall was before the House committee, the Member from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] called his attention to the omission of a very important provision from the bill relating to the National Guard. General Marshall said it was an oversight and added:

> I do not know how it happened. But they were working on these papers up to 2 or 3 in the morning, and that probably is the explanation. (House hearings, p. 17.)

I spoke of this situation as having its humorous side. But it ceases to be funny with what I am going to mention next.

Secretary Rosenberg told the Senate committee, apologetically, that "the shortness of time has not permitted us to consult with as many people as we wanted to"—Senate hearings, page 44. Spokesmen of the vitally affected Reserve Officers' and National Guard Associations testified later that they had not been consulted by anybody in the preparation of the bill—Senate hearings, page 728.

The National Guard spokesman charged that the law had even been violated, since the matter had not been considered by War Department committees which included National Guard officers, as required by statute—Senate hearings, pages 714–715.

What a farce all of this makes of the solemn assurance given the Senate committee earlier by Mrs. Rosenberg, and repeated in substance to the House committee. She told the Senate committee:

> I should like to say to you * * * that we are fully aware and particularly sensitive and conscious of the very grave responsibility we take when we recommend that this country change its whole concept of military service, national service for all its citizens. (Senate hearings, p. 41.)

Third. In devising and executing this surprise beachhead maneuver, General Marshall made use of a tactic which became familiar to all of us in the Pacific during the last war. He used the by-passing technique.

You will recall, when the President of the United States announced there was no hurry about enacting UMT, that there was legislation before the Armed Services Committees of both Houses. You will recall that it was well advanced in the Senate committee. And you will recall that this bill, strongly supported by the American Legion, was reintroduced in the present Congress as S. 1.

That bill was before the Senate committee when General Marshall appeared on January 10 and announced his beachhead strategy. Did General Marshall make any mention of this bill, of the past labors on the bill—so much as even to criticize or condemn it? Oh, no. He simply bypassed it completely. He left it to wither on the vine. For the original Senate bill 1 there was not even the courtesy of a military funeral and the sounding of taps.

The shift was adroitly executed—General Marshall, you will recall won fame in the First World War for moving an entire army to a new position under the

very eyes of the enemy without being detected. This new shift was made with equal expertness.

Twenty days later, Senator MALONE, a coauthor of the original Senate bill 1, appeared before the committee and reported:

The country is entirely confused about the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute while still retaining the title Senate bill 1. My recent mail indicates the people believe that the substitute upon which the hearings have been held is the original Russell-Malone American Legion or veterans' bill. (Senate hearings, p. 1172.)

I may add that today, more than 2 months later, my own mail indicates this impression still exists. Incidentally, Senator MALONE denounced the substitute as a monstrosity.

There was an earlier witness before the Senate committee who recognized the quick switch. That was National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of the American Legion. He told the Senate committee, in no uncertain terms, on January 19:

We want to make it clear that the plan before you is not universal military training of the type so long advocated by the American Legion, and supported by the people. (Senate hearings, p. 702.)

To be sure, after the Senate committee made a few changes the top brass of the American Legion decided to enlist in the Pentagon's "Operation UMT Beachhead." That is their privilege, of course. But I think they may wake up to find that they are very junior members of an axis they will wish they had never joined. I may add that I am not too frightened by a so-called pressure group which caves in so easily to the Pentagon pressure group.

Let us not miss the tremendous importance of the program which General Marshall is seeking to substitute for the dead-on-the-vine, original S. 1. The Marshall proposal calls for a mandatory obligation of military training and military service and thereafter membership in a Reserve component of the Regular armed services for a total of 6 years, for every able-bodied American youth. That is in the bill now before this House. The bill adopted by the Senate calls for a total obligation of 8 years.

But that doesn't put the finger on the most fundamental change. The plan, and specifically the Reserve component provision, means that the program will set up a centralized, federalized, Pentagon control, on a permanent basis, over the bulk of the Nation's military manpower.

That is the complete opposite of a citizen-army Reserve plan, with local units, locally trained, under local officers. It threatens the whole system of the State-organized and State-controlled National Guard. It means, also, that in future emergencies men would be called up directly by the Defense Department and not through a local draft board setup. That is a Prussian-type UMT.

And get this: The Pentagon has asked for up to 6 months to perfect and announce an improved Reserve program. They have asked for that interlude even though Mrs. Rosenberg told the Senate committee:

It would be useless for us to ask you to give us a universal military service and training program unless at the same time we would come up to you with an improved Reserve program. (Senate hearings, p. 50.)

This request amounts to saying: Give us our beachhead now and later on we will tell you what life is going to be like in the occupied area.

Fourth. I know the argument that will be advanced—and has been advanced during this debate.

We were told, only yesterday, and I believe that my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] said it—that this bill before the House is not the Marshall-Rosenberg plan. And we were told, too, that approval of this bill does not authorize UMT; that the UMT plan must come back to the Congress for final decision. Now, I note, they have added even a postscript to that. They now promise us there will be opportunity to amend the plan when it does come back.

Now I do not discount the work that has been done by the House committee. I do not deny that our esteemed chairman, good soldier that he is in trying to carry out the policies from above, has not sought and secured some improvements in order to make a bad bill less bad. All credit to him.

But I point out two facts.

Once you have approved UMT as part of a draft-extension bill—regardless of details—which you promise to let Congress fill in later—they have won the beachhead.

Let me remind you that the other body has already adopted, in its virtual entirety, the Marshall-Rosenberg program. This legislation will go to conference. There is no way of knowing what House-devised defenses may crumble there.

No, my friends, you do not defend a beachhead by retreating inland to imagined defenses.

You win or lose on the beaches themselves. This is the battleground and now is the battle—not at some other place and time.

Fifth. Now I want to say a very hard thing, but a thing the record forces me to say.

Like every campaign, General Marshall's "Operation UMT Beachhead" has its expendables.

Mr. Chairman, I charge—from the record—that the Pentagon demanded the draft of 18-year-olds with the sole, exclusive, and deliberate purpose of getting going now with a permanent system of peacetime conscription.

I am perfectly aware of what Mrs. Rosenberg told—and failed to tell—the House committee on January 25. The esteemed chairman said to her:

Well, the question is naturally going to arise if you go down to the 18-year-old group. What are you going down there for? Are you going down there to strengthen the military force to meet the world crisis as it confronts us today, or are you going down there partly for the purpose of inaugurating and starting a program of universal military service or training?

Mrs. Rosenberg answered:

We are going down for two reasons. One, that all our heads of the services and General Bradley have said that they are some of the finest soldiers and are needed to make our Army as combatworthy as possible; and secondly, we are suggesting going down because we have need of men and we have the choice of offering that we take fathers or husbands or veterans or all of them. (House hearings, p. 70.)

There was not a word here to indicate whether they wanted the 18-year-olds so they could gain the UMT beachhead.

But now turn back, please, 10 days, to January 15. Listen to the earlier testimony of Mrs. Rosenberg before the Senate committee—and she was repeating what she had said 3 days prior:

Again we are not asking you to give us the 18-year-old universal military training because we are going to run short in this pool. We might, but our strong argument is that if we do not have them, we have to maintain a force as large as this or larger during the entire period of tensions which, as General Marshall said, may be 10 years.

We say if you do it the other way, if you give us enough young men who will have training and can be put in the Reserve force, we hope that as tensions lessen, the Regular force, the force in being, will be reduced.

Later that day, Chairman JOHNSON undertook to sum up Mrs. Rosenberg's argument. He said:

You told us that you do not ask to go down in the 18-year-old crop just to supply the 3,500,000 force in being. That is not your real reason for doing it. * * * As I gather it, you do not rest your case for 18-year-olds on the necessity of taking them because you can't get a 3,500,000 force from any other source, because you can.

I am still quoting Senator JOHNSON'S summation:

But if you do not take the 18-year-olds, your UMT program goes out the window, because you do not have people to train them and you have got to phase them in with the Regular service in order to have a UMT program. * * * Is that correct?"

Mrs. Rosenberg replied with obvious enthusiasm:

That is the best presentation that the Department of Defense has made yet for its case. That is exactly it, Senator. (Senate hearings p. 187–188.)

That is certainly plain enough, Mr. Chairman.

That certainly identifies the expendables in operation UMT beachhead.

Sixth. No general ever planned to capture a beachhead merely to win or hold the beachhead. That is only the first objective.

Mr. Chairman, I want to warn this House that this UMT proposal is only the beginning of the system of conscription and regimentation which the administration and the military have in mind for the American people.

I wish the present administration would be even a fraction as explicit and forthright in stating their military goals and objectives in Korea as they are in stating the war aims of operation UMT beachhead.

They have made it clear that they want a large-scale standing army for an indefinite future.

They want it to be replaced, if and when it is replaced, with a Pentagon-controlled Reserve set-up—details furnished in 6 months or later.

They want—it is all in the record of the Senate and House hearings—Government-controlled selection of college students, a plan of Federal scholarships, and a plan of free medical rehabilitation through the United States Public Health Service or Veterans' Administration—Senate hearings, pages 51–53, 56, 158–159, 465, 497; House hearings, page 349.

But that is not all.

Let me read what Mrs. Rosenberg told the Senate committee:

It is his—the President's—concept, and that of the Department of Defense, that this must be a universal program and that every man physically and mentally and morally capable of performing a service, either in the military or outside, must perform that service. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Mrs. Rosenberg made it plain that she was talking about those men who would be left after drafting all those capable of only limited-duty military service. She estimated that the number of 18-year-olds in this category would be from 100,000 to 150,000 annually.

Mrs. Rosenberg continued:

We, however, want to make sure, and that is not the Department of Defense's program, but I know those are the President's instructions, that when a program is submitted to you * * * it will not be a made-work program but one of real usefulness in the national effort. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

And still later, Mrs. Rosenberg reiterated:

The President will have a program. (Senate hearings, p. 148.)

Subsequently, Labor Secretary Tobin was asked if he agreed with the program for nonmilitary service for 18-year-olds asked for by the Department of Defense. Secretary Tobin answered:

It would be a very difficult program to administer, and I would want to have an opportunity to see a specific plan before me before I would want to commit myself. (Senate hearings, p. 340.)

There was no doubt in the mind of another witness who was an enthusiastic supporter of really universal service, that this is a Pentagon project. Dr. Karl T. Compton said:

I believe that the plans now proposed by the Department of Defense are aimed in that direction.

That is, universal national service—Senate hearings, page 1051.

There was no doubt either about the long-range objective in the mind of another witness, who did not like the prospect at all.

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, told the Senate committee:

We believe that a change in the title to "Universal Military Training and Service" will leave the door open to the drafting of individuals not qualified for military duty to perform functions normally carried on by civilians.

And Mr. Carey added:

To this we are unalterably opposed. (Senate hearings, p. 1051.)

Seventh. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the barrage which is currently being laid down to cover the advance to General Marshall's beachhead objective.

It is a barrage of promise and threat, of confused and conflicting propaganda, but why should they care if it is conflicting as long as its confusing?

The Defense Department is alternately trying to sell its UMT plan to the Congress on the argument that it will make possible a reduction of the standing Army in the near future and trying to stampede the Congress into accepting the whole program without question because of real or fancied imminent peril.

They cannot have it both ways.

There cannot be any real build-up of the Reserves through UMT until it is possible to halt the draft for service and switch to the draft for training only.

More than 2 months ago, Chairman VINSON and Mrs. Rosenberg agreed on the statement that—

You may not be able to reach the training phase for a great, great many years. (House hearings, p. 110.)

Yet the House committee report says it may be possible to end the draft and reduce the standing Army in the near future—report, page 14—and the distinguished chairman last week was quoted as saying that it might be within 18 months.

Yet in his testimony, General Marshall said, as recently as March 1, we must prepare for the probability that it will be necessary to go above the 3½-million figure in the standing army—House hearings, page 438.

General Bradley said that—

After 5 or 10 years * * * you might be able to reduce those that are on full time active duty below 3½ million. (Senate hearings, p. 666.)

Does that sound like the near future?

And then Wednesday we were given a warning which should preclude all thought of early application of UMT. Our esteemed Speaker told the Congress and the Nation:

It is my firm belief that we are in greater danger of an expanded war today than we have been at any time since the close of the World War in 1945. * * * I think that we stand in the face of terrible danger and maybe the beginning of world war III. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 4, 1951, p. 3412.)

I pray God that the Speaker may be wrong. I know how sincerely he hopes that he is wrong. But surely if this is the possibility, there is no prospect in the foreseeable future for reducing the forces-in-being—which no one would want done under such circumstances. And there would be no prospect of switching to the training phase of UMT—for which there would be no possible need.

Certainly the Speaker's statement lends new and ominous import to the words of Senator JOHNSON that "we have more important things to do than debate stand-by legislation for the future."

In the light of what the Speaker has said, I say to General Marshall: If you, General Marshall, share the Speaker's grave anxiety over the immediate situation, then, in the name of national unity and for the sake of putting first things first, withdraw your demand for stand-by UMT legislation as part of the draft-extension bill—involving as that demand does, a deeply divisive issue, and involving as it does detailed work and planning by the Pentagon and Congress which have no immediate urgency or relevancy.

And I extend the same proposition to General Marshall's Commander in Chief. I urge the President of the United States to write a letter. I urge him to say—and I believe he can say it with vastly more cause than when he said it on August 29 of last year—I urge him to say in that letter: "It does not seem to me immediately necessary for the Congress to enact universal training legislation."

I say, respectfully and earnestly to the President of the United States, that this is the course of practical realism. This is the course of hard-headed wisdom. This is the course of patriotism which would do much to unite a free people to meet whatever challenge may be before us.

And if that letter is not forthcoming, then, for the same reasons, let the Congress say it. Let the Congress by its vote say to the President and to the Pentagon: "It does not seem to us immediately necessary to enact universal training legislation."

And then let us, and the President, and the American people, turn with courage and unity to the more important duties at hand.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I was told by a member of the 21-member Committee on Reserves that they would report by the end of March to the gentleman's committee. Is that true, or is that out the window? What is the present situation?

Mr. SHAFER. I do not know whether it is true or not. All I am doing is quoting the record or using their own words.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I approach this subject with the trepidation which it deserves. For 3 days I have been a daily attendant and a conscientious listener to these debates. May I say I never expect to hear on the floor of the House a finer or more carefully reasonable speech than that given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. The fact that I do not agree with him in no sense lessens my admiration for the cogency of his sincerity for the height of his idealism. I am delighted also to follow the gentleman from Michigan who has given us facts which we did not know. I would like to inform the committee—if I may be forgiven the personal allusion—that I know the experience of sending boys into the service. In my adult life I have had my family participating in two wars. I have been caught abroad in two wars. I think, whether we call it that or not, that we are now actually in one of the

most disastrous wars this Nation has ever faced, in Korea. For that reason there is no length to which I would not go to furnish this country adequate defense of men and money.

I would like to go on record permanently as saying that. However, I have distinct fears about this bill. I am convinced that the American people who are being asked to give their sons, and who may be asked to give their daughters, have a right to have their representatives vote separately on the two provisions of this bill. I shall support with all my heart the extension of the draft. I ask, however, a studied consideration of the universal military training provisions of this bill. In fact, I would hope that they might be removed from the bill and considered separately. I will tell you why. I take distinct exception to the idea that there is any necessary reason for including such provision in this bill since the chairman of the committee himself has said that the plan could not go into active operation for 24 months. If that is true, we have adequate time to study again the problem; to bring it up for late consideration before the House; and to let the people express themselves through us on the provisions of such a plan.

We are nw actually in a war, with emergency draft bills adequately covering our present situation. Furthermore, I object to the form of this bill. I think that it is another step away from truly representative government. I have great faith in the Committee on Armed Services. I have such faith in the chairman that he, the other day, almost persuaded me that this bill was perfectly harmless. However, I believe perhaps that I have more faith in them than they seem to be showing in themselves; I am perfectly convinced that there is no reason for a committee so ably chairmanned, and manned with such experienced and conscientious men, to rely upon any commission to bring in provisions to be embodied in a universal military training bill. You have been told today that any plan, as brought in under the proposed provision by the Commission, can be amended. The chairman said yesterday that an amendment to make this possible would probably be offered and passed here next week. However—and this is definitely stated in the bill—as now provided the plan suggested by the Commission and reported to the House must be accepted or rejected in full. I would remind you that such was the intention of the committee when the bill was written and reported to the House. I would remind you, as did the gentleman from Michigan, that if the House so amends this provision, the amendment can later be lost through conference. And we will then find ourselves, we the the representatives, a thinking, experienced, conscientious body of men and women elected to represent the American people, in the position of having to take or reject without change the plans presented to us by the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, my time is short. My plea is only with reference to that feature of the bill. I would urge the Armed Services Committee, if it feels that it cannot adequately bring in a universal military training plan through its own efforts, to seek the advice perhaps of an advisory commission, if it must have one. But let the committee bring in a definite plan made by itself from the proposals of that committee, which plan can be considered on its merits with a full expression of opinion from all of those at home whom we represent.

Have you stopped to think of it this way? We are here, not only through our own ambitions or desires. We are here merely because the people back home in each case thought that we were smart enough and honest enough and idealistic enough to express their viewpoint.

We are turning more and more away from our responsibilities as legislators. I would remind you, I do not think that the American people expect their Congress to turn over the processes of thinking, of planning, of deciding questions such as the UMT, to any agency or to any commission. This UMT program would go into the life of every individual American. There is no phase of our activity, no phase of our thinking, no phase of our living that it would not touch. On such questions the American people have a right to express themselves through us. On such questions we have a duty to vote specifically. I would say just this to you: We exist here, this whole Government, traditionally and rightly, only by consent of the governed. I would warn you that if we give up that right, if we refuse to take our privilege and our responsibility to draw our own plans, there should be no hope for any one of us.

We have had experience in this country with an effort to enforce laws which did not have full public support. If you are going to have full public support for an epoc-changing program, you must have behind you the will and the conviction of the American people. I would urge the Armed Services Committee to accept the responsibility, not to bring us in a piecemeal plan whereby we decide today we will take UMT without knowing or being able to tell the people back home what we have voted for; but to wait and to bring in a full plan which can be presented, a plan which could win our support if it were necessary, but a plan on which we could go back to our people and say, "You decided through us, through your constitutional authority expressed in us." Then I believe that there would be some reason for us to go out to a weary world and sell a story of what truly representative government can be. What would it mean to all of us to have a full force abroad but to lose at home not only our freedom but that sense of constitutional government in which every man and every woman can walk with human dignity, as individuals, with the right to express themselves through this Congress? I would beg the Representatives in this House: Do not in any sense abdicate your authority. It is also your responsibility. Insist upon having submitted to you in full the plans which may change the lives of every one in this generation and in the generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to one of the ablest members of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] 40 minutes.

(Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not endeavor to discuss at this time all of the provisions of this bill. I voted in committee to report the measure to the House, but did so with definite reservations. Like many other members of the House, I favor the selective service features of the proposed legislation, but feel that this subject should be separated from the universal military training provisions. Moreover, it is my considered judgment that the active duty strength of the Armed Forces should be fixed by Congress in this bill. The original measure considered by our committee contained a limitation of 4,000,000 persons at any time. On final consideration, however, and by a divided vote, this limitation was deleted. I believe it is the duty of Congress to limit our active military strength by definite authorizing legislation, and not bring about such limitation under the specious theory that this can be done through appropriations. Whether the number should be 4,000,000 persons or some other number is for us to determine when appropriate amendments are offered. Since we are proceeding at the present time on the basis of need for 3,462,000 men, I shall support an amendment to fix a limitation of 3½ million persons, or 4,000,000 if that amendment is rejected. Should the need arise at any time to increase the limit, Congress can act and Congress would act. To leave it to the military authorities would not only be dangerous for economic and other reasons, but such action would constitute an unwarranted delegation of authority. A limitation would be the best way in which to prevent a waste of manpower by the Armed Forces.

In the Committee on Armed Services an effort was made to prohibit the sending of troops to Western Europe without the approval of Congress. This amendment was defeated in committee and will be reconsidered before this committee.

This is a question of far-reaching importance and it is my purpose to support any amendment which will permit Congress to retain the power and authority to say when and how many American boys shall be sent to Western Europe for service with the armed forces of the North Atlantic Treaty nations. It is the constitutional duty of Congress to determine this question, and it is an obligation which cannot and should not be delegated to the President. I have no sympathy with the plea that the requiring of congressional approval will hamstring General Eisenhower in the performance of his duties. It could just as effectively be argued that General Eisen-

hower is being hampered by the necessity of coming to Congress for appropriations to support the American Armed Forces under his command.

I have not reached the place where I am willing to place the judgment of any President above that of the duly elected Members of Congress, even if we had the constitutional right to delegate our authority to pass upon this vital question. We shall have our opportunity to write our position into law by an appropriate amendment to this bill. It is far from sufficient to merely express an opinion on the subject by way of a resolution. Too often the will of Congress is ignored even when it is expressed in law. A mere expression of opinion would be meaningless. With no limitation on the size of our Armed Forces, and unrestricted authority on the part of the President to send American troops anywhere in the world, we will be taking a long step toward the military dictatorship the framers of our Constitution feared when it created this Republic.

While the pending bill fixes a definite termination date as to its selective service features, you will note that the universal military training part of the measure is permanent. The National Security Training Corps is created as soon as the President appoints a National Security Training Commission. No further action by Congress would be needed to make universal military training a permanent institution of our Government. There will be no further congressional review until and unless a measure is introduced and considered to repeal the law. I need not tell you that if universal military training is set up at this time there is no certainty that it could be repealed short of a two-thirds vote of both Houses, which would be required in the event of a Presidential veto. I listened with great interest to the remarks of our distinguished chairman at the beginning of this debate on the subject of adopting and terminating universal military training. But I submit the procedure is not as simple as he indicated. At the moment there is no universal military training program before us. There is nothing in this bill which definitely advises Congress about even the major phases of universal military training. Those details, we are told, must be left to a commission to be appointed by the President. Bear in mind we do not wait until a program is submitted by the Commission before we adopt universal military training. We adopt it now, and the Universal Military Training Corps comes into being as soon as the Commission is appointed by the President. The Commission may be appointed at any time after the passage of the bill.

Under the language of the pending bill Congress would leave it to the Commission to devise the program and to submit it to Congress. If the amendment which our distinguished chairman now proposes to offer should not be adopted, our only course thereafter would be to accept or to reject the plan exactly as submitted. We would have no authority to change the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" in the plan. If any legislative bill comes before us in the regular way we have an opportunity to amend it in committee or on the floor. On the other hand, if this bill is not amended, the plan of the Commission would have to be accepted exactly as the Commission wrote it or be rejected in its entirety. In other words, the Commission would do the legislating and Congress would either rubber-stamp the Commission's view in their entirety or reject them completely. In this connection let us not forget that the original plan or future plans might not be submitted to the Congress which considered this bill, but to a future Congress. That Congress will have nothing to say about the matter except to approve or disapprove the plan of a Federal bureau. Surely this is not the way to legislate, and it is not the way intended when the Congress of the United States was created by the founding fathers.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Yesterday I asked someone who was speaking on the bill, I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], about the authority of the House to amend the bill after the Commission reported it. He advised me that the chairman of the committee had stated to the House that not only would the Armed Services Committee but also the House would have the authority to amend the bill when it is submitted by the commission for approval or rejection by the House. What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. ELSTON. I am coming to that, and I shall be glad to answer the question.

While the amendment which the chairman indicates he will offer may go a long way toward correcting an incredible situation, I am not certain of its legal soundness. If the plan takes the form of a legislative bill, subject to Presidential approval or veto, it would, of course, have the force of law. On the other hand, mere congressional approval by way of a concurrent resolution would not make the plan the law of the land.

I submit it is dangerous to attempt to legislate by mere resolution. The Supreme Court of the United States has not as yet determined that it is unconstitutional to legislate through the process of concurrent resolution for the simple reason the question has not been presented to that Court. Certainly we cannot take from the President of the United States his constitutional right to approve or veto legislation passed by Congress. A concurrent resolution would seek to do that very thing. The purpose of a concurrent resolution as you know is to fix the time of final adjournment, provide for a joint session to receive the President's message, and like matters which do not constitute legislation. If the amendment which is to be submitted by our chairman provides that Congress may approve of the plan of the Commission or that we may amend or reject the plan by concurrent resolution, I submit the amendment would violate the Constitution, since it would deny to the President his clear constitutional right to either approve legislation or to veto it. The proposed amendment of the chairman contemplates that the entire plan which is to be submitted by the Commission is to be considered first by the Committee on Armed Services where it will be subject to amendment. Thereafter the plan will be brought to the floor of the House for further amendment, if desired. Thereafter Congress will, by concurrent resolution, adopt the plan or reject it. The President will have nothing to say about it.

While I differ with President Truman on perhaps as many things as any Member of this body, I do not want to be in the position of voting to deny to him or to any other President any right clearly guaranteed by the Constitution. While I have said this question has not been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States, it was considered by a United States circuit court of appeals. I refer to the case of F. H. E. Oil Co. against Commissioner of Internal Revenue decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fifth District on August 21, 1945 and reported in 150 Federal Reporter, page 857. This case reviewed the decision of the Tax Court of the United States for the District of Texas. The syllabus of the case, which constitutes the law, reads as follows:

> A resolution adopted by House of Representatives and agreed to by the Senate, but not approved by the President or passed over his veto, was not an act of Congress and did not make or change the law, but, as an expression of an opinion on a point of law, it would be entitled to respectful consideration by the courts.

I do not think we are so much concerned about whether a plan to completely set up a program of universal military training will be given respectful consideration or not. We are concerned with whether or not our concurrent resolution will have the force of law. I submit that under this decision it will not have the force of law. The amendment which the chairman proposes to offer provides that the plan of the National Security Training Commission may be adopted, rejected, or amended by concurrent resolution.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been listening very carefully to the gentleman's logic. I wondered in my own mind whether or not the gentleman would apply that same logic to the resolution in the Senate of sending troops to Europe.

Mr. ELSTON. I think it is conceded that the resolution adopted by the Senate does not have the force of law. We can give it force of law by adopting a similar amendment in this bill, and I feel it should be done. That would be the proper way in which to do it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman as a distinguished and able lawyer has pointed

out that this particular requirement or gimmick that we have had in various bills about legislating through a concurrent resolution has not been passed upon by the Supreme Court. Does not the gentleman agree with me that not only the Supreme Court but the Congress is also sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution and that we have the duty, if a provision is unconstitutional, not to adopt it?

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman is absolutely right. We have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. If it is our considered judgment that anything in any measure violates the Constitution we cannot in good conscience support it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has made a most excellent point, one that I personally had not had an opportunity to consider. He has quoted the law. It would seem to me that whatever amendment the gentleman from Georgia presents would have to take that into consideration, otherwise his amendment would have no force and effect in law. I wonder if the gentleman has any idea as to just what sort of amendment the gentleman from Georgia intends to offer? Has it been submitted to him for his consideration?

Mr. ELSTON. No; it has not, but I am advised that it contemplates adopting or changing the plan of the Commission by concurrent resolution. If, on the other hand, a bill is introduced containing the provisions of the plan, and the Committee on Armed Services and the House and the Senate fully debate it, after which the bill goes to the President for approval or veto the proper procedure would have been followed.

Mr. HINSHAW. It seems to me if the gentleman is correct, and I think he probably is, that the only thing the committee can then do is provide that a commission shall make a report, period; and then from that point a new bill would be introduced. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes. The only thing I feel the Commission should do if we need a commission at all, is to make recommendations to the Congress, leaving it to Congress to enact the law. That is the proper procedure to follow.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. I asked a question a moment ago and I am interested in knowing the answer, because I do not want any legislation to be authorized by a commission without the consent of Congress and without our having an opportunity to look at it after they get through with it. Does the gentleman understand that the amendment that will be offered by the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], will authorize Congress to amend and change or modify any legislative proposal that is submitted to the Congress by the Commission?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes, that is true, but I understand that when the House and Senate pass on any plan of the Commission it is by concurrent resolution and not as we would proceed if we were considering a legislative bill.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman's objection is that the President, if he signs this bill, will be authorizing legislation to be brought about by way of the Commission?

Mr. ELSTON. Not only would the President be authorizing it but Congress also would be authorizing it. If we pass this bill, with the proposed amendment of the chairman included, we will be authorizing the Commission to legislate. That is a power which I feel we cannot delegate.

Mr. TACKETT. If I understand this bill correctly with regard to the universal military training phase, it would just be authorizing the Commission to propose some legislation for Congress either to adopt or reject; is not that true?

Mr. ELSTON. It would authorize the Commission to submit a plan which we must accept or reject without change, unless of course the proposed amendment of the chairman is adopted. That amendment would permit Congress to amend the plan. I would have no objection to the Commission making recommendations to the Congress, if, after such recommendations are made, legislation is introduced and considered in the usual way. I object to merely rubber-stamping that which is turned over to it by the Commission.

Mr. TACKETT. If I understand correctly, the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] would not place us in the position of rubber-stamping the legislation, but we would be allowed to write the legislation after it has been suggested by the Commission; is not that true?

Mr. ELSTON. We could make whatever changes we desire. However, the complaint I make is that in the final analysis, after we have made the changes, the amended plan must be adopted by the House by concurrent resolution. The President, of course, will have no authority to approve or veto the resolution. That, I say, is taking from the President a constitutional right as firm as the right of Congress to legislate.

Mr. TACKETT. As long as no rights are taken away from this Congress, which is closer to and more representative of the people, we do not particularly give a hoot whether the President approves the legislation by one method or the other, do we? I would not vote to delegate authority to a commission to determine such legislation. But it would hurt nothing to provide an advisory committee.

Mr. ELSTON. I think so, because the Constitution provides that the proper way to legislate is for both Houses of Congress to pass legislation, after which the President shall have an opportunity to approve it or to veto it.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. My idea of a plan of military training, and I think this was the idea in the committee, is that the Commission would say a certain portion of the time served in training would be devoted to classroom work, drill maneuvers, and what not. That, of course, is not a matter of law. It is only a matter of the manner in which the time is to be utilized. I think the gentleman would agree with me the concurrent resolution would not be concerned with that, because it is not to become a matter of law, but only a matter of the application of the plan under which they are to be trained. Should the Commission bring in something which was a matter of legislation, do you not think it would then be necessary to go through the legislative process to take from that plan those things which require legislation, and that they would have to go through that legislative process? The plan is only: How are you going to utilize their time; how are you going to protect their morals; and how are you going to provide for their welfare, and all that sort of thing. If there should be anything in the plan of a legislative nature, it would have to come out, and it would not be approved by concurrent resolution, but would have to go through the regular legislative process.

Mr. ELSTON. May I ask the gentleman from Texas where any suggestions would be coming from if they did not come from the plan, because certainly there is not one single word in this entire bill which does more than merely set up a universal military training program.

Mr. KILDAY. But suppose the commission should come in and recommend that rather than $30 a month, as we provide in this bill, the pay should be $40 a month. Of course that would have to go through the legislative process, would it not?

Mr. ELSTON. Certainly.

Mr. KILDAY. That would not be included in the plan.

Mr. ELSTON. Certainly it should not.

Mr. KILDAY. The questions of drill and morals and welfare, and things of that kind included in the plan which is approved by the concurrent resolution, do not become law but only the manner in which the training should be carried on.

Mr. ELSTON. I think the gentleman is begging the question. Everything the commission proposes does not have to be brought to the Congress. What I am contending is that anything which is of a legislative nature at all should be brought to the House with a recommendation. Thereafter we should pass on the recommendations in the form of a legislative bill rather than a concurrent resolution.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that when we discussed this matter in committee we were concerned that the system might be used to promote some social-welfare program. We mentioned training in ceramics, and things of that kind. We wanted to make sure that it was to be military training, and not a socializing program. That was one of the main

things which motivated us in requiring that the plan be submitted to the Congress, so that we could keep it in line as a military program and nothing else.

Mr. ELSTON. I am not objecting to submitting the plan. I am not objecting to submitting recommendations. I think it would be the duty of the commission, if it is created, to do that, but I am saying before the plan becomes effective, if it contains legislative matter, it should be considered in a legislative bill.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, everyone in the House agrees to that, I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. That is not the way I understand the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. If I understand the gentleman correctly, and understand his point, if we adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia, we would then have committed ourselves to a definite period of, say, 6 months of training and 6 years in the Reserves, and the only thing we would then do is approve or disapprove or make recommendations for change concerning what the commission will establish as the method of carrying it out; is that correct?

Mr. ELSTON. Of course, the gentleman appreciates that universal military training is a tremendous subject. The bill which was reported out of the Committee on Armed Services in the Eightieth Congress was, I believe, 63 pages long. It contained all sorts of provisions with respect to benefits and everything that would and should be considered in that kind of a program. There is nothing in this bill setting those things up. Obviously it is expected that all those matters will be presented to us by the commission. Then we will either adopt the plan of the commission, modify it, or reject it by a concurrent resolution.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to know just what the force and effect of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Georgia would be. I do not quite understand it. If what the gentleman says is so, I do not think it would have any force and effect.

Mr. ELSTON. In my opinion it would have no force or effect in law, and if a plant for UMT is adopted by concurrent resolution we may find some day the entire procedure has been declared to be unconstitutional.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Today we do not write out definite plans in words as to what the Army and Navy and Air Force do in their training program or their welfare program or benefits to the personnel. Why would this be any different?

Mr. ELSTON. I hope the gentleman understood me. I do not contend that the Commission should present to the Congress every minor detail in the whole program. But this bill provides that the plan for universal military training shall be submitted to Congress by the Commission. The gentleman, who is one of the very able members of our committee, knows that when we considered the UMT program in the Eightieth Congress, which was reported by our committee unanimously, it was a huge bill. It contained all kinds of provisions; the same provisions that should be in any legislation setting up so important a program as universal military training. Under this bill all of these things will be presented to us by the Commission in the form of a plan. I know of no other legislation that is going to be introduced on the subject. If we pass this bill we must stand aside and wait for the Commission to act. We must wait for their plan. Until the amendment suggested by our distinguished chairman was announced, we could not even amend the plan that was to be submitted to us by the Commission.

Mr. DURHAM. I thought the point which was disturbing the gentleman was that it would not have the force of law.

Mr. ELSTON. It would not, if it is to be approved by a concurrent resolution. The point I am making is that a concurrent resolution does not have the force of law.

Mr. DURHAM. Of course, I do not believe it would be possible to submit a plan in its entirety that would not require some legislative act.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman contend that the bill we are considering provides for anything of that kind? The bill provides that the Commission shall submit a plan to the Congress, and the Congress shall either approve or reject it.

Mr. DURHAM. If I understand what the chairman is going to offer as an amendment, he will submit an amendment based on the fact that the House can amend or the Senate can amend.

Mr. ELSTON. That is right, but ultimately we approve of the plan, amended or not, by a concurrent resolution.

Mr. DURHAM. We can write anything in it that we want to.

Mr. ELSTON. But it would not have the force of law if it was in a concurrent resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. It would have jurisdiction to incorporate things in a legislative program that are not set out in a concurrent resolution.

Mr. ELSTON. Of course, the Congress has a right to repeal the entire act if it cares to do so.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. ELSTON. But let me ask the gentleman, for whom I have the highest regard, if his proposed amendment does not provide that the plan which will eventually be adopted, whether we amend it or not, is to be approved by Congress by a concurrent resolution?

Mr. VINSON. May I take the time to read it, and I would like to put it in the RECORD at this point, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. ELSTON. Very well.

Mr. VINSON. What I propose to offer for the consideration of the Committee on Monday is an amendment to this effect:

On page 37, strike out lines 3 and 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) The Commission shall, not later than 6 months following its appointment, submit to the Congress an initial plan or plans for —."

On page 38, strike out lines 1 through 20, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection shall have been transmitted to the Congress and shall have been approved by the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress incorporating such plan with or without amendments. Upon receipt by the Congress the plan shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services which committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress, report a resolution to their respective Houses incorporating the plan with or without amendments and its recommendations thereon, and such resolution shall be privileged and may be called up by any Member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged."

On page 39, strike out lines 2 through 7, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(9) Following the adoption of a plan submitted by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (8), the Congress may, in accordance with the procedure established under paragraph (8) modify or change such plan, or the Commission may, if changes to the plan are demed desirable by the Commission, submit such changes to the Congress in accordance with the procedure prescribed in paragraph (8), and such changes shall be acted upon as prescribed in paragraph (8)."

Mr. ELSTON. As I indicated the amendment does provide that the plan shall be adopted by concurrent resolution.

Let us keep in mind that compulsory military training is in itself a tremendous subject. It would be something new in the history of this Nation and, as I see it, should not be embarked upon until legislation is introduced in the regular way, adequate hearings are held, and the subject fully debated on the floor of the House. The incidental questions involved, all of them of great importance, are large in number. As an example of the magnitude of the subject, I would call your attention to the fact that the universal military training bill which was unanimously reported to the House during the Eightieth Congress by the Committee on Armed Services, contained more than 60 pages.

Among other questions, the Congress might want to consider the cost which it is conceded will amount to billions of dollars a year. I appreciate, of course, that it will be claimed that where national defense is involved we cannot count the cost. I believe it has been demonstrated that that is the attitude of Congress. However, since universal military training cannot, or at least should not become operative until after the present war emergency is over, such an argument is not supported by logic or reason. If an effort should be made to put universal military training into operation before the present emergency

is over, it would seriously interfere with our defense effort rather than help it. The more immediate the threat to our national security, the more necessary it is that peacetime training programs be deferred. If the threat is immediate and serious—and under existing conditions it is not safe to proceed on any other theory—our manpower and our dollars must be used as fully as feasible in preparation for the impending conflict or to prevent its execution, rather than upon any purely peacetime-training program.

Whether you are for or against universal military training is beside the point. Ordinary procedure should require the entire program to be subject to congressional review. This can be accomplished only by the fixing of a termination date. Since the bill does not fix a time when inductions into the program shall cease, I propose to offer an amendment to make this part of the bill conform to the selective-service phase. Selective service is definitely terminated on July 1, 1954, thus requiring a complete congressional review of the whole program before that time. On the other hand, universal military training will continue on a permanent basis unless the program is terminated or suspended for a stated time by concurrent resolution. It has been conceded in this debate that the only hope for universal military training is to tie it in with selective-service extension. That in itself should call for congressional review not later than 3 years after the passage of this bill. A provision for the termination of universal military training by concurrent resolution is far from being even a poor substitute for a provision which would require a complete congressional review the same as is required if selective service is to be extended.

If a concurrent resolution may be used to terminate universal military training, it may be used to terminate any law. It may be employed to amend any law. That I do not believe is the function of a concurrent resolution. If laws may be terminated or amended by concurrent resolution, I repeat, What becomes of the constitutional provision requiring action on the part of both the President and Congress? What becomes of the Presidents right to veto, and the necessity for a two-thirds vote of both Houses to override a veto?

However much we may disagree with the President, I submit it is neither our province, nor should it be our desire, to seek to deny to him any authority guaranteed by the Constitution itself. A concurrent resolution, according to section 1037, VII of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives "is without force and effect beyond the confines of the Capitol." Yet section 18 (c) of the pending bill would provide, by concurrent resolution, for the termination or suspension for a stated period of time of all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Obviously the procedure defined in this section is designed to prevent the same complete congressional review of the universal military training program as is provided for selective service, as outlined in section 17 (d). That section definitely terminates selective service on July 1, 1954, unless Congress, after a review of the program before that date decides it should be continued.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to ask the gentleman in reference to the reorganization program. It is generally conceded now that program can be set up by law through agreement by Congress with the Executive, and plans shall be submitted to the Congress. If not acted on, they shall have the force of law.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. Analyzing that, if the Congress and the executive department agree to a plan whereby the universal military training program may be submitted, not to a commission or to a board or to a department of Government, but to the Congress itself, you might say acting as a commission, and it adopts that plan affirmatively, why would not that be a similar case?

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman refers to plans under the reorganization bill sent to us by the President. Of course, that is not a precedent at all because the plans which are sent to us by the President under the Reorganization Act are initiated by the President himself. He had had his opportunity to pass on the plan. We simply give his plan our approval or disapproval.

Mr. BROOKS. We can set up a commission and agree that the commission adopt a plan and submit it back to us. If we fail to act it is law.

Mr. ELSTON. I am sure that would be an unwarranted delegation of power. Moreover, under such procedure, the President would not have had his opportunity to exercise his constitutional right to approve or to veto it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I presume from what the gentleman says that if the President were directed to submit a plan to the Congress, the Congress could by concurrent resolution approve or disapprove it?

Mr. ELSTON. I doubt that, since that would not be similar to the procedure under the Reorganization Act. Under the Reorganization Act, which was passed by Congress and signed by the President, the submission of plans of reorganization of executive departments is authorized.

This method of attempting to legislate by concurrent resolution is not new. During the Roosevelt administrations it was employed many times. During the Truman administration it has been employed many times, but two wrongs do not make a right. Since the Supreme Court of the United States has never passed on the question, the fact that Congress has been doing something which may be unconstitutional does not make it constitutional. You cannot make an unconstituonal act constitutional by practice or custom.

Mr. HINSHAW. Suppose that the commission submits a plan and the Congress decides to change the plan and by concurrent resolution approves the changed plan, then the President does not like the thing and pays no attention to the concurrent resolution. He can then proceed on his own authority to put any plan into effect he wants to?

Mr. ELSTON. The President could properly take the position that the plan which was adopted by a concurrent resolution is not the law of the land, but he, of course, could not put a plan of his own ilnto effect that was not authorized by law.

Mr. HINSHAW. You put in the law here there should be 6 months of military training and 6 years in the Reserves. That is sufficient law, I think, to enable the President to institute any plan he wants to.

Mr. ELSTON. The President might take the position that that is sufficient as to that particular phase of the law.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Does the gentleman not agree with me on the concurrent-resolution feature that it would depend on whether it is a condition precedent or a condition subsequent? In other words, in answer to the gentleman from California, fearing the President might be able to put it into effect because the concurrent resolution was not effective, if it was a condition precedent he could not do it. The point is that a concurrent resolution terminating has always been sustained, not by the courts but here in the Congress, on the ground that it is a condition subsequent, beyond which the law shall not proceed.

Mr. ELSTON. I have every reason to believe that we would respect our concurrent resolution, but it still would not have the force of law.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. Chairman, it would appear that while this bill contains many desirable and highly essential features, it at the same time has its objectionable side. The objections may be and should be corrected by proper amendments so that we may present a united front on the only part of the bill that is needed at this time in our national defense effort.

[Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the Committee on Armed Services and having heard the testimony and evidence produced before that com-

mittee during the several weeks we studied this important subject of selective-service extension and UMT, and also again this session being a member of the Subcommittee on Reserve Components of the Military Establishment, also having been present on this House floor during all the present debate these 4 days, I believe I can add to, clarify, and emphasize a few material points and ultimate conclusions in support of this bill as it comes from the Committee on Armed Services. I make my remarks having in mind that my distinguished chairman has announced a clear and constructive amendment. That amendment is clearly so reasonable and sound no voice has been raised against it.

As no Member has raised his or her voice during this debate against the proposed extention of the Selective Service Act of 1948 as proposed in this bill, it is clear to me that the people of this great Nation generally recognize the necessity for its extension and this House knows the extension is necessary. Therefore I will treat briefly with the UMT division of this bill, only.

It has been stated in the committee report that the avowed purposes of this UMT proposal are, first, to enable the armed services to immediately raise and maintain an armed force of sufficient size as determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet our minimum security requirements and, second, to establish a universal military-training program.

Now, as to the first objective which has been stated. The necessity for raising an armed force of sufficient size to meet our minimum national defense security requirements is so self-evident and so much the paramount issue and the responsibility of this Congress that I only need to mention it, and you unanimously agree with me. The Constitution charges us with this continuing responsibility. It is as clear as crystal. No Members desires to shirk it, I feel sure. Our security is at stake. But whether or not we in Congress and the American people should let the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our Military Establishment determine from their expert training and experience, what the minimum requirements for our national security should be; then they recommend them to us and we take their advice, is the subject at issue, brought forth in the recent 4 days' debate on this bill.

Some of the opponents of universal military training apparently believe they know more about, or at least as much of, what is needed to meet our minimum military security requirements, as do our combined and total Military Establishment, as represented to Congress by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am not only disturbed, I am shocked, to hear so many opposing this bill say so much of what cannot help but be, and will naturally be, construed by aggressive Communists, Stalin, and his cohorts, as less than lack of faith in the ability of our American military. Aggressive communism delights to hear our top military criticized and referred to with undignified words and with careless, thoughtless language—not giving any proof with our criticism.

Such criticism, to the extent that it appears unjust and unfounded, is weakening to our sinews and results in causing natural fears and anguish in the minds of the American people. The American people need the assurance of sound, competent military leadership, rather than any carping, unwarranted innuendos and insinuations against those on whom we must depend.

In this connection, I yield to no man the having of a more fixed purpose than I do, that our beloved Nation shall not become militarized or fall under the control of the military. I have always felt that way. Constitutionally and on all other grounds, from the office of the Commander in Chief to the Halls of Congress, ours has been and is and must be maintained in fact, as a civilian economy and a civilian-controlled military through the actions of Congress on appropriations and otherwise. We must remain a Republic of free men, living daily the democratic way of life. There is no need of civilian control passing to the military. It is inconsistent with our whole history.

It has not been my knowledge nor experience in the 5 years, almost, that I have been here now, that the rank and file of our Military Establishment leadership has been or now is less able in their profession, or less patriotic or less devoted to duty and the best interests of our great Nation, than are we Representatives in Congress, who have been chosen from the many millions to patriotically represent the American people legislatively on a high ethical, moral, and nonpartisan plane in matters of national defense and national security as concerned in this bill. I recall the Biblical story of some having motes in their eyes. Let us be eminently fair in our remarks.

Finally, as to the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to the minimum requirements for national defense and security, I want them to know that as far as I am concerned, I consider them continuously charged with that responsibility, legally, morally, and on all points. I look to them to be well-qualified and equipped to fully, adequately, safely, and vigilantly determine our minimum military and defense requirements at all times, and then to recommend and advise Congress promptly what those minimum requirements may be for our national defense against aggression. I see no other way provided whereby we in Congress can the most safely and sanely proceed to render our legislative responsibilities; even though we must always continue to control the numerical strength and expenditures of the Military Establishment by our appropriation control and legislative processes.

Our Joint Chiefs of Staff have informed us of the need of immediately raising an armed force of 3,462,000 men. They advise this is the minimum sufficient; they advise us of the necessity of maintaining this size force to meet our minimum security requirements probably during the next several years.

As one Member of Congress, I would not want the responsibility of refusing to provide the minimum military recommended by our Joint Chiefs of Staff in the event of a global war or even under present global conditions. I know I am not sufficiently informed to know as much as they do. We must depend upon them for their military opinions and advice. I would rather err in favor of having a million men too many, for a short period, than 1,000 men too few at all in time of necessity. Aggressive communism knows only the power of might as a deterrent to her world conquest pronouncements. America never has had, and does not now have, and never will have, with God's help, any desire or determination to conquer a territory or to conquer a people. We must always keep the heart of America on that level—no conquest of territory and no conquest of people. We must build a world of good-will relationships through righteous treatment of people.

But America has an immediate and continuing responsibility not only to the United States of America, but to the freedom-loving and freedom-seeking peoples all over the world. And our own security is in jeopardy. Distance and space have been shrunk; the time element and distance have been practically erased; communication delays and transportation bottlenecks have been eliminated. We in America have been catapulted into a world neighborhood which is by hour and by day becoming more dependent and interdependent on the daily behavior and conduct of the nations constituting this world neighborhood. We are a neighbor in this world neighborhood and cannot change our residence, street, or location.

Having previously discussed the first stated and avowed purpose of this bill, as found on page 9 of the committee report, let us now briefly discuss the second objective which is, to wit, "that it will establish a universal training program."

At this point I wish to inform my colleagues I will digress from my written notes to speak ad lib. First I wish to refer to the Towe bill, and wish to remind you that in the Eightieth Congress it almost passed a universal military bill. It passed the Armed Services Committee unanimously. I read the bill H. R. 4278, Report No. 1107, introduced July 18, 1947. I found the concluding statement by the Committee on Armed Services saying this:

> The committee concludes that a flexible well-administered program of UMT as provided in H. R. 4278 is a vital necessity to the United State at this time.

This bill by the Republican-controlled Armed Services Committee also created a UMT Commission.

I find no objection, so far as I am concerned, to the Congress referring for study and survey and report to a committee controlled by a civilian majority, such as this Commission will be under this bill. Three of the five must be civilians. I find no objection to referring to such a commission approved by the Senate of responsible citizens for study, survey, and report back to the Congress well considered plans and programs for a UMT program. I think it is wise that we set up such a commission

that will have a year or two, or even longer if you please, to study that important subject and report back to the Congress. When the reported plan can be amended, adopted, or entirely rejected. So far as I am concerned, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, at this stage of my information I do not feel qualified, to be frank with you, to report now a UMT bill to this House in detail so far as my judgment and knowledge is concerned, and draw up a program of universal military training of which I would ask your approval. I do not feel I have the knowledge. I would need much study and advice. I fully know I would have to have the expert advice and opinion of men who know far more and of men who are admittedly best advised on those problems. We need educators and others to help us. I think it is very important that Members of Congress get the best advice they can and have it coming from an experienced group of men specifically delegated for that purpose under this bill for 1 or 2 or 3 years to study the problem and then report back to Congress. We can take it or leave it; we can take the good and leave out what we wish. We can then more intelligently legislate. We are surely not ready to do it now.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have given up my place on the speaking schedule to some of my other colleagues so that they could get away earlier in the day, as they had pressing official business in committee work. So I have shortened my remarks.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman from California is a member of the subcommittee on reserves. Earlier in the day the gentleman from Michigan brought up the question of when the Reserve program would be given to the Congress.

The question was asked as to the specific time and readiness of the Defense Department to give that program to the committee. Since the gentleman is a member of that Reserve subcommittee, I think the RECORD ought to show, in his time, that the Defense Department is prepared and has been for several weeks prepared to come before the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee with a Reserve program, and as soon as our legislative schedule permits, we hope to be able to have representatives of that Department give us the Reserve program in detail. I have consulted with the able gentleman from California on that point.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for that observation. He very ably heads this important subcommittee, and I enjoy working under his leadership. I do wish to now mention a couple of subjects and ideas that I mentioned in Armed Services Committee, and I do it with a great deal of feeling that they are important to consider under this universal military-training proposal. I think this House should be reminded of the fact that if and when this UMT program is set up, it is set up for the youth of our Nation between 18½ and 19 years of age, the 'tender" young men of our Nation, so-called, the youngest in our military call. On pages 36 and 37 of the committee hearings there is quoted there a discussion between myself and General Marshall. Then, later in the report, a discussion between myself and Mrs. Rosenberg and General Hershey, dealing with the matter of the morals and welfare of these young men in the UMT.

I wish to say as one Member of Congress I shall expect the Commission, when it is set up, and if no Commission is set up, I expect any bill passed by this Congress to contain adequate provisions to protect, as far as they can be, the morals and the welfare of the young men who go into this national training corps. I think it is high time that we in this Congress declare ourselves that we are not afraid to speak clearly and firmly on the proposition that the conditions and circumstances surrounding the training of boys and young men must be to the uttermost for their protection and their strength; rather than for their weakness and the destruction of their character and their morals. Such protection against commercialized vice of all kinds is a must.

Another thing, about 5 years ago I spoke over a considerable radio hook-up in New York City, and at that time I extemporaneously said something like this: "It is time America gets on her knees and stays there." I have said it frequently since that time. I think that is true. I know it is true. To do so keeps a person or a people humble enough to deserve prosperity. I wish at this point in our discussion, because I do not believe it has been sufficiently emphasized in this debate, to say that military strength alone will not give us world peace. Military might alone will not do the job. Adequate military strength is absolutely necessary at this time, to prevent Russian communistic aggression, but the greatest force, if you please, the greatest force that we have in this Nation, is the morality, honesty, integrity, and clean living and righteousness, and all the other intangible elements and factors that enter into American life and make the hearts and souls of men, as the strength of 10. As far as I am concerned, I know that these moral and spiritual powers have more permanent power than even powder and bullets. We need to get on our knees and keep our powder dry, also. I want to urge that as we think of making our Nation stronger in a military way, stronger than ever before, that we place paramount in our objectives the proposition that our main national objective in becoming strong in a military way, is not to conquer people and territory but to be strong enough to compel world peace. This is not inconsistent. It is factual. That, if you please, is my paramount justification for voting for this bill for UMT. It gives us a reserve source of military training which will make it unnecessary to keep a back-breaking sized Regular Army over a term of years. It will give us the strength to keep off a war of communistic aggression, I hope.

If you ask us what letters or communications I have had for or against UMT from my congressional district, I will say that not more than 25 residents of my congressional district have written me opposing it, which I have had many times that number of approvals. And just a few minutes ago I was handed this telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 6, 1951.*
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The following national organizations urge your support of Senate bill 1 as amended by House Armed Services Committee including UMT and extension of draft in one bill.

National Guard Association of the United States, by Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, President; Reserve Officers Association, by E. A. Evans, Executive Director; Military Order of the World Wars, by Milton G. Baker, Commander in Chief; Adjutant Generals Association of the United States, by Maj. Gen. W. H. Harrison, Jr., President; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, by Charles C. Ralls, Commander in Chief; the American Legion, by Miles D. Kennedy, National Legislative Director; Disabled American Veterans, by Boniface R. Maile, National Commander; AMVETS, by Harold Russell, National Commander.

I think the American people feel we in Congress will vote our honest-to-God conscientious convictions upon all the known facts.

It is a chance for world peace sooner through present strength and might. But we must keep our objective—a just world peace.

I had a son—some of you have said he was a distinguished son because he gave his life for our country in the uniform of the Air Force as a first lieutenant. I had always been opposed to the conscription of the young men of our Nation until one time in his lifetime, when home for a few days' vacation from the Aleutian Islands where he was stationed, he said this to me, he said: "Dad, be sure, if you ever have anything to do with it, that the young men of our Nation before they go to college, if possible, have more military training. Give them more training, dad, than I had before I had to go into combat." And so you can understand, you men who know, how I feel. The thing that convinced me outside of the volume of evidence that came before our committee and convinced us, outside of the justification that I know these men made before our committee, the evidence and the telling to the committee, to justify this UMT commission at this time, was the appeal of my own son based on his experience in the United States Air Force when he said to me: "Dad, give the American boys, if you ever get a chance, more basic training than I, myself, had before I went into combat in the Aleutian zone."

So I wish to urge you, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, to realize that we are not going to abdicate anything from Congress; we are going to keep control of the UMT plan; we can end it if we want to. I do not anticipate or look toward abdicating any legislative responsibility on my part. If that commission comes back to us and makes recommendations which need the legislation of

Congress, we will enact the legislation. The commission cannot and need not legislate. Congress will continue to legislate if necessary. I do not conceive of that commission's usurping the power of Congress or taking over unto itself the pronouncement or the enforcement of rules that have the effect of law. This bill does not intend or allow that. I am not afraid of that at all because I know and you know that if the commission comes back to us with a plan and a program which we approve, then that program or plan, after we amend it or otherwise treat it, if it needs the power of legislation, Congress is the only power to legislate.

I have not again repeated the figures of either men or dollars involved. Members have already done so—several of them. You have the financial saving of many millions which will result before you. You have heard of the necessity of this UMT plan to gain a permanent reserve. You know Congress can end the program or change it at will. You know it will not start until or unless Congress has first and previously approved the plan and passed the necessary legislative enactments and provided the money. You know it is even possible the world will settle down to settle up in time so the UMT will never be necessary. God grant it may be so. But, meantime, let us not procrastinate and do less than our fullest duty to ourselves and to our freedom-loving friends and allies for peace on earth.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, bill S. 1 which we are now considering has as its objective the common defense and security of the United States and for other purposes. The effort for national security is an old one. For many years organization for group security has been the objective of even primitive forms of social organization. This security has taken on many different forms and for offensive as well as defensive purposes. We like to think and we profess that all policies in the field of military preparedness are for defensive purposes and yet we have seen throughout history that these defensive measures for security eventually justify the claim for aggressive action. It has long been a popular concept that the best defense is an offense. Napoleon, Bismarck and many other leaders used that concept to start a war.

History also shows that foreign policy as the official conduct of relations of our sovereignty to others grew up side by side with the professional soldier and the professional army. The military as an institution from the outset of civilization has been a pertinent tool of foreign policy. The Military Establishment provides the latent force that makes diplomacy effective. It likewise is that arm of government which has always been a heavy burden upon taxpayers.

Since all expenditures for the military and for foreign-policy operations must be paid for by the people, the population as a whole is beginning to realize that the most of its Government's foreign policy has a direct bearing upon their lives for they foot the bill.

No President or Secretary of State or the Chief of Staff will admit that his policy is aggressive and calculated to bring war. So here today we hear the same arguments that have been used since 1939—that whatever we do is always designed for peaceful purposes. Yet we look in vain for evidence of peace anywhere in the world.

The necessity of deceiving the people, especially in matters of foreign policy, says Mr. Felix Morley in an article on foreign policy to be issued very soon, is indeed an accepted principle of statesmanship. Machiavelli, writing The Prince in 1513, devoted all of one chapter under the title "In What Way Princes Must Keep Faith." The conclusion of this great political scientist was that a chief of state must always "seem to be all mercy, faith, integrity, humanity, and religion." However, he continues, those that have been best able to imitate the fox have succeeded best. But it is necessary, he goes on to say, to be able to disguise this character well and to be a great feigner and dissembler; and men are so simple and so ready to obey present masters that those who deceive will always find those who allow themselves to be deceived. It is hard to believe when Machiavelli made that statement in 1513 that it would have such a close application to the arguments that we have listened to in this debate. Machiavelli also said when foreign policy is unsuccessful the tempo of deception must be increased and the blame for failure must, if possible, be focused on a situation for which it is claimed the chief of state is not responsible.

Alliances such as the North Atlantic Pact, as a device of foreign policy, are as old as recorded history. Though unfamiliar to most Americans because until recently it was our policy to have nothing to do with entangling alliances, today we find ourselves stripping our economy and imposing great financial burdens upon our people. All of this in an effort to bolster questionable alliances to the detriment of our way of life.

As we review history and remember great civilizations which relied upon the use of force to maintain their position, there is but one conclusion. It has failed to bring peace or security. The use of force has led rather to the disintegration and destruction of those empires. This is the road we are traveling today. There will be neither peace nor security if we continue to march down the road which is proposed in the pending legislation. Peace through force is a fiction; it is contrary to the judgment of history, as I read it.

Mr. Chairman, there will never be a lasting peace while we continue to rely upon guns and bombs. This is the program we are asked to approve today. I repeat, that peace and security will elude us if we use bombs, bacteria, pacts, promises or advance commitments. Since 1915 the role of commitments in American policy have obviously insured the enlargement of limited wars to general wars. Yet they have always been advertised as vindications of international morality. So as we look at the question before us, we are forced to the conclusion that the methods we now seek to use can result in but one condition, namely the ultimate destruction of the United States of America as we know it. In 1917 we joined with other nations in the use of force for peace. We failed. It was the same in 1941. What reasons are there to expect a different result now?

Mr. Chairman, we need to do some thinking in new directions if we are to pass a peaceful world on to those who follow us. It can never be, I repeat, achieved by the use of alliances and military force. War is an evil; good cannot be secured by evil means. War is a cancerous growth of minor conflicts which would remain small as issues between the nations concerned but which grow into larger conflicts of war as a consequence of amassing forces by means of involuntary servitude.

Mr. Chairman, the decision of whether or not to use force in self-defense is a matter of strategy to be determined by us but I remind you that Christ's method met the force of great military and political power 2,000 years ago and its defensive strength was impressive. Has not the Prince of Peace demonstrated the secret of both peace and defense for which we ourselves have not been able to see the reason. Why it works so well may defy some of our instincts and surpass our full understanding.

Mr. Chairman, we are at war and I shall vote to amend the Selective Service Act if the age for induction is fixed at 19 years. I see no justification for this country furnishing the great bulk of fighting men for countries all over the world when the draft age in those countries is higher than here. I would remind you that we are furnishing 90 percent of the men in Korea and as usual we are also providing the money and the material.

It is my opinion that universal military training should not be in this bill. I do not think it is a military training bill at all. It is bait to secure support for the pending measure. This House should consider a separate bill which incorporates the principle of universal military training. I do think the people want the question settled soon but this is not the place to do it. I shall vote against it in its present form.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if we are living in a world today of lessening tension I am not aware of it. If there is anything that appears to be guaranteed to the people of the world these days it is stabilized tension. If we are not faced with a condition of all-out war, it appears we are faced with a long period of stress. The most prominent men of our country have prophesied that this period of stress will probably last for some 20 years. We cannot afford during that period to spend some thirty-five to fifty billions of dollars a year in military expenses, because should we do that we would lose the war economically. If we do not get involved in

all-out war we must have a program that is within the capacity of our economy to stand and one that will be adequate to cope with any emergency that may present itself. We cannot move up and down like a thermometer and suddenly expose our unprepared youths to meet an emergency situation. This can only result in the reckless expenditure of lives and money. Time after time we have had Congressmen appear in the well of this House and complain about the short period that existed between the time a man was called into the service and when he died in Korea. We cannot be expedient with the lives of men. The men of this country are entitled to the best plans that the best brains of this country can devise.

Today the youth of America have had no opportunity to plan their lives. There is to them no real security. Consider the inactive reservist who has been called back for the second time within a decade, men who said they were willing to serve their country in the event of an all-out war, but who have been snatched once again from their home life. Why? Only because there were not adequately trained men available to take their places. As long as we pursue a hapazard system, repeated injustices will follow. We listened to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] and the advice that his son passed on to him. Because there was a boy who had had experience in war. He knew what training meant.

It is up to us to prepare the men of this country, to give them the training that they need. Strength will direct our destiny until such time as the Ten Commandments of God are imbedded and felt in the hearts of men, but until that time comes we must have recourse to strength, unlike prior to World War II, when our allies represented strength, today we find them practically destitute economically and having been ravaged by war, have perhaps lost the will to fight. The vitality of force and factory that was available to us during the days of the League of Nations is not available to us under the United Nations. Youthful and vigorous America finds itself facing new conditions. We have greater responsibilities and challenges in a smaller and a more explosive world.

We have heard speaker after speaker here tell us that other countries are not taking their boys at 18½ and keeping them in service for 26 months. If the people of this country have a suspicion of the aid we might expect to receive from our so-called friends overseas, it is all the more reason why in this country we must protect ourselves. It is not our friends I am primarily concerned about, it is our potential enemies and what they may do that really concerns me.

The universal military program is designed to permit a smaller standing Military Establishment with a broad Reserve base. With the knowledge and assurance that we have trained reserves that can augment our standing Armed Forces, we can decrease the size of our standing force, and take a calculated risk to meet any emergency. This bill does not commit any Member to any definite plan. If you are interested in some particular plan you will have an opportunity to discuss it before the committee. You can amend it on the floor and in its final analysis you can accept or reject the plan. I know there are probably a hundred plans in the minds of various Members of Congress. I have one and probably each of you sitting here at this moment has a plan. But if we can devise a plan that will cut down on the standing Army and lower the cost to the taxpayers and still have military security, and if we can also give some certainty to the plans of our youth, and if we can give more bargaining power to our diplomats, and if we can create a reservoir of men to meet an emergency and to make an enemy think twice before he attacks, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of such a plan.

I propose to support the bill when it comes to final vote when it contains certain amendments which will be offered.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to add to the dissention and general confusion that has developed in the prolonged debate on this legislation. I have requested this time in order that I might plead the cause of more than 100,000 injured and otherwise disabled ex-servicemen who, in our zeal to prepare America for another war, we may make the "forgotten men" of World Wars I and II.

I shall, Mr. Chairman, during the course of my discussion, ask to include in the RECORD a mass of detailed information to prove that the medical, dental, and nursing staffs of our Veterans' hospitals are being raided by the armed services to such an extent that before the close of the current year, more than half of our veterans' hospitals will be closed to these helpless men who so richly deserve every service and assistance our Government can possibly render.

I am fully aware of the dire emergency that faces our Nation. I realize the need for prompt and courageous action in setting up our defenses. We must, of course, put first things first; but there should be a triple-A priority for those men who, in 1917 and again in 1941, rendered such gallant service to America.

Today we have in operation throughout the Nation 142 veterans' hospitals. On January 15 of this year, these hospitals were short 379 doctors. Hardly a single one of them had a full medical staff. On this same date, there were six new hospitals completed, prior to January 1, 1951, that could not open their doors because there were no doctors available. These new installations were located in Albany, N. Y., at Erie, Pa., at Seattle, Wash., and at Beckley and Clarksburg in West Virginia. One hundred and five doctors were needed to staff them. The one located in my district, at Clarksburg, has in the past few days opened its doors; but only 56 patients have been admitted because there are not enough doctors.

To add to this already deplorable situation, there are 21 other new hospitals now in the course of construction that will be completed in this calendar year of 1951. They will require 355 doctors and there is not a single doctor in sight. One cannot escape the economy angle involved—or rather, the lack of economy. The six units already completed and the 21 units nearing completion will cost in excess of $300,000,000. Can we justify such a huge expenditure with no return in the way of service to the thousands of servicemen now pleading for admission to these hospitals?

What I have just told you is not even half the story. This already bad situation is further aggravated by the action of the armed services in recent months in calling for active service Reserve medical men and other doctors who are subject to service under the provisions of an act by the Eighty-first Congress that provides for drafting doctors between the ages of 25 years and 50 years.

As of the 1st day of April, this year, a total of 418 of these reservists and other doctors have been separated from the staffs of the 142 operating hospitals. A total of 136 of these are specialists particularly trained for the care of servicemen. There are 79 other doctors who have been called on whom the Veterans' Administration has asked for deferments. Few, if any of these, will be deferred, and they are subject to call at a later date.

The total score is a shortage of—

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) Present installations | 379 |
| New installations | 460 |
| | 839 |
| (b) Armed service calls (separated) | 418 |
| Armed service calls (pending) | 79 |
| Total | 1,436 |

The situation in the dental and nursing staffs is also acute. Four hundred and thirty-six nurses have already been separated and 57 others have been ordered to report for active duty. In the case of dentists, the smaller hospitals are the hardest hit. Many have but one or two on the staff which has been wiped out by the summary and arbitrary action of the Armed Forces.

I would like to submit and put in the record these statistics that I have here.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR,
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
*Washington, D. C., January 18, 1951.*

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BAILEY: The attached material is forwarded in accordance with our telephone conversation of yesterday.

If any further information is desired, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Very truly yours,

ARDEN FREER, M. D.,
*Acting Chief Medical Director.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of full-time physicians needed for existing installations (from par. 4, p. 2, of letter to Mr. Kraable, Jan. 9, 1951) | 379 |
| Number of full-time physicians needed for hospitals which have construction completed, but not open for admission of patients (from enclosure A) | 105 |
| Number of full-time physicians needed for hospitals which will have construction completed during the calendar year 1951 (from enclosure B) | 355 |
| Total | 839 |

[Enclosure A]

*Veterans' Administration hospitals with construction completed but not open for admission of patients*

| | Date construction completed | Estimated date for admission of patients | Number of beds | Type of beds | Number of physicians needed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Omaha, Nebr. | October 1950 | February 1951 | 486 | General medical | 22 |
| Beckley, W. Va. | do | do | 200 | do | 10 |
| Clarksburg, W. Va. | do | do | 200 | do | 10 |
| Erie, Pa. | January 1951 | March 1951 | 208 | do | 10 |
| Seattle, Wash. | do | do | 325 | do | 16 |
| Albany, N. Y. | do | April 1951 | 1,005 | do | 37 |
| Total | | | 2,424 | | 105 |

[Enclosure B]

*Veterans' Administration hospitals which will complete construction during calendar year 1951*

| Location | Estimated date of completion of construction | Number of beds | Type of beds | Number of physicians needed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seattle, Wash. | January 1951 | 325 | General medical | 17 |
| Miles City, Mont. | March 1951 | 100 | do | 5 |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | do | 494 | do | (1) |
| Phoenix, Ariz. | April 1951 | 192 | do | (1) |
| Bonham, Tex. | May 1951 | 50 | do | 4 |
| | | 288 | Domiciliary | |
| Denver, Colo. | do | 494 | General medical | (2) |
| Kansas City, Mo. | do | 498 | do | 25 |
| Madison, Wis. | June 1951 | 486 | do | 25 |
| Louisville, Ky. | July 1951 | 494 | do | (1) |
| Iowa City, Iowa | August 1951 | 489 | do | 25 |
| East Orange, N. J. | September 1951 | 945 | do | 34 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | do | 496 | do | 25 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | October 1951 | 496 | do | 25 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | do | 546 | Neuropsychiatric | 20 |
| Baltimore, Md. | November 1951 | 295 | Tuberculosis | 17 |
| Birmingham, Ala. | do | 497 | General medical | 24 |
| Durham, N. C. | do | 491 | do | 25 |
| New Orleans, La. | do | 493 | do | (1) |
| Boston, Mass. | December 1951 | 955 | do | 34 |
| St. Louis, Mo. | do | 486 | do | 25 |
| Syracuse, N. Y. | do | 496 | do | 25 |
| Total | | 10,106 | | 355 |

[1] Transfer from old hospital.
[2] Transfer from Fort Logan.

*Status of medical military personnel as of Jan. 11, 1951*

DOCTORS

Total number of—
- Doctors separated to enter armed services:
  - Doctors ---- 119
  - Residents ---- 194
  - Total ---- 313
- Requests for delays submitted to armed services:
  - Doctors ---- 281
  - Residents ---- 106
  - Total ---- 387
- Requests for delays awaiting action by armed services:
  - Doctors ---- 78
  - Residents ---- 27
  - Total ---- 105
- Delays granted by armed services:
  - Doctors ---- 43
  - Residents ---- 19
  - Total ---- 62
- Delays granted by armed services:
  - Doctors ---- 47
  - Residents ---- 37
  - Total ---- 84
- Total number of—Continued
  - Requests returned by armed services without action (physically disqualified; to be resubmitted upon receipt of extended active-duty orders; not to be called at this time, etc.):
    - Doctors ---- 113
    - Residents ---- 23
    - Total ---- 136

DENTISTS

Total number of—
- Dentists separated to enter armed services ---- 38
- Requests for delays submitted to armed services ---- 102
- Requests for delays awaiting action by armed services ---- 22
- Delays granted by armed services ---- 19
- Delays denied by armed services ---- 19
- Requests returned by armed services without action (physically disqualified; to be resubmitted upon receipt of extended active-duty orders; not to be called at this time, etc.) ---- 42

NURSES

Total number of—
- Nurses separated to enter armed services ---- 270
- Requests for delays submitted to armed services ---- 209
- Requests for delays awaiting action by armed services ---- 60
- Delays granted by armed services ---- 27
- Delays denied by armed services ---- 109
- Total number of—Continued
  - Requests returned by armed services without action (physically disqualified; to be resubmitted upon receipt of extended active-duty orders; not to be called at this time, etc.) ---- 13

*Doctors separated to enter armed services by specialty as of Jan. 11, 1951*

| | |
|---|---|
| Internal medicine | 49 |
| Neuropsychiatry | 17 |
| General surgery | 14 |
| Orthopedic surgery | 4 |
| Neuro surgery | 1 |
| Plastic surgery | 1 |
| Anesthesiology | 1 |
| Urology | 1 |
| Otolaryngology | 2 |
| Eye, ear, nose, and throat | 5 |
| Ophthalmology | 3 |
| Tuberculosis | 7 |
| Pathology | 2 |
| Radiology | 4 |
| Cardiology | 1 |
| Dermatology | 1 |
| Obstetrics | 1 |
| Physical medicine | 1 |
| Gastroenterology | 2 |
| Tumor research | 1 |
| Total | 119 |

Source: Prepared by Medical Manpower Unit, Jan. 15, 1951.

JANUARY 9, 1950.

Mr. T. O. KRAABEL,
*National Director, the American Legion, National Rehabilitation Commission, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. KRAABEL: This is in reply to your letter of November 27, 1950, concerning the comments of Mr. Grant Morgan, your national field representative, following his visit to the VA Center, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., August 7 through August 11.

My staff and I have been aware of, and concerned regarding the lack of doctors in the specialties of psychiatry and otolaryngology at this center and have given Sioux Falls high priority for the procurement of these specialists.

We are most fortunate insofar as the psychiatric situation at the center is concerned, as on November 7 one of the psychiatrists at Lincoln, Nebr., requested transfer to Sioux Falls. With this exception, in spite of all recruitment efforts, both in and out of the Veterans' Administration, no psychiatrist up until this time has been at all interested in an assignment to Sioux Falls. It is expected that this physician will be transferred the latter part of January, unless, of course, the Armed Forces should take him.

The possibility of recruiting a qualified psychiatrist for replacement at Lincoln, Nebr., is practically nil. As far as the State of South Dakota is concerned, the Veterans' Administration has in its employment 40 percent of all psychiatrists listed by the American Psychiatric Association as practicing their specialty in this State.

In regard to the possibility of assigning an otolaryngologist to the center, I can only paint a dim picture. Earlier this year, before the Korean incident when recruitment was still a possibility, my staff interviewed several candidates, but they were definitely not interested in coming with the Veterans' Administration for assignment in South Dakota. However, we will continue our efforts to find an otolaryngologist willing to accept this assignment, either from physicians presently with the Veterans' Administration or by recruitment. It is out of the question to try to transfer a physician unless he is agreeable to the transfer. If we try to force the

transfer, he will resign and be lost to the Veterans' Administration. There are such lucrative opportunities for qualified specialists in civilian practice that doctors are resigning rather than accept an assignment to which they are not agreeable.

I am very glad you brought to my attention the situation at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., as I am more concerned than anyone else over this lack of physician personnel, which is rapidly becoming evident in more and more of our hospitals. Your letter concerning the center at Sioux Falls gives me an opportunity to acquaint you with this grave situation which faces the whole Veterans' Administration.

As you are aware, we have for the past 2 years maintained the highest type of medical care to veterans, in spite of the handicaps of budgetary and ceiling limitations under which the Veterans' Administration is operating.

Our present situation is this: As of November 1, 1950, we had 290 fewer full-time physicians and 130 fewer part-time physicians on duty in the Veterans' Administration than were on duty as of February 1, 1950, in addition to a loss of 162 residents. The opening and staffing of 21 new hospitals during this period made the situation doubly acute. Due to shortages in critical categories we are beginning to spread our medical care in specific specialties dangerously thin.

This decrease of 290 full-time physicians does not seem as great as compared to the total number of physicians in the Veterans' Administration, but when transposed into terms of patient care, it is a major item. If we apply the ratio of one physician to 30 patients, then the care of 290 times 30 equals 8,700 patients being affected by this loss. The total number of vacancies for physicians was reported by the field stations to be 379 as of December 7, 1950.

It is my expressed policy, to which I am irrevocably committed, to maintain the highest quality of medical care for veteran patients. If I am faced with alternative of continuing our present standard of medical care for fewer patients and poor medical care for a greater number of patients, I choose the former. In considering anything less I woud be derelict in my duty and responsibility to veteran patients.

If the Armed Forces continue to call Veterans' Administration physicians at the same rate as in the recent past, we will be in dire need of physicians at our existing hospitals, and the staffing of certain new hospitals to be activated in the remainder of the fiscal year 1951 may prove to be a practical impossibility.

As you may be aware, the Office of the Secretary of Defense has not yet set up any system of permanent deferment for physicians. The best we can do is obtain a temporary delay in orders, which in the long run will catch up with us.

My staff and I are devoting a major part of our time to developing some effective method of easing this crisis, but in view of the present situation I have found no over-all relief or remedy possible within the authority of the Veterans' Administration. If the Veterans' Administration were placed on a parity with the Armed Forces for procurement of physicians, this would do much to stabilize our personnel situation.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
*Chief Medical Director.*

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote the last paragraph of a letter from Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, former head of the Medical Services Division of the Veterans' Administration. Dr. Magnuson says:

My Staff and I are devoting a major part of our time to developing some effective method of easing this crisis, but in view of the present situation I have found no overall relief or remedy possible within the authority of the Veterans' Administration. If the Veterans' Administration were placed on a parity with the Armed Forces for procurement of physicians, this would do much to stabilize our personnel situation.

I want to propose to my colleagues that we remedy this situation by inserting a short, simple amendment to this pending legislation. The amendment should be inserted on page 33, after line 8 and would read as follows:

Said paragraph (1) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "No physician or dentist who is engaged in full-time employment as such at any hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the thirtieth anniversary of the date of his birth."

I had thought of asking for deferment of doctors between the ages of 25 and 50 years. I recall the Government paid for the education of several thousand doctors during and after World War II. Many of these young men are under 30 years of age and should discharge their obligation to the Government.

I shall go into this matter in greater detail when this legislation reaches the amendment stage. In the meanwhile, it is my sincere hope that you will join me in helping these men when the opportunity is at hand and the need is so great.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have brought some of the same information to the House already, the part regarding the number of doctors and nurses that have been seized by the armer services for duty. I have introduced a bill which would give the doctors and the nurses military status. That was necessary in World War II. We were not getting the doctors and nurses then. It was done, and the situation was eased. If they do that, Veterans' Administration doctors can be kept in the VA or in some cases there could be a transfer of doctors from one service to another, and the Veterans' Administration and the care of veterans would be better. The appalling thing to me, as it is to the gentleman, is that our men are injured in the service and then the benefits they shoud have are not secured to them. Also the Veterans' Administration does not fight as it should fight to give the men the benefits to which they are entitled under the law.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her comments. I know of her great interest in the veterans of this country.

In conclusion, may I state that this Congress would be remiss in its duty if it does not at this time take advantage of an opportunity to handle the situation that will close, as I said before, half the veterans' hospitals of the United States before the first of January 1952.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very fine and very necessary contribution.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have been on this floor every minute throughout the entire debate on this question of preparedness through manpower conscription, and certainly the only purpose of this legislation before us today is preparedness—yet no one has as yet touched upon the point of what to me is the material question involved in this draft and training issue.

It seems to me that in order to understand what preparation we need for war, we must first consider the basic, underlying reason of why we are heading for war, why we are in the shameful international condition that we are in today. In our thinking let us build our foundation first and ask ourselves why did we get into this mess? Then consider how we are going to get out of it.

First, I want it understood that I am not an isolationist—I propose to defend every free country, every God-fearing country, against the ravages of a godless communism.

Next, I want it understood that I hold no grudge against the military. I think they are doing the only kind of a job they can do under the outmoded kind of training they have had. I do not think they are any worse than any other American organization or Government department which is not responsive to the people. Every department of Government has great difficulty in getting away from the "horse and buggy" days of the past.

But, I want to say at the outset that I am convinced that the principal reason we got into this mess today was because of the inability of our military leadership to depart from the outmoded military textbooks of the past. In their preparation for World War II their only conception of waging such war was surface warfare—fighting man for man, gun for gun, tank for tank, and carcass for carcass.

There is not a person sitting in this room who has not said to himself a thousand times, "How could they do it? How could men with the capacity and the vision of Roosevelt and Churchill sign the agreements that they signed at Yalta and Tehran, or their successors at Potsdam?" How could they do it?

I have read everything that I could read. I have talked with some of those in high places. I have heard those of the top official brackets. I have attended committee hearings. The answer that I submit to you this afternoon for your thought and consideration is the only logical thinking and conclusion that I can come to. I want you to think this through with me. But in doing so, let us be fair, let us be tolerant to the place where it hurts, let us lay aside partisan politics and ask ourselves this simple question of how could great men, international thinkers, world leaders, give the Russian bear one-third of free Europe and the only friend we ever had in Asia, China, and its possession that

we had previously agreed to return to her, Manchuria?

How could they do it?

Oh, yes, I know, I, too, have thought that it was the influence of Alger Hiss and the Remingtons and the other pinks in the State Department and high Government departments, and yet, upon serious reflection, I could not conceive of how those men, even with their inside influence, could do the entire job. They might have been able to sell the book to Roosevelt, but by what magic power could they cast the same spell over Churchill?

There is no question but that Alger Hiss took advantage of the existing hysterical situation to further his nefarious and traitorous ends, but the fundamental reason why our leaders were willing at Yalta and Tehran to trade half of what we had to win by World War II was fear, was panic, was hysteria.

They knew of no way of winning that war against Germany except with ground forces in surface warfare. They knew that this Nation and her democratic allies could not match German troops man for man. They could not believe that air power could do any more than serve as mobile guns, and rather than to see our men slaughtered in a man-to-man struggle in surface warfare in a bloody mile-for-mile battle to recapture lost ground, they were willing to trade the free people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and what not into eternal slavery in exchange for the Russian masses who would move in from the east to help make the kill.

There is no question but that the black hand of the traitorous Hiss was writing the doom of all free people everywhere, that he took advantage of his position and the hysteria of the day to further his nefarious ends at Tehran, but the underlying cause of the shameful trade of friendly China and Manchuria was the fear and hysteria of our military leaders. Marshall and King and our other military experts could not conceive of being able to bring Japan to her knees without the use of ground forces for a bloody invasion to wade in to make the kill. And, because they could not, they were panicky, they were hysterical, and they were willing to trade another friendly nation into dark and doomed slavery in exchange for the Russian masses to move in to help make the invasion.

In spite of the fact that strategic bombing and strategic bombing alone, cut the economic and war potential heart out of Japan and caused her surrender with an army of six million well equipped men still in the field without the need of one single Russian soldier, our military leaders refuse today to admit that their strategy was wrong, they refuse to admit even today that Japan was defeated from the skies.

Let me read to you the words of Secretary Marshall delivered on June 21, 1943, when he said:

> Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing, but he will recover unless the knockout blow is delivered by the Army.

As proof that his thinking has not changed, less than a month ago speaking at Columbia University, said:

> The experience of battle * * * points to the continued and decisive role of ground forces.

General Bradley wrote only last year that he is convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that—

> We shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground.

All of General Collins' statements revolve around his certainty that "the doughboy is the final answer."

No, my friends, let us be fair, let us be tolerant, let us admit that Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam were the result of fear, panic, and hysteria brought about by an outmoded conception of warfare in our military leadership.

Yes, our leadership and their military advisers were hysterical as they sank into the slime of their own ideology of surface warfare, and, as they sank, they were grasping for a straw at Yalta, they were grasping for a straw at Tehran, they were grasping at Potsdam, and my friends, they are panicky today, and because they have no more free people to trade into slavery, they are grasping for another straw, our 18-year-old kids. And well, they might, because if they still refuse to come down to 1951 in their thinking, they will have to draft into their surface forces every man, woman, and child in these United States to be able to meet Russia on the ground man for man.

No, this is not a question of whether 18-year olds make the best soldiers. It is not a question of morals of these kids. It is not a question of whether we need 3,465,342 or 43 men, whatever the figure it, it is a question of national policy, and national policy alone.

It is a question of whether we, as the elected Representatives of the people, are going to serve notice today upon the military that they throw away the old textbooks of Napoleon and his Maginot line successors and come down to 1951 in their methods of warfare.

A vote for this 18½-year-old draft is a vote to ratify Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, because it is the same underlying principle that is facing us today. A vote against it is a vote to serve notice on the miiltary that this is 1951 and that we demand that they modernize their war machine.

I agree that we have to have an army. I agree that we have to have a navy. I agree that our youth should be trained in the fundamentals of war for their own and their country's protection, but the time has come when our Air Force has got to be our striking force, has got to be our deterring force against the ravages of Communist aggression.

There is not one single person in this room who has the slightest doubt in his mind today but that if we had 3,000 B–36's loaded with bombs and ready to blacken the sky of any nation who dared put one foot across any border in aggression that there would be no Koreas, or Indochinas, or Irans, or an invasion of Europe.

Yes; we need fighters and strafers, but if we had that air superiority, if we had those long-range bombers to hit at the heart of Russia or any of her satellites and simply serve notice on her, "You send one division of men across any border anywhere in aggression, and we will blast you into all eternity," there would be no world war III. You may be as sure of that as you are that 3,500,000 American soldiers will not deter 30,000,000 well-trained Russian soldiers.

Even Secretary of State Dean Acheson 2 weeks ago Thursday night when we were briefing the freshmen Members of Congress on the Russian situation made the statement that Russia will not strike this spring because she is afraid of our air superiority. When I asked him if he did not believe unquestionable air superiority would continue to contain Russia, he said, "Yes," and then he stopped short and said:

> That is for a time, until they build up their defense, and then we have got to depend upon our ground forces.

Yes, in spite of that knowledge, in spite of that fact, the military still refuses to throw our resources into the manufacture of B–36's. In spite of the fact that Russia is being contained today because of our puny fleet of striking bombers, the military refuses to throw our economy into the manufacture of 50 or 100 times as many as we have today. Believe this or not, in spite of the fact that aluminum is the one essential metal needed in the manufacture of B–36's, 2 weeks ago the military released 40 percent of the aluminum stockpile to civilian use, and believe it or not, South Dakota has purchased enough aluminum on the open market to manufacture two license plates for every car in the State for 1952. And you tell me we are honestly preparing to defend the peace?

Yes, they are up here on the Hill asking us to draft skilled American boys, potential pilots, potential mechanics, potential navigators, to throw into the muck and the slime of surface warfare in Korea or Europe, or wherever the Commander in Chief may decide to send them next. At the same time, their Secretary of State tells us that it is our puny striking force of long-range bombers that is deterring Russia today. At the same time, the Pentagon tells us they are making every effort to defend this Nation, and yet by their own act, the one essential metal that is necessary to build up that containing force, is released to civilian use to add to the glutted market of refrigerators, chrome on new cars, and yes, let us not forget, two license plates for every automobile.

Today our Nation is standing at the crossroads. Our freedom, our way of life, our homes, the future of our children and their religion hangs in the balance. The decision rests upon you as the Representatives of the American people.

Let us vote an extension of the 19-year-old draft. Let us serve notice on the Pentagon that when they get their house in order, we will provide for the

military training of our youth in a bill which does by direction what this bureaucratic monstrosity claims to do by indirection. This Congress is not feeble-minded. This Congress has some of the most able men in the Nation on its roster. Then why do we have to delegate our duty and authority to five men to perform? It is time the legislative branch of the Government started to legislate.

Let this Congress put an end to this bickering in the military. Instead of being so worried about grabbing our boys out of high school, let us conscript every ounce of metal necessary to immediately construct 3,000 B–36's and the fighters and strafers necessary to protect them in the air, and let this Congress once again speak for the people of the United States, speak for the free people everywhere, and let its voice be heard in the saving of civilization.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time principally to inquire of the chairman, or the gentleman handling the bill on either the majority or minority side, for information concerning the recent directive of the President concerning the deferment of young men who are able to go to college. As we all know, the President on Sunday, or last week, issued an order which permits or which directs the selective-service boards throughout the country to defer men who are going to college. It so happens in my home county the two draft boards, or a substantial number of the members have felt this directive is discriminatory. There have been resignations from the two draft boards because the draft boards feel that the President's order is discriminatory and in effect would set up a poor man's army. I would like to read into the RECORD a telegram sent to me from Draft Board No. 43 in Grand Rapids. I quote:

Congressman GERALD FORD:

We are indignant over the inconsistency and the embarrassment that will be ours on the college and university student deferment proposal outlined in Operations Bulletin No. 28 just received from national selective-service headquarters.

It is felt that the procedure outlined would show discrimination to those who can afford college against those who cannot afford this higher education or who prefer some vocation equally beneficial to our country. Branding those economically unable to afford college or those least intelligent as the only ones eligible for the defense of our country was construed as an insult to those whom we are inducting into service.

HENRY S. KAMINSKI,
*Chairman.*
FRANCIS T. RUSSELL,
ROBERT J. YONKMAN,
LEWIS M. DE KORNE,
*Members, Local Board No. 43, Selective Service System.*

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some clarification of an amendment which I understand is to be offered next week by the gentleman from Texas in reference to this problem. Can the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] amplify what I have seen in the newspapers in reference to that amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. I am not familiar with the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texis next week. As I saw it in the press, I assume it would be offered to the Committee on Armed Services when the other amendments were taken up on Monday.

Mr. FORD. I wonder whether the gentleman from Texas can enlighten us. I think it is very important, not only so far as these two draft boards are concerned, but I think it is important on a Nation-wide basis. The men on that particular draft board and those on draft board No. 43, I know take their responsibilities very seriously. They are high-type individuals and it would be tragic if they should resign during this emergency period over the question of a policy which I am sure the House and the other body might revise very shortly.

Mr. KILDAY. The amendment to which he refers was mentioned by me the day before yesterday when I spoke on the bill. I read it as part of my remarks, and it is printed in the RECORD at page 3410 of April 4, together with a brief statement of my objections to the Executive order. The amendment in effect repeals the Executive order and therefore would leave the matter of students and education as it now is under the act of 1948, and as it was under the act of 1940.

In other words, the effect would be that the local boards would continue to determine who should be deferred for the purpose of education, and the examination now called for would be eliminated.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman advised as to whether the draft boards to which he refers have granted deferments to college students within their jurisdiction?

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding that they have pursued a policy of granting deferments for those who are in college and who have requested permission to finish their present semester or college term. I do not know whether or not they have gone beyond that particular policy.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, the result of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas, which would revert to the present practice of allowing local boards to deal with college deferments, inevitably results in discrimination with respect to dealing with college students in one community as contrasted with the way college students are deferred in another community. It is for the purpose of avoiding that discrimination that this plan announced by General Hershey has been devised, through which a formula of granting college deferments will be standardized and will be granted to all college students, irrespective of where they live. Speaking for myself, there will be one who will resist the proposal of the gentleman from Texas, because I feel that the plan proposed by General Hershey, which has been before the committee and which the committee endorsed in reporting this bill, and the plan is set forth in the committee report, is a fair method of dealing with this very difficult problem. I am not greatly impressed with this argument that the plan of General Hershey will result in a poor man's army. I have yet to find any boy who wants to go to college badly who is prevented from going because he has not got the money to do it. That is an argument, I think, without any foundation, that it will result in deferring the rich boys over the poor boys, because it will not at all.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the gentleman that I think we should weigh very strongly the point of view of those who are actually operating a selective-service board. They have had practical, down-to-earth experience of handling deferments of many thousands of individuals.

Mr. COLE of New York. Why should that be any more true with respect to college deferments than with respect to agricultural, industrial, or any of the other deferments which are written into the law?

Mr. FORD. It seems to me you have to give some discretion to the local boards. The order of General Hershey, as announced by the executive branch of the Government, makes an arbitrary, across-the-board determination for all draft boards, taking away the essential discretion at the local level. For that reason I personally think the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is highly desirable.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the major objection is that an agency of the Federal Government is permitted to choose those who shall go to or continue in college. I am basically and fundamentally opposed to permitting the Federal Government to choose the people who shall be educated in this country.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I agree completely with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] in his position of opposition to authorizing any Government agency to select who shall go to college, but the Hershey plan does not do that at all. It simply prescribes the pattern of determination. It does not select the individuals themselves.

Mr. KILDAY. But it does provide the examination; it gives the examination, and it grades the papers, and all that sort of thing. So that it results in the Federal Government determining who shall go to or continue in college.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course I am very much concerned with reference to the proposed changes. I am informed, however, that the new directive actually reduces rather than increases the number

of deferments. While that is not the final test, whether or not we will increase or decrease them, I think we should have a very orderly plan. I think we should have a plan that will fit into the operation of the schools and colleges throughout the country so as to do them as little damage as possible. Furthermore, I recognize that it is only a 3-year proposal, as I understand, and at the end of that limited period, of course, deferments will cease.

Mr. FORD. That is under the directive by the executive branch?

Mr. BROOKS. Under the statute we have a limit imposed upon the operation of any such plan. Of course, it is merely deferment, it is not a final exemption.

Mr. FORD. It is possible that in the interim the international situation may be such that those who have been deferred for that interim period will not thereafter have to serve in the Armed Forces.

Mr. BROOKS. We fervently hope that that is the case; and if that is the case we certainly would not want to put out of business thousands of schools and colleges throughout the country through the unwise operation of any deferment policy.

Mr. FORD. In closing I would like to say that I am certainly sympathetic with the position in which these local draft boards find themselves. I only hope that they will defer their resignations where they have not already done so, and in the meantime I hope that we shall be able to include in the legislation the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, there are three or four other Members who have asked for time, but I do not see them on the floor at the moment. Since the hour is late I imagine they are as exhausted as most of us are.

There are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have several requests for time. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr Chairman, in my opinion the subject matter which we are debating this week is the most important of any which we may be called upon to consider during this term of Congress. This very debate is the debate which should be characterized as the "great debate." We are not proposing a hair cut for the Nation, nor the treatment of a common cold. The proposal today is an operation affecting the vitals of human life. It is a departure from a firmly founded and long-standing American tradition. We are here considering a proposal, which if it becomes law, will penetrate every fiber of the social structure of the United States, which will affect every family in the Nation and which will take in control the youth of this Nation.

This is a frightening prospect. Yet it is one which we must face. It will not profit us, or the Nation, to turn our face away from the reality of the evil which faces us; to underestimate its power, and to fail to make adequate preparations to meet and overcome this evil. The question before us is not the pleasant one of proposing means by which the horizons of freedom will be extended further. It is not a question of securing greater freedom and liberty for an already free people, but rather one of securing the freedom which we possess, and/or of attempting to make secure that freedom which we possess, and which we value.

Mr. Chairman, I stand ready to make the unpleasant decisions which may be necessary in order to secure that freedom. At this time of decision, we must remember the important truth expressed by W. H. Gardiner. We must remember that—

> We are but the transient trustees of the heritage of all for which the past has lived, charged with administering it for a little while, but surcharged with responsibility of administering today our trust for the future, of our successors and of the world, in such manner that they will not look back upon us as false trustees, who took our present ease instead of performing our perhaps more painful duty as a sound link in the chain of generations.

First. The case that has been made for the Selective Service Act has been well presented.

Second. The members of the Armed Services Committee, who have presented this bill, have spoken well of the need for a general training program, a program which will meet our national needs, in time of cold war, in time of uncertain and precarious peace.

They have told us that we need such a program to insure the continued safety of this country. They have told us that we need such a program in order to give some measure of certainty to parents and to young men as to how much of their lives is to be given in service to country, and when. They have told us we need a program which will give some assurance to men who are in the military service, or who have already served, that they will not be left alone to defend this country, and that other men who may be called upon to defend this country and the couse of freedom, will not be called upon to enter upon this task short-handed and inadequately trained. They have told us that we need a program which will prove to the world that the United States intends to carry out its responsibility in the cause of justice and freedom.

They have told us of this great need.

Individual members of the committee have told us of the great knowledge, wisdom, and virtues of the other members of the committee, and of the committee as a whole.

The have told us of their great labors as a committee. For 65 days they have dwelt on the mountain top.

But, after all this, I looked to the proposals in the bill. What is proposed? A commission to study the problem and write the law.

A commission, another commission. The executive branch of the Government now operates through commissions. The judicial branch has yielded in many fields to the commission, and the legislative branch too.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to delegating legislative responsibility to a commission when the question is one of reorganization, when the principal point at issue is probably that of who shall control the files. But, here before us today, is a proposition of another order. I believe that the committee should have brought before us a specific plan and program drawn by the committee. They have chosen not to do so. They propose a commission. I will accept this proposal, but under the condition that that commission will be required to report its proposals to the Armed Services Committee, which will then have the power to modify them, and which will, itself, have the responsibility to report the plan, as amended, to the House of Representatives for final disposition.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this action should be completed in this first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I could not help but take recognition of the statement of the gentleman that we were in between peace and war. Does the gentleman believe the fact we are losing thousands and thousands of American boys in Korea indicates we are not at war?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I said we were between all-out war and peace. I said we were in what has been called a cold war.

Mr. BUSBEY. Would the gentleman agree we are at war but the President has not made a declaration or asked Congress to make a declaration of war, which in my opinion he ought to do?

Mr. MCCARTHY. It is obvious it has not been declared; it is obvious we are shooting and losing men. I know the American people know that and I hope the Members of Congress know it. The technical point whether war has been declared does not have any particular bearing on our action on this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include tables and excerpts.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very thankful to you, to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the great American who heads our committee, for yielding me time to present my views on the pending measure.

I entertain such high admiration and such deep affection for the gentleman that it is not at all pleasant for me to have to disagree with him so sharply on this major and perhaps crucial legislation.

However, I have very deep convictions on these issues, which I feel conscience bound and duty bound to express and vote.

Let me make it clear at the outset that I do not question in any way the present need of a strong and invincible and powerful national defense. I have long been conscious of the menace of Soviet

aggression and the shadow which it has cast over the free world and I sincerely and heartily approve of the objective of facing up to that threat with all the material and physical resources which this great, powerful Nation can command.

I am in complete agreement with the program of marshaling and mobilizing our great resources, both human and material, so that we may be prepared to meet every possible eventuality affecting our security, our freedom, and our well-being as a great democratic Nation.

I am not questioning the strictly selective-service parts of this bill. I am willing to vote for the extension of the present draft, because I believe it is necessary for us to build up our Army and our other Armed Forces consistently with emergency conditions which now face us.

If it appears, as has been intimated on this floor by very responsible leaders, that we are facing all-out war, then I am prepared to vote for all-out mobilization and I will vote, not only to draft boys into the Army, but I will vote to draft wealth, industry, and agriculture and every other part of the American economic machine that may be necessary to win that war and save the Nation.

But I must confess that, while I have studied these matters very carefully and have surveyed international developments very scrupulously, I am unable to whip myself into the frenzy of apprehension and hysteria which I have seen manifested in some quarters.

So far as I can view it, we are about the only democratic nation where responsible leaders are exhibiting such extreme hysteria. None of the nations located closest to the source of this great threat—the Soviet Union—seem to be greatly disturbed about their particular situation. None of them are raising large armies. None of them are passing sweeping and drastic draft and manpower bills like this one. These data have been presented to the House and I will not repeat them at this time. But it is very interesting and pertinent to note that the large majority of Atlantic Pact nations are at present drafting only boys over 19 years of age, and some of them do not draft boys until they are 20 or 21 years of age.

We are all aware of the outstanding record and great service of General Eisenhower, and I think that he is greatly respected by every Member of the House. Despite his able and energetic efforts, it must be admitted that the number of military effectives which he has pledged by member nations up to this time for the defense of Europe, is hardly what one would call an enthusiastic response.

As of February 15, 1951, the size and strength of present armed forces of the member nations of the Atlantic Pact and the plans for future increases thereof, which I am inserting as part of my remarks, do not indicate that any of the members has been moved by the hysteria and sense of urgency, which have prevailed during some of our own deliberations.

We are a great Nation. But certainly we cannot be expected to carry all the burden of fighting against potential common enemies throughout the entire world. There are over 250,000,000 people in the democratic nations, outside of the iron curtain in Europe, and it is logical, proper, and just for us to expect that these peoples, these nations, will assume full responsibility and make all necessary sacrifices that may be required to defend their own soil and wholeheartedly join with us to stave off Communist aggression.

It should be clear to every one of them that the military resources marshalled up to this time in Europe are wholly inadequate, if war comes, to stop hostile military aggression. We must be reminded that in case of such aggression, the Red army would have the assistance of its satellite states and Communist fifth columns of size, significance, and power in almost every single country involved, where, according to our best information, Trojan horses of Communist conspiracy stand patiently by, ready at a given signal, to unload the enemies of democracy.

On the point of possible resistance to this threat, let me cite briefly from Gen. Pierre Billotte, one-time head French military adviser to the United Nations, who certainly ought to know the situation, and I quote:

> To put up resistance with any real hope of success, the least Europe would require is 100 divisions, extremely mobile, equipped with the most powerful antitank weapons and supported by ultra-modern air power—at least 10,000 tactical and 2,000 strategic planes. * * * Reduced to financial terms, no less than $100,000,000,000 investment, spread over several decades, is indicated.

Mr. Chairman, this is just the kind of a trap into which the Soviet is seeking to lead us, to tie us up for several decades, if necessary; even some of our own leaders say that it would be 20 or 30 years, piling untold expense, regimentation, burdens, and sacrifices upon the American economic system and the American people, which would finally wear down our morale, smash us financially and economically, and bring us to a state of collapse.

Now there is one answer to this situation from the American standpoint and it does not lie in transforming our own great Nation into totalitarian patterns and binding the strong arms of our people with the obnoxious and unnecessary restraints of supermilitarism. It does not lie in a piecemeal, scattered, ineffectual program for the alleged benefit of foreign countries. In the first place, any arms, military strength, naval components or air power which we provide under any program in defense of democracy and America should, insofar as possible and practicable, be kept under the control and direction of our own military leadership. Otherwise, in some conceivable circumstances, our own weapons may be turned against us. As we deem the occasion demands it, in this world which has been torn asunder by the blandishments and threats and conspiracies of communism, let us strengthen first the Armed Forces of our own Nation. Let us at this time strengthen our own air power and bring into being—which I hope we are preparing to do because certainly that is the intent of our people—a fleet of supertranscontinental and intercontinental strategic bombers and other suitable modernized aircraft, capable of carrying atomic bombs and other effective explosives to the very heartland of the enemy.

We should greatly speed up the building of our radar screen as this committee, I am proud to say, has been seeking to do.

We should hasten and expedite our guided missile program.

We should assemble a great fleet of modernized tanks.

We should take more of our great naval forces out of moth balls and put them into action at the fastest possible rate.

We should build, strength and equip a reorganized army—an army based on modern concepts of warfare, equipped with every modern device and weapon.

We should revitalize and build the National Guard and the Reserves, which have been, to such an amazing extent, neglected and demoralized since the war.

We should utilize the weapons and techniques in which our great free creative and productive system gives us such a great superiority.

If we do these things, we will be giving the most effective possible answer—the answer of freemen, not slaves—to the threats of Russian aggression and the defense of the United States and the other democracies, should it become necessary.

There is little chance of any significant land invasion of the United States at this particular time and such operations would not only take long, careful preparation but would be attended with greatest difficulties and obstacles. We must recognize, however, that in the event of war, we would undoubtedly suffer some serious and crippling attacks from the air. We must be in such a position, should attacks come, that we will be able to meet the aggressors with an adequate radar screen on land, sea and in the air, and also with a flood of tactical aircraft and antiaircraft fire on land and sea and be ready to deal with problems of public safety and public medical care in damaged areas.

We must be ready also to deploy our air strength and our valuable sea power that we can immediately and without any delay from several strategically located points within the range of our heavy bombers visit swift and terrible retaliation upon the enemy that dares attack us. If we are to believe our military authorities, we are equipped to visit terrible retaliation from the air against the attacker nation.

We have many things on our side. We not only have hundreds of atomic bombs made and ready to go, but we have an incomparable know-how, the scientific genius, the industrial capacity, the skilled workers, the capable leadership to make enough atomic bombs and other destructive weapons to bring ruin and

devastation to any potential enemy. And believe me the Soviet Union recognizes that fact.

We should move with all possible speed to set up hemispheric defenses, not only along the coastline of the United States, but jointly with our neighbors to the north and to the south and in Alaska.

I am not one of those who believes that war is imminent. I do not speak in the spirit of a jingoist or warmonger, nor am I an appeaser, nor do I presume military expertness. I have vigorously protested against appeasement of the Soviets on very many occasions, even while World War II was going on, because I saw the great danger and the menace to our free institutions that was looming in the person of the great Frankenstein which this Nation and other democracies helped to set up to challenge the most precious values of civilized man.

I am intensely profoundly interested in peace and, even now when a wave of defeatism and resignation to war has spread over much of the Nation or at least has affected many people, I am as anxious to strive for and to work for peace as eagerly and as militantly as some seem to be striving for war. I am glad to know that the leadership of this Nation has inaugurated fresh measures even at this advanced stage on the road toward hostilities to effect a world-wide disarmament program and to look forward to some international arrangement to utilize atomic energy for the benefit and advancement of humanity rather than for its destruction.

But I recognize that it takes two to make such a bargain. It takes at least two to sit around the peace table at a time like this and they must sit around it with the genuine feeling and spirit of peace in their hearts. Long ago, long before the Soviets acquired their present strength and at times when we ourselves were formidable militarily, I urged that we call peace conferences to make the peace and to unite the nations of the world against war. But it is better late than never and in the name of Christian civilization and humanity, even now the goal of peace and peaceful settlement of the present situation should be gept in mind and earnest, untiring efforts made to reach it.

I may say—and I think we are practically all agreed upon this—that we must be prepared against every possible eventuality and we must take into account every possible military contingency. If we obey our ordinary instincts of self-preservation, in a world torn with strife, persecution, and brutality, in a world plagued with Communist infiltration, threats, and intimidations, we cannot gamble as we have heretofore, we cannot delay until another Pearl Harbor shakes us out of our lethargy, because this time, the visitation of war will come like a bolt from the blue. It will come without warning. It will come on a broad front, not only in Europe, but in Asia, where bloody war in which we are engaged, is already raging. It will come with the crushing power of the Soviets and their satellites, accompanied by internal troubles, dissension, revolution, and rebellion in various countries, generated by Godless Communism, such as this Nation and this world has never before witnessed.

Unless we are fully prepared and ready for it, we will be completely overwhelmed even before we have time to get into action. Then in truth the lamp of liberty will go out and the darkness of slavery will have come upon us.

Now is the time for firm, high courage, courage in our strength as free men and women, courage to carry on boldly and unflinchingly as Americans have always carried on in emergencies and in time of danger and crisis. It is a time to strengthen our free institutions and not to weaken them by forms of indenture and peonage and other forms of ruthless tyrannical dominion over the individual.

Our aim is high. Our cause is just and if we but seek it in a humble, honest spirit, we will find the guidance and the help of the Almighty and we will not only be safe and secure from our enemy but we will be able to preserve our liberties and build a lasting and enduring peace upon this earth based upon justice, tolerance and love of our fellow man.

I am very sorry that the bitter controversial UMT proposal has been injected into this bill. It merely diverts us from considering the really vital questions of our national defense and preparedness. There is nothing new, strange or startling about UMT. It is as old as the hills. It has been employed by every tyrant who ever lived from Caesar to Hitler and from Charlemagne to Stalin. Here in this country they call it the Plattsburg plan because it had such an aristocratic origin. It has been considered several times by the Congress and in every instance repudiated and put aside in response to overwhelming public sentiment. In an ordinary time, there is not a man in the Chamber who believes it would have a chance of passing this House.

History is strewn with the wreckage of great nations which put their faith in supermilitarism. Now I am not criticizing the military. I greatly admire our military leaders and I recognize above all the great debt which we owe them. But this is a civilian government dominated by the people and directed by their representatives. Military men have their place and it is a very important place, but they must always be subject to the direction and control of the civilian arm of this Government and they must always be subordinate to the representatives of the people, in matters of policy unrelated to military strategy and tactics. Essentially and basically, UMT is a Prussian-slave system of militarization which has signally failed every country that has tried it. At different times and in some cases more than once in history, France, Russia, Germany, and Italy have gone down to defeat under this tyrannical, conscript pattern before the forces of free nations.

France, which has had universal military training for over 160 years, has been overrun by its enemies four times during that period. As recently, as June 1940, as you all recall, the French Army, consisting of 5,000,000 men who had received years of military training, was disastrously defeated in a few days by far fewer numbers of technically trained Germans. Germany, which had UMT for more than 100 years, has suffered complete military defeat and disaster twice within the past generation. UMT did not bring victory to Japan, nor prevent the invasion of Russia, which but for the assistance of our own Nation, would have been most certainly overrun and conquered by Hitler. All the nations of Europe, with their millions upon millions of conscripts, with years of universal military training, could not check the ruthless march of Hitler. It remained for our American soldiers, without UMT, I repeat, and our American Air Force, to blast and defeat the powerful Nazi hordes.

UMT is a most alarming development in American life because it would strike a telling blow at our great educational system and our traditional family life. It is based on the assumption that military leaders are better qualified to bring up and train our young men than their parents, than their spiritual advisers in the churches of America, and than the teachers in their schools.

UMT is contrary to American free tradition, antagonistic to the spirit of the American people. Americans are born free and the youth of America, in this and future generations, are entitled to our incomparable heritage of freedom. UMT is just the opening wedge for much wider regimentation by Federal bureaucrats of our educational, religious, and social structure. It will unquestionably result in dangerous and un-American encroachment upon the freedom of the individual. First, our young boys will be impressed and indentured, and then it is entirely possible, in fact some responsible people are already demanding, that our young girls will follow suit. Next, after that we will revive the idea of universal service, the drafting of all able-bodied people between the ages of 18 and 65, such as was proposed and brought into this House during the last war.

Many of you will remember that bill. It finally wound up as a draft of all those between 18 and 45 and would permit a Federal bureaucrat to send our citizens away from their homes to work in any part of the country. I had the privilege, at that time, of voting against that bill. But it passed this House and was sent over to the other body, where an aroused public opinion soon consigned it to the well-known and well-deserved pigeonhole. Such a measure has strong support in many places even now.

UMT presents the greatest of challenges to free sectarian education of young men. If carried to its logical conclusion, it will greatly hamper, if not destroy, the training of youths in religious schools of all denominations and substitute instead training in Army camps under the decrees and plans of some Federal bureaucrat. Let no one here get the impression that UMT is a substitute for a general draft in the event of an all-out war because in that case, as in our previous wars, it would be necessary to mobilize all our strength and manpower.

This Prussianized system would disrupt and jeopardize all privately endowed education in the United States and it would unquestionably result in widespread Federal control over our schools, colleges, and institutions of learning. By making schools and colleges financially dependent upon the Government, UMT may well lead to nationalization of education. No real, reliable cost estimates are at hand. In fact, that question has been very carefully avoided for the most part. A few years ago, the UMT national committee estimated that it would cost something in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000 a year. At the same time, Hanson Baldwin, eminent New York Times military authority, estimated that it would cost from three to five billion dollars a year. Since that time, costs have gone up and it could well cost twice that amount or $10,000,000,000 a year for the cost of running the program alone.

But do you suppose for a moment that these boys, who have been dragged away from their homes into Army camps at the age of 18, are going to be satisfied with a pay of $30 a month. In modern America, that is nothing but peonage and no one can make anything else out of it. You will have demands for equalized pay for the trainees, you will have demands for the full GI benefits, compensation, insurance, health benefits, and other fringe benefits, which Congress will find it very difficult to reject. Before we get through with this program, its cost could be so staggering as to greatly handicap the financial needs of the entire national defense. So far as I am concerned, if the Congress is going to spend such huge amounts of money, I would rather see it spent for strategic bombers or other necessary equipment that would have some real value to us in an emergency, and, believe me, we are going to have no difficulty whatever in getting very smart, capable young American boys to handle our aircraft and to man our Navy and Army.

Let me point out also that from a moral and social standpoint, UMT will have devastating results upon our youth and everyone in this House knows it. It will promote the development of bad habits, always occasioned by the associations and environmental attractions of Army life for extreme youth. It will encourage premature marriages and breed unimagined social problems for which the Government will finally have to pay a huge price.

In my humble opinion, the great nation like our own which takes its boys away from their homes, away from their churches, away from their schools and colleges, and makes them part of a great militaristic caste system, with all its known and demonstrated evils, under the pretext that it is necessary for the national security, cannot avoid the gravest of consequences to its political freedom, the integrity of its family life, and the impairment of its educational system. The preservation of individuality, morally, spiritually, politically, and in every other sense, has been one of the chief contributing factors to the greatness of America. Our strength lies in our freedom. Experience has clearly demonstrated to us that Americans can live, work, and fight better when they are free. To shackle young America into a Prussianized militarism bred of hysteria and propaganda is to ignore the chief source of our great power as a nation.

It is surely unnecessary for us to adopt a pattern of totalitarian government in order to defend ourselves against the Marxist superstate. If democracy fails to meet these issues clearly and courageously, the door will be wide open for the development of a regimented American state.

I was glad to note that the great chairman of this committee is considering amendments that will soften up this bill. But that is not enough for the American people. There is one sound, sensible solution, and that is to strike UMT completely from the bill, raise the draft age to 19, and then proceed to clear the way for the building of a powerful, invincible national defense predicated on modern concepts, and not based upon the outmoded and discredited militaristic systems which have brought nothing but defeat and disaster throughout all history to the nations which employed them.

Our purpose should be not to disrupt the lives of young Americans except where it is absolutely necessary for the defense of the Nation. We can and should institute voluntary training programs in the schools, colleges, and factories for young men and launch a program of summer training in universities and colleges, trade and technical schools, coordinated with training programs at military installations where our young men can receive military training without causing them to abandon their career. The great Marine Corps has made exceptional progress in shaping a satisfactory program, which is known as "platoon leaders' class," and it can well be copied by other branches of the service. These are matters which should be carefully studied by the committee and legislated upon by the Congress, and not by some outside commission.

It is utterly unthinkable to me that this Congress should at any time delegate its lawmaking powers to any commission, and I am constrained, for the reasons I have set forth, to vote against UMT and the 18-year-old draft.

TROOPS TO EUROPE

As I understand it, the administration contends that the President has general power, as well as authority under the Atlantic Pact, to send troops abroad without the approval of Congress.

The Constitution specifically vests Congress with sole power to declare war, and this connotes the plenary power to wage war with all the force necessary to make it effective.

While the President has no power under the Constitution to initiate or declare war against a foreign state, he has power to recognize the existence of a state of war and to resist force by force. Where the President acts in an emergency to involve the Nation in war, or the danger of war, it is certainly contemplated by the Constitution that he should seek approval or ratification of his acts by Congress. If this were not true, this Nation would be just another dictatorship and its Executive head could not only engage in war, but invoke every measure, including the draft and assignment of armed forces and troops, to fight such a war of his own will. Clearly this is not the case.

The President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and as such is authorized to direct the movement of land, naval, and air forces placed by law at his command and employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual. But it must be remembered and emphasized that Congress has sole power to raise and support armies and to maintain and provide the Navy and the Air Corps and every other military component. The Congress makes the laws relative to war. The President enforces them. Neither should intrude upon the authority of the other. The power of the President acting as Commander in Chief must be exercised according to law. In this democracy, the military is subordinate to the civilian authority and must be kept so.

The above-stated principles are not figments of the imagination but specific provisions of the Constitution and judicial intrepretations thereof. Therefore, I am of the view that the question of sending troops to Europe should be presented to and determined by the Congress.

Apart from constitutional power, there is another side of this question: Is it advisable to send additional troops to Europe in substantial numbers until the nations of Europe have clearly and unmistakably demonstrated their firm purpose, expressed in action, that they intend to defend themselves against aggression. There are more than 250,000,000 people in free Europe, powerful industrial resources and very sizable military manpower. Yet up to this moment, General Eisenhower's efforts to raise military divisions under the Atlantic Pact for the defense of Europe could hardly be termed successful.

Would we not be foolhardy, indeed, if, until Europe moves very decisively and substantially to defend itself, we were to pour in substantial numbers of American boys and large quantities of American arms? Do not European nations have primary obligation to defend themselves?

I think we must follow the prudent course of building and conserving our strength for possible all-out war. Clearly, Europe is afraid of being turned into an atomic battleground. She is war-weary and intimidated, and wracked by social ills and unworkable social panaceas. In our own interest, and in keeping with our own ideals of democracy and freedom, not to speak of our obligation to our honored dead and all thse who recently made such bitter sacrifiecs in the name of human liberation, we cannot ignore Europe's plight. For many rea-

sons, not the least of which is our own security, we certainly cannot stand by while she is overrun.

If it is necessary, as it seems to be, to lift her morale and strengthen her courage, let us state frankly and unequivocally that unwarranted aggression by the Soviets against western civilization means war. Such an attitude on our part coupled with overwhelming air power, a strong remobilized Navy and a powerful Army, all implemented with atomic weapons, guided missiles and other modern war matériel, backed up by the vast incomparable productive power of America, will make any nation think twice before committing an aggression that would require us to protect our security and defend our spiritual ideals and our free civilization. Above all, let us be prepared for every possible contingency.

Let us not feel that war is inevitable or imminent. Intelligent, courageous action may well keep the peace. But that action must be based upon overwhelming strength of arms and a firm resolution not to dissipate or misuse our strength. And it must be taken with calm, prudent, if sober, judgment, free from vagrant emotions of the hour.

I hope that the President will submit the question of sending troops to Europe to the Congress. In this way, the representatives of the American people will be able to pass upon the merits and demerits of this proposal and the decision reached, whatever it is, will make for a policy that will have behind it the support of the country.

*Casualties in Korea*

| | |
|---|---|
| United States, as of Mar. 23: | |
| Killed | 8,511 |
| Wounded | 37,918 |
| Missing | 10,691 |
| Total | 57,120 |
| Turkey (of which 298 are killed) | 1,169 |
| Britain | 892 |
| French | 396 |
| Australia | 265 |
| Netherlands | 112 |
| Thailand | 103 |
| Philippines | 55 |
| Greece | 89 |
| Canada | 68 |

UN figures are estimates only. Information from UN Secretariat.

*Troop strengths in Korea*

| | |
|---|---|
| United States: | |
| Army | 250,000 |
| Navy (including Marines) | 90,000 |
| Air Force (unestimated groups) | ------- |

Source: General Bradley, Feb. 26.

| | |
|---|---|
| UN, as of March 1: | |
| Korea | 60,000–90,000 |
| Commonwealth and United Kingdom | 13,000 |
| Philippines | 1,000 |
| Turkey | 5,000 |
| Thailand | 1,000 |
| Netherlands | 600 |
| Greece | 800 |
| France | 600 |
| Canada | 10,000 |
| Australia | 1,000 |
| Sweden | 200 |
| Total | 33,200 |

In addition, there are unestimated naval and air contingents from some of these countries.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
*Washington, D. C., April 3, 1951.*

To: The Honorable P. J. PHILBIN.
From: Dr. Albert C. F. Westphal, Chief, Foreign Affairs Section.
Subject: Draft ages in the various Atlantic pact nations, also size, respective present standing armies.

The following is in answer to your request of April 2, 1951, regarding the draft ages in the various Atlantic Pact nations, also the size, respective present standing armies:

| Country | Ground forces | Navy and air | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Belgium | 91,000 | 11,000 | 102,000 |
| Luxemburg | 2,000 | ---------- | 2,000 |
| Denmark | 23,000 | 6,000 | 29,000 |
| France | 600,000 | 122,000 | 722,000 |
| Italy | 245,000 | 62,000 | 307,000 |
| Netherlands | 78,000 | 36,000 | 114,000 |
| Norway | 15,000 | 10,000 | 25,000 |
| Portugal | 64,000 | 9,000 | 73,000 |
| United Kingdom | 380,000 | 349,000 | 729,000 |
| Canada | 34,000 | 27,000 | 61,000 |

Source: Basic Information on Implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty. Committee print, 82d Cong. 1st sess. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, February 15, 1951; p. 1.

*Type and period of military service in foreign countries*

| Country | Type of service (conscription or volunteer) | Minimum age of service |
|---|---|---|
| Belgium | Conscript | 20 |
| Canada | Volunteer | 18 |
| Denmark | Conscript | 19 |
| France | do | 19 |
| Italy | do | 21 |
| Netherlands | do | 18 |
| Norway | do | 19 |
| Portugal | do | 20 |
| United Kingdom | do | 18 |

Source: Universal Military Training and Sevice Act of 1951. Hearings before the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. U. S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess. January and February 1951.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the importance of the legislation now under consideration, relating to the present and future security of our country, requires that we give it the careful and studious attention its importance demands.

The debate which has now proceeded for 3 days and will continue, according to present plans, for many more before the final vote is taken has been characterized by sincerity. There has been an almost total absence of partisanship. The arguments for and against the legislation in its present form have been based upon facts, figures, testimony, and statements of military and other personages well qualified to speak and express opinions on this legislation and its provisions.

I have listened carefully to the debate as it has progressed. I have learned much from the discussion. As a result of what I have heard and the individual study and consideration I have given the matter, I am convinced that the wisest course for us to pursue would be to separate the two divisions or parts of the bill so that each subject may be treated on its individual merits.

Title I of the bill provides for an extension of the selective-service program with certain changes in the provisions of the present law. Without discussing at this time the suggested changes, and, leaving that until the bill is read for amendment, it is my opinion that no doubt exists as to the necessity for a continuation of selective service. It is unfortunate that such a necessity does exist. We won the war but we do not have peace. Uncertainty and fear exists. Failure of some of our allies of World War II to recognize, now that the war is over, the principles of freedom for which we fought has brought throughout the world a condition that requires the free nations of the world to strengthen their military forces. As the leading exponent of freedom in all the world we must do our part with particular reference to our own security. Unpleasant though it may be to be faced with the continued necessity of providing men for military forces, yet, in the face of present conditions we cannot do otherwise. Hence, it is my opinion that the selective-service feature of the bill, or one similar in most respects, will have the unanimous support of the House. This is as it should be.

When, however, we consider title II of the bill, a different situation exists. This part of the bill sets up a program or plan for universal military training. It is no definite plan. The formulating of such a program is left to a commission of five members to be appointed by the President. It is provided that it shall make a report to Congress, and, Congress can then only vote up or down the plan without the right to amend or change in any particular. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory. I am certain that those individuals and organizations that have expressed a favorable opinion of universal military training would not favor such a plan. It would mean an abdication of congressional rights and responsibilities. No such plan can be justified no matter how favorable one may be to a universaly military training program. In this controversial matter the question as to whether there shall be a system of military training, as well as the type and form it shall take, must and should be decided by the Congress.

Furthermore, this is not the time, nor is this bill the proper place for universal military legislation.

The present bill to extend and continue the selective service is before us because of the present emergency in Korea and elsewhere. It is immediately necessary. It is admitted by the sponsors of the universal military training feature of the bill that such a program could not and would not be put into effect until the termination of the present emergency. And, as to this our highest military authorities have said that it might be one, two, three, or more years before it could be done. One of our highest authorities has even fixed 10 years as the possible date before it could be put into effect. Therefore, there is no immediate reason for its adoption at this time. We should wait until this emergency is over and then decide what, if any, program for universal

training is then necessary. It should be judged in the light of the situation then existing. It is my opinion therefore that the present emergency legislation for extension of the selective service should not be encumbered with a controversial matter that cannot be put to use, even if adopted, until some time in the distant future.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have thoroughly appreciated the opportunity to hear the outstanding debate on S. 1, which is now before us for consideration. It is a privilege, indeed, to join in the discussion in the closing minutes of this debate and I appreciate very much the time granted me.

Throughout my entire lifetime I have tried to study preparedness fairly and thoroughly and I have tried to analyze America's position in the family of nations as well as analyze the factors important in our defense of America.

Some 30 years ago I taught military science and tactics at the University of Iowa. In that capacity I had occasion to lecture to student groups on matters of military history and military policy. We studied the factors important to preparedness and we tried to determine the most important sinews of war but above all we studied the prevention of war through strength.

I will today outline briefly the historic American and Russian rivalry and enumerate the sinews of war, discuss briefly our manpower situation and the importance of military training in our preparedness program, and close with a brief statement of my views regarding the prevention of war.

BACKGROUND FOR WAR—HISTORIC AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN RIVALRY

Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, in 1831, visited the United States to inquire into what was then hailed as the great experiment in constitutional liberty. Coming to North America shortly after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, de Tocqueville was acquainted with the major currents of national developments in Europe which, in view of subsequent events, he described with remarkable precision.

Writing about 1835 in his Democracy in America, he summarized his views with unusual clarity:

> There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points: I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place amongst the nations; and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.
>
> All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth; all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the ploughshare; those of the other by the sword.
>
> The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm; the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Just before the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853 between France and England on the one hand and Russia on the other, Lord Palmerston, British Foreign Minister for many years and Prime Minister for nearly 10 years, spoke of the czardom and its methods as follows:

> The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance. In furtherance of this policy, the Russian Government has always had two strings to its bow, moderate language and disinterested professions at Petersburg and London; active aggression by its agents on the scene of operations.

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned.

Commodore Perry presented a paper before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, at a meeting held March 6, 1956, in New York City, from which I quote as follows:

> It requires no sage to predict events as strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

Let us examine America's position today in the hope that we can disagree with Commodore Perry's prediction.

The United States can avoid becoming involved in a third world war if we build our own defenses strong enough to discourage other nations from attacking us. But if we build our strength to full preparedness and use it as aggressors against other nations, we will most certainly fulfill Commodore Perry's prediction. We need an appraisal of our Nation's role in the family of nations. No nation has yet permanently benefited by world-wide conquest and subjugation of other nations. Surely the United States cannot consider its role that of forcing all other nations of this earth to adopt our prescribed forms of government and to govern themselves as we dictate.

It is most hazardous also to permit our defenses to become so impotent as to tempt aggressor foreign nations to attack us because of our weakness. We were dangerously close to that level of unpreparedness when the Korean war started last June. America dangerously had assumed that the appropriation of dollars for defense assured us of strength in our defenses, and America awakened with a rude jolt, indeed, last June. We have made good progress in rebuilding our defenses during the past year, but we should not be so naive as to assume that our adversary—Russia—has not appraised our strength and our weakness in every factor bearing upon the adequacy of our strength.

THE SINEWS OF WAR

It is my belief that the defense of any nation, or the sinews of war of that nation, can be classified under five general headings:

(a) Strategic and critical materials.
(b) Industrial production and inventive genius.
(c) Economic strength and manpower.
(d) Military preparedness.
(e) Fiscal strength.

In this debate on the proposed Universal Military Training and Service Act now before us special attention should be given to the matter of guarding America's small manpower in industry, agriculture, and in our Armed Forces, with special emphasis upon the latter. This is made necessary by the fact that our total population equals approximately only 6 percent of the world population, together with the fact that the logistics of world war III will be weighed heavily against us if that war is to be fought far from our own land. And Heaven forbid its being fought here at home.

America must launch a successful broad-based reserve military training program to the end that there will not again be permitted to occur the abrupt and disastrous let-down in our preparedness whenever the Korean war might end or if it is permitted to drag along in stalemate.

Some time after World War I ended, Germany rebuilt her armed might faster than the Allies, and immediately at the end of World War II Russia launched a tremendous drive for preparedness while we declined in our own preparedness and concentrated our energies almost exclusively in the rebuilding of our civilian economy. I will not take the time now to outline the steps taken by Russia in contrast to our own but I do urge you to read the writings of Robert Magidoff, who was expelled from Russia April 15, 1948, and who has written good first-hand reports on Russian industry which have appeared in American publications;

also, the comparison of the armies of the world that appeared in the Encyclopedia Britannica Yearbook for 1948 starting at page 73, which summary was prepared by Gen. E. S. Seibert, of our own General Staff. You do not need to have access to classified information to draw an accurate picture of the contrast between Russian preparedness and American unpreparedness between 1945 and 1950. The handwriting was plainly written on the wall in those years and Russia is capable of analyzing the sinews of war whether or not we in America choose to close our eyes to our own weaknesses that Russia may discover and accurately appraise notwithstanding.

The draft for military service must continue as long as we are at war, and Congress will also very properly establish the size of the standing Armed Forces to the extent needed to protect our country over the years ahead. But we should not attempt to build the armed services beyond the point that will threaten our own fiscal stability. We cannot in this debate expect to set the exact peacetime limits of the standing Armed Forces, but we can make provision for a successful broad-based reserve military training program that will enable our Nation to mobilize and place combat troops in the field more quickly in event a world war should strike us after the draft for military service has been discontinued.

During the past 35 years I have been a firm believer in universal military training under civilian control, but to date I have never had an opportunity to register my support of universal military training in any vote here in Congress in my time.

I am tremendously interested in giving our young men the opportunity to learn how to defend themselves and our Nation without taking them into the armed services by the draft in peacetime. The powers of the President under our Constitution as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces are far too great for Congress lightly to transfer the power to raise or create the Armed Forces in that way. In my opinion, Congress must jealously guard its constitutional power and obligation by placing an expiration date in any legislation establishing the draft for military service, and Congress should also guard against crippling our defense self-sufficiency. This can best be done by building a training program under civilian control to make available the greatest possible number of basically trained men who can fit quickly into any mobilization effort. A standing armed force of 2,000,000 men together with the National Guard and the ROTC program as it has functioned cannot furnish us with enough basically trained men to protect our country adequately in the early days of another world war. Universal military training is not the sole factor of adequate preparedness but it is a highly important factor that can be helpful through cutting down the length of time needed for basic training and team training before newly recruited men should be committed to combat. With our small percentage of the world's population and the increased tempo of modern warfare, basic training of all men for defense is more important today than at any time in history, if we are to guard our manpower as we should guard it, if we are to strike our adversary quickly and effectively, and if we are to give our young men a fair chance to defend themselves in the first disastrous days of any future world war. On the effectiveness of our punch in those first days may rest the fate not only of the men committed quickly to combat but the success or failure of our Nation in that world war and the fate of our Nation for all time to come.

PREVENTION OF WAR

One of civilized man's greatest problems is the prevention of war. Both individuals and nations have within them enough of the spirit of Cain to make necessary the most careful self-control, both against imperialistic impulses at home and against aggression from without.

No one nation today has such a monopoly of any one of the five sinews of war as to enable that nation to rely solely on that one factor. Strategic and critical materials are divided largely between Russia, Britain, and America. America has outstanding leadership in industrial production and inventive genius. America has developed her economic strength ahead of other nations but this factor is somewhat offset by America's comparatively small land area, population, and manpower. At the end of World War II America held undisputed leadership in military preparedness and military strength but 5 years of repose in America and determined effort by Russia had almost produced disastrous results at the outbreak of the Korean War. During those 5 years Russia devoted from 25 to 30 percent of her entire industrial production to preparedness and Russia maintained large armed forces together with tremendous training programs, in contrast to America's devotion of 6 to 8 percent of her industrial production to preparedness and the characteristic return to small armed forces with no reserve training program worthy of the name. America on the other hand set something of an all-time record for rapid and successful reestablishment of the civilian economy. Industrial production and inventive genius rapidly have built up our standard of living to the point that Stalin has used the iron curtain more tightly than ever to conceal information of our success from the Russian people.

This achievement, however, carried with it a very dangerous impact upon our available reserves of raw materials. Private industry not only used up 95 percent of RFC stocks of strategic and critical materials and all other supplies of these materials they could get from all sources, but private industry failed to preserve stockpiles of its own of the most strategic and most critical items and now faces unparalleled competition in the world market for the basic materials needed to maintain our industrial production at its capacity. Throughout the past 5 years the Government stockpile program has coasted along with the Munitions Board unwilling to compete with private industry in requiring needed reserves of strategic and critical materials during the period of postwar rehabilitation. Their miserable failure to safeguard America's security in strategic and critical materials is best proven by their record of increasing our Government stockpiles from 15 percent in 1946 to only 30 percent in 4½ years. Even so, hungry industrialists, have already launced a vigorous attack on the program of building these meager Government stockpiles to the size needed for the safeguarding of our Nation in event of another world war.

On the fiscal front, Stalin no doubt has more than once expected a crash in the financial structure of America. I am not qualified to predict with certainly whether Stalin's hopes on that line may be fulfilled but I do know that our Federal Government cannot long proceed with its profligate and wasteful spending as usual for nondefense, and even for defense itself, without resorting to confiscatory taxation on the one hand or to impossible deficit financing on the other. Most certainly America's strength today does not lie in sound fiscal planning but I am not in position to draw comparisons between America and Russia on that front because I have no authentic information on Russia's fiscal situation.

In summary, the one factor in which we are best prepared to hold our position of strength in the family of nations is in the field of industrial production and inventive genius. Altogether, on the other four points I can see no clear-cut guaranty of either peace or war in the years ahead, but I can predict that unless America builds adequate stockpiles of strategic and critical materials, skillfully guards her small manpower, launches a successful broad-based Reserve military training program, and reduces Federal spending enough to remove the threat of confiscatory taxation, deficit financing, and fiscal collapse, we can expect an attack by Russia based upon our weakness in one or more of these four factors.

On the other hand, if we build our strength successfully and skillfully in these four fields and preserve our industrial power of production and our inventive genius, we can build this Nation to such strength that no nation will dare strike us. If in our great strength we then refrain from the role of the aggressor and in true Christian spirit do not undertake to force other nations to live and govern themselves as we dictate, we can build a lasting peace out of the rubble of this war-torn world.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST) having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

[No. 73]

# FULL COMMITTEE HEARING ON H. R. 7405 AND SUNDRY MATTERS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, D. C., Tuesday, April 8, 1952.*

(The committee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the committee, presiding.)

The CHAIRMAN. Now let the committee come to order.

Members of the committee, Mr. Anderson of California introduced H. R. 7405, a bill establishing the catalog for the Department of Defense.

## A BILL ESTABLISHING THE CATALOG FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The CHAIRMAN. I was privileged to sit with the subcommittee while they were presenting this bill and I think it is a very fine piece of legislation and should be enacted, but to keep us from getting in a jam and getting in position that we are subject to criticism, I think it should be referred to the Department for their comment. It has never been referred to the Department for its comment. Of course, we are going to do what we think is right and proper. But I think we had better refer it to the Department for comment. I prepared a letter, if it meets the views of the committee—and Mr. Courtney agrees with me—that the Department must have their report back not later than the 21st day of April and then on the following Tuesday, the 22d, when we get back here, we will act on this bill. I hope that we will vote this bill out.

Now we can act on it now without referring to the Department, but I think it is just a little bit better procedure to just follow that channel.

Now what do you think, Mr. Hébert?

Mr. HÉBERT. I think that is perfectly proper procedure. Nothing would be gained by voting it out now, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you think, Mr. Cole?

Mr. COLE. It is fine, but it does seem to me, anticipating that the Department might raise objections to the bill in total or in part, that we ought to allow them a chance to come in and explain their position before we report it.

The CHAIRMAN. We will. Read the letter Mr. Courtney prepared.

Mr. COURTNEY. I will get it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not necessary.

Mr. COURTNEY. It merely asks for comment.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course the Department probably will come out and say they are against this whole principle of the way we set it up. We will read what they have to say and if it is necessary then the full committee will have a brief hearing to get the Department's views and put it in the record. But it is not being sent to the Department for

the purpose of delay. It is just being sent to the Department to stop one avenue of criticism.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is perfectly all right.

The CHAIRMAN. So without objection, it will proceed along that line. You have prepared the letters.

Mr. COURTNEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Thank you very much.

## REAL ESTATE PROJECTS

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Smart, what is the next thing we have?

Mr. SMART. Your real-estate projects, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kelleher, now what real-estate projects have you here? We have acquisitions 37, 39, 54, and two disposals Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. KELLEHER. No. 37, Navy, is the naval storehouse at Gulfport, Miss., Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Now, members of the committee. I examined this and it is proposed to pay $100,000. From the facts in it, I didn't think they were justified to pay the $100,000. So we wrote a letter to the Department and the Department agreed with it and said that they thought $100,000 a year was too much rent. So negotiation was opened up and they have already reduced it down to $95,000. But the Department says that they are still keeping on negotiating, and if they cannot get it down to what they consider to be a reasonable price, why they will reject it, is that it?

Mr. KELLEHER. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, with that understanding—there have been no complaints from any members of the committee?

Mr. KELLEHER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. COLE. You said this was a disposal.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. KELLEHER. No; this is an acquisition.

The CHAIRMAN. They are leasing a piece of property and they put in there $100,000. From the facts, I thought $100,000 was too much and I wrote the Department and said from the facts it looked like too much money and they said—they agreed with us, is that what they said?

Mr. KELLEHER. That is right.

Mr. BATES. Why did they come up here in the first place?

Mr. KELLEHER. They came up really with the idea of getting a tentative approval subject to an appraisal and a determination of the true value and that is the way they are proceeding at this time. They will turn it down if it is too much money when they get the appraisal this Thursday.

The CHAIRMAN. $100,000 is too much. We have already saved $5,000 and we may save some more money. With that understanding, if there is no objection, we will withhold any action.

Now, what is your next one?

Mr. KELLEHER. The next acquisition is at Cherry Point, N. C., for the Marine Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes. Now you recall last week at Cherry Point, N. C., where we are renting at 16 cents a square foot some storage facilities being built by the port authority and the Marines need it. The 16 cents a square foot is about the cheapest that has been presented to this committee up to date and Mr. Durham has looked into it and I am advised that Mr. Durham interposes no objection.

Mr. KELLEHER. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that satisfactory, Mr. Durham?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Does that have any relationship to the fact that it is in North Carolina?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, in North Carolina, he wanted to be definitely sure that it was not subject to the slightest degree of criticism. And that is the right way to proceed. So the gentleman from New York on these items from New York will bear that in mind, too.

Without objection, that is approved.

Mr. KELLEHER. The first disposal is a Navy disposal of the Pasco Naval Air Station.

The CHAIRMAN. Now that turns it back to that community. I held it up. There had been no complaint from anybody else. I looked it over and wrote the Department that I didn't think it was in the best interest to turn that over. I have had some correspondence with Congressman Holmes of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. And turns it over to that community. It is surplus, but we have a recapture clause in it.

Mr. KELLEHER. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that is approved.

Mr. KELLEHER. The next one is Air Force acquisition No. 54, McKees Rocks.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Mr. KELLEHER. McKees Rocks, Pa. There are now no objections to that.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. KELLEHER. There are now no objections to that. Mr. Cole questioned the rental value there and we looked over an appraisal and he now feels that it is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, without objection, that is approved. Now what is your next one?

Mr. KELLEHER. The last one is the Casper Air Force Base in Wyoming, a disposal.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I held that up and wrote a letter to the Department. Senator Hunt and Senator O'Mahoney came over and talked about it. It is turning it over to that community and it will be maintained as an airfield and there is a recapture clause in it.

Mr. KELLEHER. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And we are not losing anything by letting that community have that piece of property?

Mr. KELLEHER. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLE. What about Pasco, is there a recapture in that?

Mr. KELLEHER. There is. Both of these and all others we may have in the future are disposed of by GSA and there is a recapture clause.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say to the committee that we are scrutinizing every one of these matters very carefully. Our staff member looks into it and the members look into it. We are not letting a thing slip by, because the committee is conversant with every phase of these matters. It is thoroughly looked into.

Mr. COLE. There is a question in connection with the recapture right that I think should be clarified, and that is whether the recapture right runs only for an emergency that might occur or does the right of recapture continue indefinitely?

Mr. KELLEHER. It continues indefinitely, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE. I have understood with some of these plants, at least in the newspaper references to the recapture right, the recapture only goes to the period of a future emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. COLE. I think that is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. KELLEHER. That is true. Most of them fall in that category. Incidentally, the question has always arisen whether it included the present emergency, too.

Mr. COLE. Well, at any rate, with respect to these military disposals, the right of recapture that we preserve is a permanent right.

Mr. KELLEHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLE. It may continue beyond an emergency if the conditions——

Mr. KELLEHER. Actually, I would like to check that exact language before I give a firm answer on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you write a letter to the Department telling the Department we think the recapture should not be restricted to merely an emergency, but it should be an established principle and any time the Government needs it for its defense it has the right to recapture.

Mr. KELLEHER. I think that might interfere with CAA's participation in giving cities and municipalities funds if they had a permanent right of recapture, but I will look into that, Mr. Chairman, and advise you.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, where the Department declares surplus and there is not any need and turn it over to the GSA and GSA disposes of it, we can have the definite policy that notwithstanding the fact that some community might have difficulty in getting money, that the Government comes first. If the Government needs it, it must take it back for its defense.

Mr. KELLEHER. All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now that covers all your projects?

Mr. KELLEHER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any bills for consideration this morning?

Mr. SMART. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now members, we will have to go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 10:18 a. m., the committee proceeded in executive session.)

○

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 10, 1951
For actions of Apr. 9, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 63

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....12
Appropriations.....1
C.C.C.....1
Civil defense.....23
Dairy products.....9
Daylight saving time.....2
Education.....4,16
Electrification, rural....3
Expenditures.....10
Foreign affairs, aid....21
Forests and forestry.....7
Grain.....21
Housing.....6
Information.....1
Insect control.....1
Labor, farm.....18
Lands, reclamation....14,22
Livestock and meat.13,19,20
Military training.....5,24
Personnel.....1,4,11,15
Prices, control.....20
parity.....17
R.F.C.....8
Taxation.....13,19

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. House debated D. C. daylight-saving-time bill. Rep. Whitten defended parity prices for farm products.

## HOUSE

1. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 3587 (pp. 3634-63).

Agreed, 69-57 (by teller vote in Committee of the Whole), to an amendment by Rep. Heselton, Mass., to decrease the amount for Commodity Credit Corporation administrative expenses by $750,000 (pp. 3662-3).

Rep. Flood, Pa., spoke in favor of the Voice of America program and against the committee's reduction in the Budget estimate, and Rep. Rooney, N. Y., spoke in favor of the cut and criticized the program (pp. 3648-60).

Rep. Aspinall, Colo., urged additional funds for control of Englemann spruce bark beetle and objected to the committee's policy statement on this project (pp. 3661-2).

Rep. Vursell, Ill., recommended that annual leave of Federal employees be reduced to 15 days a year (pp. 3644-5).

2. DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME. Debated H. R. 2612, to authorize daylight-saving time in D. C. during 1951 (pp. 3631-4). A vote on the bill is to be taken today.

3. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee submitted its Third Intermediate Report on a study of "certain operations of" REA (H. Rept. 301)(p. 3669).

4. PERSONNEL. Received from the State Department a proposed bill "to provide for the education of the dependent minor children of the military and civilian personnel of the Federal Government stationed overseas"; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 3669).

5. MILITARY TRAINING. The "Daily Digest" states that the Armed Services Committee "Approved unanimously an amendment to be offered to S. 1, the military training and service bill, which would require both congressional and Executive approval

of any future legislative proposal to put universal military training into effect. The provision now in the measure being considered in the House would call for a commission to draw up details of a UMT plan as soon as possible, which will go into effect automatically unless rejected by Congress within 60 days." (p. D265.)

SENATE

6. HOUSING. Passed with amendments S. 349, the defense housing and community facilities and services bill (pp. 3568-77, 3583-609).

7. FORESTS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 109, to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway within the Kaibab National Forest, Ariz. (S. Rept. 212) (p. 3560).

8. R.F.C. The Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee was authorized to file during recess a report on S. Res. 76, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, relating to RFC (p. 3611).

9. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution requesting that fresh dairy products be served members of the armed forces at camps in the U. S. when such fresh products are available (p. 3558).

10. EXPENDITURES. Received an Okla. Legislature resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to require that appropriations, except in case of war, shall not exceed estimated receipts (pp. 3557-8).

11. PERSONNEL. Sen. Connally inserted a Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce resolution suggesting a policy on loyalty in public office (p. 3560).

12. RECESSED until Wed., April 11 (p. 3629).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. TAXATION. S. 1276, by Sen. Thye, and H. R. 3601, by Rep. Curtis, Nebr., to amend section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income tax treatment of sales of livestock; to Finance and Ways and Means Committees (pp. 3560, 3669).

14. IRRIGATION. S. 1297, by Sen. Malone, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of works diverting water from Lake Mead and tributaries of the Virgin River, together with certain appurtenant pumping plants and canals;
S. 1298, by Sen. Malone, authorizing works diverting water from Lake Mead, together with pumping plants and canals;
S. 1299, by Sen. Malone, a bill similar to S. 1298;
S. 1300, by Sen. Malone, to authorize works diverting water from Lake Mead above Hoover Dam, together with pumping plants and canals;
S. 1301, by Sen. Malone, authoring works diverting water from the main stream of the Colorado River above Davis Dam, together with pumping plants and canals; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3561). Discussion of these proposed projects by Sen. Malone (pp. 3620-7).

15. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3609, by Rep. Teague, Tex., to establish a basic administrativ workweek of 48 hours for officers and employees of the U. S.; to Post Office an Civil Service Committee (p. 3670).

16. EDUCATION. H. R. 3608, by Rep. Lane, Mass., to bar Federal aid to any college o

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 11, 1951
For actions of Apr. 10, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 64


CONTENTS


A.A.Act.....11
Appropriations.....1,19
C.C.C.....19
Civil defense.....1
Claims.....9
Daylight saving time...2,21
Electrification.....1,24
Electrification, rural...18
F.A.O.....5
Foreign affairs, aid.....22
Grain.....22
Insect control.....1,19
Irrigation.....13
Labor.....15
farm.....6,20
Lands, reclamation.....25
Loans.....9
housing.....10
Military training.....3
Minerals.....14
Monopolies.....7
National defense.....1,26
Personnel.....1,16,23
Prices, control.....1
Purchasing.....4
Report.....8
Tobacco.....17
Transportation.....12,24


HIGHLIGHTS: House passed 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. House passed D. C. daylight-saving-time bill. House debated military training bill.

## HOUSE

1. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 3587 (pp. 3672-90).

Rejected, 159-250, the Heselton amendment to reduce the CCC item by $750,000 additional (pp. 3672-7, 3689-90, A1983-4).

Agreed to a Cannon amendment reducing "Expenses of defense production" from $38,000,000 to $33,029,000. Rep. Cannon said this reduction was offered by the Office of Price Stabilization because "recruitment of personnel has lagged." (p. 3674.)

Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Davis, Wis., to provide that the $450,000 for planning the Niagara power development be obtained by transfer of flood-control funds, by a 64-14 vote. Rep. Miller, N. Y., moved to recommit the bill with instructions for elimination of the Niagara item, but the motion was rejected. (pp. 3679, 3686-90.)

Rep. Yorty, Calif., made a point of order against the general provision which would prohibit salary payments to a person "who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government." Rep. Cannon, Mo., then made a point of order against the entire anti-Communist paragraph. The point of order was sustained, and this paragraph was stricken from the bill. (p. 3686.)

Reps. Hill and Aspinall, Colo., and Rep. Whitten, Miss., debated the question of whether funds should be provided for the spruce bark beetle (pp. 3684-5, A1982-3).

Several members debated the item for the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the civil-defense program in general (pp. 3681-4).

2. DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME. Passed, 278-115, without amendment H. R. 2612, to authorize the D. C. Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in D. C. during the summer of 1951 (pp. 3671-2).

3. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military training and selective

service bill, acting on amendments (pp. 3691-706).

Agreed to committee amendments providing for a five-member National Security Training Commission to report to Congress, not later than 6 months following their appointment and confirmation, legislative recommendations for a program to build a National Security Training Corps, which plan would then have to be acted upon by Congress within 45 days before it could take effect (pp. 3691-705).

4. PURCHASING. The Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee submitted a report, "Survey of Procurement Process" (H. Rept. 307) (p. 3709).

5. F.A.O. The Subcommittee on Federal Relations With International Organizations of the Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee approved for submission to the full committee an information report, "Technical Assistance Proposals of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations" (p. D271).

6. FARM LABOR. The Judiciary Committee authorized its Subcommittee No. 1 to investigate the Mexican wetback situation dealing with illegal entry of Mexican migratory labor into this country (p. D272).

7. MONOPOLIES. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2401, increasing criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act (H. Rept. 306) (p. 3709).

8. REPORT. A report has been issued on "Work and Activities of the House Committee on Agriculture for the Second Session of the Eighty-first Congress." It discusses the study of research and marketing programs, foreign agricultural relations, fertilizer, farm machinery, foot-and-mouth disease, commodity exchanges, terminal markets, and farm labor. A copy has been sent to the head of each agency of the Department. A few additional copies are available in this Division.

## SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Apr. 11, 1951.

9. LOANS; CLAIMS. The Banking and Currency Committee unanimously voted to report with amendments S. 998, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, so as to encourage banks and other financial institutions to make loans to Government contractors on the assignment of Government contracts (p. D269).

10. HOUSING LOANS. One of the amendments offered by Sen. Sparkman to S. 349, the defense housing bill (see Digest 63) would extend until July 1, 1953, the authority of the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to veterans, under certain conditions, for construction or improvement of farmhouses. The amendment is in the bill as passed by the Senate and would also remove the limitation of $150,000,000 on such loans. This authority was first given the Veterans' Administration by the Housing Act of 1950, section 512.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

11. A.A.ACT. H. R. 3625, by Rep. Abbitt, Va., H. R. 3626, by Rep. Burton, Va., H. R. 3627, by Rep. Harrison, Va., and H. R. 3639, by Rep. Stanley, Va., to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3709).

12. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 3635, by Rep. Rankin, Miss., to appropriate funds for con-

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, April 6, 1951, general debate had been concluded on the bill. Under House Resolution 171, the committee substitute will be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk will now read the committee substitute for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'."

(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of 18 years and 6 months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereafter provided (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this act."

(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945."

(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than 4 months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this 4 months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone)."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of 26 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"(3) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of 18, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.

"(4) Any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"(5) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."

(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of 6 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other re-

serve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(i) Subsection (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six."

(k) Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its applications to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 26 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under section 4 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of 6 months: *Provided,* That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of 19 years during the period of such deferment.

"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians; of the remaining two members one shall be an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, the other shall be a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a reserve component. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

"(4) The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be 2 years. The term of office of the remaining three members of the Commission shall be for 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member, shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. Members of the Commission, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. Subject to the direction of the President, and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies, standards, and directives of the Commission.

"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"(7) The Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a plan or plans for—

"(i) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which program shall include the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(ii) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(iii) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;

"(iv) such other policies and standards as may be established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and

"(v) recommendations with respect to disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

"(1) the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress and referred to the Committees on Armed Services during which 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses of the Congress, by the affirmative vote of a majority of either House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such plan: *Provided,* That the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses to which the plan is referred shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress, report a resolution to their respective Houses approving or disapproving the plan submitted by the Commission, and its recommendations thereon, and such resolution shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House; and

"(2) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(9) Following the adoption of a plan submitted by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (8), the Commission may, if changes to the plan are deemed desirable by the Commission, submit such changes to the Congress in accordance with the procedure prescribed in paragraph (8), and such changes shall be acted upon as prescribed in paragraph (8).

"(10) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding 6 months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding 6 months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

"(11) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: *Provided, however,* That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"(12) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(l) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": *And provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "six

months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed 1 year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regualtions as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f), under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided,* That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further,* That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwse deferable under any other provisions of this act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they may maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."

(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such source of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided,* That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Section 7 of said act is hereby repealed.

(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is

able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within 30 days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board."

(v) Section 10 of said act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President."; and

(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this act; and the number of deferments granted under this act and the basis for such deferments."

(w) Section 17 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than 6 months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954."

(x) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 90 days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of 12 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty."

Mr. JAVITS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it appropriate at this time to offer an amendment which will follow line 11, which was just read by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not proper to offer amendment until section 1 of the bill has been read.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of section 1, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have an amendment which comes right after the enacting clause. Could the Chairman inform me when I should present it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not able to advise the gentleman when he should present his own amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill under consideration. Am I correct in believing that following the reading of the first section, which has just been completed, committee amendments are in order and take precedence over any amendment or substitute; and that following the completion of the consideration of committee amendments or amendments to committee amendments the substitute to which I refer is in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. It is in order to offer a substitute after the reading of the first section of the bill and after the committee amendments have been presented and considered.

Mr. BARDEN. I wish to apprise the Chair of the fact that that is my intention and that I have such a substitute and expect to offer it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it the intention of the Chair to rule, therefore, that the substitute will precede any other amendment except committee amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is not the intention of the Chair, because that is not in conformity with the rules of the House.

The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Page 37, strike out lines 3 and 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) The Commission shall not less than 6 months following its appointment and confirmation submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include but not be limited to—"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as the committee can understand from a reading of the amendment, its purpose and objective is that after the Commission has been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, then within 6 months the Commission must submit to the Congress for its consideration the legislative recommendations it thinks advisable.

You will see from an examination of page 37 of the bill that it would be amended to read this way:

The Commission shall, not later than 6 months following its appointment and confirmation, submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include but not be limited to—

And then we enumerate and set out certain facts that the Commission must necessarily send up to the Congress for its consideration.

Following that another amendment will be offered to the effect that when the Commission submits its report to the Committee on Armed Services this committee will be required within 45 days to submit a report on the recommendations, or a bill or resolution. If it is a bill or resolution, it will be privileged and can be called up by any Member. Then will start the debate as to the type and character of the plan. In other words, we are not delegating to the Executive; we are performing our responsibilities. One of our constitutional responsibilities is to provide and maintain an army. You cannot provide and maintain an army unless you have complete control of the various phases of the Army, its plans, and its program. So in this language now we are simply saying that the Commission must within 6 months send up to the House its plans and under the next amendment that those recommendations must be considered by the committee within 45 days. It does not come to the floor as a concurrent resolution; it comes in the form of a bill. It will be here like any other bill that comes before the Congress, it will be here under all parliamentary rules, except one. It is privileged and must be and can be called up by any Member of the House.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Why does the gentleman in his second amendment to be offered later insist on the 45-day privileged

status? Why not let it go before his committee and that committee bring it out or not bring it out the same as any other bill?

Mr. VINSON. I do not want it pigeonholed in the committee, I do not want it blocked in the Rules Committee. I want the Congress to have an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Do I understand the amendment that the gentleman proposes contemplates that there shall be a plan; in other words, the gentleman says the Commission within 6 months shall submit its plan which by the gentleman's Committee on Armed Services will be reported to the House within 45 days. Will it not be within the right of the Congress to turn down the plan altogether?

Mr. VINSON. Of course it will.

Mr. COX. And whatever plan is adopted will be the plan of the committee or the plan of the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. It will be the plan of the Congress. Let us understand that.

Mr. JUDD. Can the gentleman's committee amend this plan before it brings it out or must it bring the plan out in exactly the same form that the Commission submits it?

Mr. VINSON. The committee can, like we do here, write a brand new bill.

Mr. JUDD. The committee can?

Mr. VINSON. It merely has the advice of what the Commission recommends. We do not have to follow the advice. We can modify it or change it and when it comes to the House the House does not have to follow the views of the Armed Services Committee. The House can write whatever plan it wants to write.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the chairman of the committee, the gentleman now addressing the House, assure the House at this time that under no circumstances will he yield to striking out this part of the bill in the conference between the House and the Senate?

Mr. VINSON. I will say this at the outset: Whenever a man is so honored by the Speaker as to be named a member of a conference committee, it is his duty to carry out the views of the body that he represents. Now, whatever is written here in this bill in regard to the acts of the House, as one conferee, if I am so named by the Speaker, I will try to carry out the views of the House that I represent. Of course, it may be impossible to get an agreement and we will have to come back for instructions on the part of the House. Any conferee on this bill or any other bill who goes beyond doing what he thinks his body wants him to do is exceeding his authority as a conferee. Everybody understands that whatever bill comes back will have to be agreed to by the House again, either by voting up or voting down the conference report.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I understand, then, the gentleman will stand firm on this amendment in conference?

Mr. VINSON. I will insist as vigorously as I can that the American Congress write the plan.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. In view of what the gentleman is saying now that whatever report comes up from the Commission, may I ask him, it will have to come before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. What did the gentleman mean a while ago when he said he would not put up with any pigeonholing?

Mr. VINSON. We provide in the bill that the committee cannot pigeonhole it. It must report ultimately to the House so that the House can within 45 days work its will.

Mr. JENKINS. Then that is another instance of a commission telling the Congress what to do?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all.

Mr. JENKINS. Why is that not so if the gentleman's committee cannot do anything with it but bring it back? Why can you not reject it, why can you not pigeonhole it, if the Congress is going to legislate?

Mr. VINSON. We can kill it, we can write a plan of our own, we can bring it in here after the Commission has submitted its plan.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand the proposition, the gentleman's committee could not kill the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it could kill it, probably, in the sense it could not do something within 45 days, but in substance it could write whatever it thought necessary to write.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to inquire, as a practical matter: The gentleman has said that the committee will write the bill the way it wants to; that it will take into consideration the recommendation of the Commission. Assume that the committee, of which the gentleman is the chairman, could not agree upon the terms of a bill; then, under this procedure, which is quite novel, I might say to the gentleman from Georgia, what would the situation be?

Mr. VINSON. Well, if the committee cannot agree, why, we will continue to work, as we have done repeatedly, until we do agree. Someone will give way until we get a plan out here.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, you have a provision in here that requires your committee to bring the matter to the floor within 45 days.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, then, certainly if the committee could not agree, you could not bring it in within the 45 days.

Mr. VINSON. All right; then they submit to the House that they could not agree.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course; then on what would the House act?

Mr. VINSON. Then the House could act on whatever views the House wanted to act on.

Mr. HALLECK. It strikes me, I might say to the gentleman, that the idea of the Commission to study this matter is not, as far as I am concerned, a bad thing. I can see much good in it. But the compulsory provisions as against his committee that the gentleman has incorporated in this amendment certainly are a departure from the Hoover Commission proposals. For instance, when the Hoover Commission was set up it was directed to report to the Congress for action by the Congress. Now let me ask the gentleman one further question. Can he conceive of a situation 6 months and 45 days from now that might involve all-out war with tremendous other problems that would be confronting the Congress? Under those circumstances, does he think that the Congress should proceed to the consideration of this sort of a measure with no alternative left to the House of Representatives?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the House can always act on any legislative matter that is laid before it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The commission that is provided for has no power to put into effect any plan that it might devise until there is congressional action.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. COX. And until such action by Congress the Commission serves only in an advisory capacity.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it a fact that if the gentleman's committee takes the Commission's report and reworks it and brings it up within 45 days, that is the bill that we would work upon?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. And if the gentleman's committee should not do anything within 45 days, then any Member could bring up the Commission's report and the House would have to act upon that; is that a correct statement?

Mr. VINSON. No; I would say that it would be reported out by the committee. It will be acted on within 45 days and laid before the House in a certain, intelligent form for the House to act on one way or the other.

Mr. JUDD. So what will be called up is what your committee brings in after study of the Commission report?

Mr. VINSON. As a background of what the Commission has set up.

Mr. JUDD. What is called up is not necessarily the Commission report.

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. JUDD. It is what you do with the report.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me say this at the outset that I intend to support the gentleman's amendment as a great improvement over the present language contained in the bill. But, there is one question I would like to ask, rather one criticism that I would like to make of the gentleman's amendment, and that is I do not understand exactly whether the House will be able to give full consideration to this legislation when it is called up under a privileged motion.

Mr. VINSON. Let me read the next amendment so that you will get it all clear:

The Commission shall, not later than 6 months following its appointment and confirmation, submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to.

Note that "which shall include, but not be limited to" certain things we put in the bill.

Then, on page 38, the amendment is to strike out all of lines 1 through 20, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

(1) The legislative recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law: *Provided*, That such recommendations shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and both committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to their respective Houses: *Provided further*, That any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged and may be called up by any Member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged.

That is the whole system.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, as I understand that language it contemplates action by the Committee on Armed Services to report a bill or resolution to the House.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me get back to my original inquiry: If the committee cannot agree on such a resolution or bill, what then would be the circumstance? To my mind, nothing would be reported or could be reported, hence there would be nothing before the House for consideration; that is, I take it that the recommendation of the Commission would not have the status of an introduced bill or resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it would not.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman would be the first to insist that his committee act upon it and report it as a bill.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. If anyone sought to circumvent his committee, I am quite sure he would be quite vigorous in his denunciation of any such tactics.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. To my mind, it presents the very definite question as to what the situation would be if the gentleman's committee could not agree on a bill.

Mr. VINSON. If the committee could not agree, or the House could not agree and did not write a bill, they would not have any bill. You would not have any plan to operate the universal-military-training language. You just would not have a plan. You have to do something, and this is an effort to start it. If the House says, "No; we will turn it down," you do not have a plan then. You would have to start all over again. If the Commission says, "This is my plan," and the committee says, "We won't accept it, but we will submit to the House this plan," and then the House says, "We won't accept that," why, it goes back and you do not have a plan then. What I am driving at is this—let the Congress write the plan.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I am for that, as I said earlier to the gentleman. I do not object to the appointment of the Commission. To my mind, that would be a good thing.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. However, is not the essence of the gentleman's proposal the appointment of the Commission and the report of that Commission to the Congress, the report being some sort of basis upon which the Congress would then undertake to act?

Mr. VINSON. It could be the basis, but it does not have to be the conclusion. It could be the basis, but it does not have to be what the committee recommends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I call the gentleman's attention to the provisions of the amendment which requires the committee to report to the House within 45 days and report upon the Commission's recommendations. This does not require the committee to report to the House within 45 days a bill for a plan, but requires the committee to report to the House upon the Commission's recommendations. If the committee could not agree with the recommendations, it would report to the House within 45 days that it could not agree, and comply with the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. What is this privilege of which the gentleman spoke? The gentleman says any Member could call up the bill on a privileged motion. What is privileged, then?

Mr. VINSON. The privileged matter would be any bill or resolution so reported.

Mr. BONNER. Who would report it if the committee could not agree on reporting it to the House? What would be reported?

Mr. VINSON. Now the gentleman is splitting hairs and is dodging around matters which cannot arise.

Mr. BONNER. How much debate would there be on this privileged matter?

Mr. VINSON. It would be privileged, but you could go before the Committee on Rules and get a rule to have it considered like the other bill.

Mr. BONNER. What would be privileged? Would it be the Commission report which would be privileged?

Mr. VINSON. It would be either the Commission's report, if we could not agree on a bill to be reported, or else it would be the bill reported out by the committee. You see, what we are driving at is that we are trying to get it on the floor of the House and let the House say what kind of a plan should be adopted. That is what we are trying to do and that is the whole objective.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. If the committee votes down this proposal, may I ask him whether we will have a straight-out universal military training proposal to vote on on final passage?

Mr. VINSON. If you vote this down and it comes in as the committee reported it out, then you have a proposal which falls within the category of the reorganization bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it ought to be made clear that it is not the report of the Commission which has a privileged status, but it is the bill which the committee formulates based upon such reports as may be filed.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I understand the situation, the gentleman desires to have this matter acted on today so as to make certain that the House, within 6 months and 45 days from now, will pass upon the question of universal military training, is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. It is for the purpose of requiring the Commission, within a 6 months' period to do something about inaugurating a plan so far as it is concerned.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, if the Committee on Armed Services 6 months and 45 days from now, or even 45 days from now, or the day after tomorrow, would bring out a universal military training bill, it seems rather certain that the Congress would have an opportunity to pass upon that measure, does it not?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, the Congress could pass upon it whenever it is presented here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then why is it necessary to decide today on whether we are going to bring out a universal military training proposal for consid-

eration 6 months and 45 days from now, or 3 months from now, or 45 days from now?

Mr. VINSON. May I point out that that line of argument has no particular application to this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, but it has a lot of common sense to it, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. That may be true, and that would be a very pertinent argument under the proper circumstances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A little common sense would not hurt, with reference to this measure.

Mr. VINSON. No; and I am glad that the gentleman is beginning to use a little of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that I can contribute a little common sense to the debate here and also hope that we may dispense with levity on such an important matter as this.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is contributing some common sense to the debate, and I appreciate it. May I say the gentleman's criticism would be pertinent and germane when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] moves to strike out the universal military training phase of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman feel that he is justified in criticizing another Member for asking a question on the floor and trying to get an answer?

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman is perfectly right in making the observation as to the right of the Congress to pass upon the proposal, and the observation I made was no reflection on him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will agree, I think, that the Committee on Armed Services can bring out a universal military-training bill any time it wants to and that the House can vote on it.

Mr. VINSON. I agree that the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction to bring it out.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And may I add also that the gentleman always brings out any bill that he desires to bring out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] asked a pertinent question about the debate on the proposal as a privileged matter whenever the bill comes out. I think the answer to that is that like debate on an appropriation bill, the time is agreed upon. Furthermore, the House would go into the Committee of the Whole, and if the time is not agreed upon before resolving into the Committee of the Whole, the agreement would be made later. I do not know of a case when the time was not agreed upon. Therefore, that is a matter that can very easily be taken care of, as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. If these amendments that you propose are adopted, will a Member, if he votes for the bill after the amendments are adopted, be indicating that he is for some kind of universal military training?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. If this amendment and other amendments are agreed to, you have accomplished this, and this is all you have accomplished: You have set up the machinery, you have set up a commission, you have set up a corps, and Congress later on, in bill form, will write the program. That is all you have done here if you adopt this.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not think the gentleman has quite answered my question. I want to know whether or not, as the proponent of these amendments, you feel that if a Member votes for the bill after your amendments are adopted, that he is, at least to some extent, expressing himself in favor of universal military training.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot answer that question. I cannot answer how a man is going to straighten his own conscience with his mind or his mind with his conscience or what not.

Mr. MORRIS. That is not the reason I asked the question. I am not worried about my own conscience in the matter. You know what is in the amendments better than anybody else. I have given some consideration to them since you have presented them here. I want to know whether or not that will be an expression of approval of some form of universal military training.

Mr. VINSON. I will say this is the first step in inaugurating the machinery under which universal military training, in an orderly fashion, can be put into operation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. That is a definite answer. That is true. That is the first step.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take 10 minutes to talk as calmly and as coolly as I can about these amendments. If we pay attention, I think perhaps we can clear up some of the doubts and perplexities that are in the minds of all of us.

Yesterday morning every member of the Armed Services Committee present, 29 of us, voted for this amendment, not because we liked it but because it is the lesser of two evils.

Under the present bill as written, when the Commission is created, it is required to give a report within 6 months' time. Then the Committee on Armed Services would have to vote up or vote down that plan submitted by the Commission, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i." It would be a cowardly abdication of the powers of Congress to turn over to the executive branch of the Government the power to legislate for us.

Under the proposed amendment offered by our distinguished chairman a commission is established in the same manner. It reports in 6 months, but when that report or plan or recommendation is submitted to the Committee on Armed Services, then the Committee on Armed Services is free to consider that plan or those recommendations just as it considers any other bill. They can vote it up or they can vote it down, or they can amend it in any such fashion as they might choose. That is the chief difference between the pending bill and the proposed amendment. But having stated that, I want to say to you that it is a rather foolish and futile gesture, and we are placing ourselves in a ludicrous position, and we are doing it for this reason: Here, the Congress this afternoon, in April 1951, is attempting to pass legislation that will authorize Congress at some future date to pass a bill. Is it not silly? It is downright silly. Why place ourselves in such a ridiculous position?

Now, this move, of course, by our astute and resourceful chairman, was to get votes; it was to get the boys who are on the fence, who are wobbly, and who have not made up their minds definitely. It is a sop; it is a little molasses. Talk about attempting to soothe one's conscience; this bill has been watered down; it has been rendered more or less innocuous, and foolish, and futile. But that is exactly what we are attempting to do here. Congress passed a law that will compel us to take action at some future time; of course, the same Congress will be here 6 months from now, but if it were next year, then perhaps a different Congress would have to pass upon this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this morning I received a letter from one of the greatest and wisest men I have ever been privileged to know, Harry Emerson Fosdick. He is a great student of theology and religion and for years was pastor of the Riverside Memorial Church in the city of New York. In my opinion, he and Joseph Sizoo are the two greatest preachers I have ever heard. These men know not only their theology and religion, they are also great students of moral, social, economic, and political question. They understand Government and military problems as well. Above all, they understand human nature.

Here in two brief paragraphs Harry Emerson Fosdick hit the nail squarely on the head and drove home the big point we attempted to make last week in the opening of the debate, that there are not enough young men in this country to take care of the draft and universal military training at the same time, and that this law would have to be implemented in the future, perhaps even the distant future by some distant Congress; that no one Congress can bind another; and you cannot vote for a military appropriation for more than a 2-year period.

This letter is headed "Harry Emerson Fosdick, 4, The High Road, Bronxvile, N. Y.":

APRIL 9, 1951.

MY DEAR MR. SHORT: I have been told on good authority that if the new proposal by Mr. VINSON to get the House to approve UMT in principle is accepted, the House-Senate conference may substitute the Senate-approved version. The American people are not likely to be happy about any device which results in a permanent program of universal military conscription.

I have sat in many conferences with our great chairman from Georgia, and I know he is tougher than a pine knot; I know that he will carry out his promise and pledge to you. But I know that no conferee can be absolutely bound before he goes into conference or you never could reach an agreement, and I also know that those Senators who are members of the Armed Services Committee in the other body happen to have minds of their own. While I do not entertain any great fears or grave doubts of our capitulating and surrendering to the Senate, yet there is always that possibility, and Harry Emerson Fosdick is absolutely right.

Here is the second and last paragraph of this letter:

Why should this Congress shoulder the political responsibility for the adoption of permanent UMT when it cannot be put into effect until the emergency is over? General Eisenhower and others have told us that this may be a long emergency, possibly lasting 10 or more years. Should not the generation and the Congress which must deal with the post-emergency world also make the decision on post-emergency military policy?

Most sincerely yours,

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

Let us cross that bridge when we get to it. Why muddy the waters now? Why not continue the present Draft Act as it is for another 3 years, upon which our people are united and which would pass the House without a dissenting vote?

We had only one vote against the extension of it last year and that gentleman from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, is not here any longer.

Now, I voted for this proposed amendment in committee, I will vote for it now, but I am going to vote against the whole blooming business. Every member of the committee knows what my position is and the Members of the House know my position.

If we are wise, as I said last week, we will vote for the Barden substitute bill which will divorce universal military training from the draft, that will continue the present law to meet all of our requirements and that will make it possible for our armed services to bring in other legislation at the appropriate time. We cannot have universal military training in this country until this present emergency is over and much as I respect commissions and committees, it is hard for me to conceive of any commission the President might set up—I do not know whether he is going to name Oscar Ewing or Lilienthal, or who he may name to that Commission—I cannot conceive of any commission that in the next 6 months can learn nearly as much about universal military training as the members of the Committee on Armed Services, most of whom have lived with this problem for many years. No commission should write legislation, but only the Congress. It is our sole authority and duty under the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is uncalled for, it is untimely, it is dangerous. We should vote for the Barden bill that will soon be offered as a substitute for this measure and we will all have clear consciences; then we will go forth as a united people and not sharply divided over this bitter controversial issue. I have tried to make my position clear.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri that he will vote for this amendment but still vote against the bill, I assume that the gentlemen feels that no matter what the position of an individual Member may be, in favor of or against the Barden bill or in favor of or against the committee bill, the provision offered in the amendment now pending is a proper one and should be adopted?

Mr. SHORT. I do. I frankly admit it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. I would just like to further follow up the gentleman's statement in reference to Dr. Fosdick by saying that not only Dr. Fosdick but every single religious leader in this Nation, Catholic and Protestant, are on record in the gentleman's committee against UMT.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is eminently correct, so are the agricultural organizations, including the National Grange and the Farm Bureau.

Mr. POWELL. Every single religious organization.

Mr. SHORT. And most of our educators.

Mr. POWELL. The Council of Bishops, Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the American Baptist Convention, the National Conference of Methodist Youth, Church of the Brethren, Southern Baptist Church, Society of Friends, Disciples of Christ, United Lutheran Church, Evangelical and Reformed Church—right on down the line. They are all against UMT. I agree with the gentleman, let us vote for the Barden bill and have what the Nation needs, a draft, and not what some people want.

Mr. SHORT. I plead, I prayerfully beg every one of you to vote for the Barden bill. Let us settle this for the time being. Now is no time to fight among ourselves. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for his valuable contribution.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman recalls that one member of the church who indorsed the conference report for a permanent UMT and who appeared before our committee in strong support thereof was the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University?

Mr. SHORT. That is true. He is a fine and great man but he is an exception to the rule. Most all great religious leaders are against it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I addressed a question to the chairman of the committee as a matter of eliciting information in respect to what the situation might be if after the Commission reports the Committee on Armed Services found itself unable to agree upon a measure to be reported. The proposed amendment that is to follow clearly refers to a bill or resolution, not a report to a bill or resolution, which would necessarily contemplate action by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SHORT. If we do not resolute, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, I do not see what the Congress could do about it. It is the impotency of this thing, the futility, the foolishness, of creating another commission and spending a lot more of the taxpayers' money to take care of some political parasites, that stagger me. Let us not have any of that. We have too much already.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the name of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick carries great weight with me since he is a graduate of the same institution that I am and served on the board of trustees of that university with me. But, his mission in life is to cultivate the religious and theological welfare of our citizens. My responsibility and yours is the preservation of the welfare and the security and the defense of our country.

First, with respect to the question raised by the gentleman from Indiana, which is entirely appropriate, as to what would happen in case the committee could not agree within the 45-day period. Has it ever happened or is it conceivable that a committee or a majority of its members would not agree? This committee amendment does not require the committee to unanimously approve a recommendation of the Commission to be created or unanimously endorse some plan. A majority of the committee will determine the recommendation of that Commission, and the report of the majority of that committee will be submitted to the House whether the majority may favor a particular plan or be opposed to it. The committee will report by a majority of its members, just as is the ordinary practice in any other legislative resolution or bill.

Respectfully, I cannot agree at all with my theologic, religious, learned friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] when he asserts that this is a silly, incongruous position for us to take. To me, it is entirely logical and consistent. Those who want a plan of some kind, those who realize and recognize that if it is at all possible to discontinue drafting men for service we must start the machinery to develop a reservoir of trained civilians, realize that they must see the plan of training before they put their stamp of approval upon it.

But, there is another factor which I think is overlooked in the consideration of this approach to a problem which affects the lives of so many of our citizens. We lose sight of the fact that this Commission under the bill not only makes recommendations with respect to the program of training, but this very Commission, assuming the Congress eventually adopts a program of universal military training, administers that program. So, is it not highly essential that the Congress take a look at the complexion of the members of that Commission to see whether there are any Oscar Ewings, or Lilienthals, or Rosenbergs, or Smith, or Coles on it in order that they may make sure of two things. First, that the plan is proper, sensible, and acceptable from a military standpoint, and that the people who are going to run it are the right kind of folks to run it? To me that is a logical and sensible way of approaching the proposition.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. What is there that a Commission could do better than the members of the Committee on Armed Services in setting this policy? Why have a commission? I think you on the committee must show to the Congress that the Commission can do better in setting this policy than you can.

Mr. COLE of New York. Well, all the Commission does is to make recommendations. As has been said many times here on the floor the committee eventually will work out the program, and after that the Congress will work its will. Of course, the committee is equipped to do it.

I want to make reference to the fear that has been thrown up here, from my standpoint largely as a smoke screen, as a straw that some people are seeking to grasp to justify their position in opposition to any kind of military training, and that is the fear that the House conferees are going to capitulate to the Senate conferees and accept the Senate provision with respect to universal military training. You know as well as I that whatever the House conferees do with respect to the conference with the Senate is not binding on this House, and whatever recommendations the House conferees may make must be approved finally by a majority of the Members of this House. So let us not try to build up too many straw men or search for skeletons in the closets or conjure ghosts under the bed in a frantic search for some argument which will give a plausible but specious reason for opposing a measure which is so very vital to the national security. Let us be honest with ourselves and the people; if we are against giving consideration to any kind of military training program, let us have the courage to say so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman feel that any commission which might be set up under this bill would have a better knowledge of the questions involved in connection with the status of a universal military training program than would the members of the Committee on Armed Services themselves, most of whom have spent many years studying that subject?

Mr. COLE of New York. No; I do not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Why is it necessary to have a commission? Why not let the committee itself do the work, which you would have to do eventually, anyhow?

Mr. COLE of New York. Who is going to run the training program?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The committee of course would determine that in any legislation it might report.

Mr. COLE of New York. All the many groups which have given study to this problem have recommended that the program be run by a commission of civilians.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am talking about establishing a law for universal military training. Does not the gentleman believe the committee is more able to recommend a bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. The Commission I am talking about is the one that runs the law after the plan is approved.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 37, strike out lines 3 through 22, inclusive, and substitute the following:

"The Commission shall conduct such studies as it may deem appropriate in order to carry out the purposes of this act and shall, on or before January 15, 1952, submit a report thereon to the Congress."

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all three of the amendments which I have be read at this time, because they refer to the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the other two amendments for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SUTTON:

On page 38, strike out lines 1 through 20, inclusive, and substitute the following:

"(1) The Congress, following the date on which the report provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress, has enacted legislation setting out the provisions which shall govern the National Security Training Corps; and."

On page 39, strike out lines 2 through 7, inclusive.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the first amendment provides that the Commission set up under S. 1 shall make a study and not report a plan, but shall report to the Committee on Armed Services, and in turn the Congress of the United States shall legislate accordingly. The Armed Services Committee then writes a universal military training plan, under the power delegated to the Armed Services Committee. They bring the plan in to the Congress of the United States. Then we vote on it.

I am glad the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and I are a little closer together in this instance, because he wants the Congress of the United States and the Armed Services Committee to write the plan. I do, too. I do not want to delegate the power of the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Agriculture, or any other committee of the Congress of the United States to any outside commission. I do not want any outside commission to write a plan to bring to the Committee on Armed Services. I want the Committee on Armed Services to write their own plan.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Committee on Armed Services has some of the most intelligent men on military affairs in the United States. I do not believe there are 29 members of the Armed Forces who know more about the armed services of the United States than the 29 members of the House committee. I have the highest respect for them. I know they have been giving a great deal of study to the subject of universal military training. If we want to set up a commission they should make recommendations and then let the Committee on Armed Services write the plan that you and I are to vote for or vote against. In so doing, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has the same thought in mind as I have. We just disagree in that he wants a commission to write a plan and I want the Congress to do the legislating.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not a fact that the President of the United States can set up a committee or a commission any time he wants to to study anything and to submit recommendations and act in an advisory capacity? So why should we be worrying about that at this time?

Mr. SUTTON. The argument of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is that this commission is set up to carry out the program of universal military training. I think the committee and Congress should direct how the universal military training program shall be administered.

Mr. BUSBEY. They could have their own staff study it, could they not?

Mr. SUTTON. That is true, but too many members of commissions have the staff doing all the work.

The second amendment provides that following the date of this report no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after Congress passes a universal military training bill.

On page 39 my amendment strikes out lines 2 through 7, inclusive. This is a section of the bill which is not needed. I believe the gentleman from Georgia will agree that the provision is useless should this amendment be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, the matter comes down to this—the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia offered is better than his original bill; but at the same time it still says that a commission shall draw up the plan. That is a power which is delegated to the Congress of the United States, as set out by the Constitution of the United States. My amendment provides for the Commission to make a report on or before January 15, 1952, to the Committee on Armed Services; then the Congress would consider the committee recommendations. In that way we do not delegate our power to any commission of three or five men, but we take the responsibility right here. We will not be letting anybody write our bills, but we will be writing them ourselves. I think the Congress of the United States should know more about this question than any commission that could be appointed.

The only difference between the gentleman from Georgia and myself is that he wants a commission to write the plan and I want the Congress to do it. That is what my amendment does.

I am in hopes that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will accept this amendment to his amendment because I think we are driving at the same thing. We want the Committee on Armed Services to write this bill because we do not even know that we will be in session 6 months and 45 days from now. Six months and 45 days from now, which is November, we may not even be here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would provide for the establishment of a commission which could make recommendations, but it would be left to the Congress, and with the Committee on Armed Services, to decide whether or not such recommendations should be followed or enacted into law.

Mr. SUTTON. Definitely.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If that is the case, I will certainly support the gentleman's amendment because I recall the Congress established the so-called Hoover Commission which I believe has accomplished much, and has received great recognition throughout the country. At the time it was created there was no authority given to the Hoover Commission to do anything further than to submit a report and recommendations to the Congress. The Congress itself retained complete power and authority to pass upon the Commission's recommendations as it saw fit; and to accept, reject, or do as it pleased with them. That is exactly what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee proposes, as I understand it?

Mr. SUTTON. That is exactly what my amendment does.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, you propose the same sort of commission in connection with universal military training that we had in the Hoover Commission?

Mr. SUTTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, if that is true, I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. There is a point that has been suggested. That is, that in the committee amendment and in the Vinson amendment each of them bypass the Rules Committee. May I ask you does your amendment bypass the Rules Committee?

Mr. SUTTON. This would not bypass the Rules Committee.

Mr. FULTON. So that is another difference.

Mr. SUTTON. Yes; it would not bypass the Rules Committee. It would be the same as any other bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. There is this big difference between the Hoover Commission set-up and this Commission. The Hoover Commission was set up to make recommendations to reorganize the executive departments, which we accept or reject.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS. And then the committee ceased to function. Here is a Commission set up for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the law provided by Congress. They make recommendations to the committee. The committee accepts them or rejects them. If the committee accepts the program which the Congress finally enacts into law, then that same Commission will be charged with the responsibility of executing the laws of Congress.

Mr. SUTTON. I realize what the gentleman is saying. I am sure he does not want to delegate any of the responsibility of the Armed Services Committee to any commission.

Mr. BROOKS. We asked the Department of Agriculture for recommendations, and we know that they are going to carry out the law.

Mr. SUTTON. That is true.

Mr. BROOKS. Then we write the law.

Mr. SUTTON. Then we write the law, and that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Did I understand correctly that we would be committing ourselves in advance to a program whereby this Commission which prepared the plan would carry out the plan?

Mr. SUTTON. In my amendment this Commission will not write any plan. The Armed Services Committee will write the plan.

Mr. JUDD. I understood the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] to say that if the Congress went ahead and adopted a universal military training program, this Commission would then carry it out.

Mr. SUTTON. This Commission is to be set up in this bill only to study and report.

Mr. JUDD. Only to study and report?

Mr. SUTTON. Only to study and report; not a plan at all.

Mr. JUDD. Who is to operate the plan, should we adopt it? That would be determined in the legislation which the committee adopted, would it not?

Mr. SUTTON. Under this bill it sets up a commission. We do not change that at all. This Commission then will report, after its findings, to the Armed Services Committee, not a plan, but what they found out. Then the Armed Services Committee will sit down and write a plan. Then they will bring that to the Congress and we will vote on it as any other bill.

Mr. JUDD. And we could use this Commission or anyone else that we decide should operate the program.

Mr. SUTTON. That is true.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman leave in the language on page 35, lines 18 and 20, which provide that at such time as the Commission shall be appointed in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps? Are those words left in?

Mr. SUTTON. I have no amendment on pages 35 and 36 at all.

Mr. VORYS. That means, then, that under both the Vinson amendment and the gentleman's amendment we create a National Security Training Corps, but we do not say what it is until after the Congress decides what this corps shall consist of. Is that correct?

Mr. SUTTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a subject which has been studied, this is it. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] as a substitute for the committee amendment would result in nothing in the world but delay. Whether you are going to vote for or against universal military training, I plead with you, I beg with you to have the courage to vote today for it or against it. Whichever way you vote I am not going to criticize, but let us not duck and dodge any longer. Let us come right up and vote for or against UMT.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Not at this time.

The Compton Commission was one of the highest order, and it studied this question and reported it to the Congress in a Republican administration, under a

bill offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE], and we thoroughly studied the matter and reported the bill. So it is time to vote on it, and let us not put it off for some commission to make some study.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I must yield to the author of the amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Then, in a case like that, why do we not have a plan here today?

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to discuss that. Not only I, but a number of other members of the Committee are amazed at the importance the plan has suddenly assumed, and it seems quite strange that a great many people who have consistently opposed legislation of this kind are those who seem to place the most importance on the plan. There has never heretofore been a bill in which restrictions were placed upon the nature of the plan of training to be followed. We put that in here as an abundance of precaution to give us a chance to look at it, to make sure that it was a program of military training, and not a great socialized training program, so that there would be no danger of their attempting to carry into the military training such things as they had in the bill that came from the Department providing for the rehabilitation physically and mentally of those who were substandard and incapable of taking training. I say to you frankly that that was the thing we did not want, we did not want these boys to be trained in ceramics and the social arts and in welfare programs; and, very frankly, from the very first Selective Service Act there has been an element in the country which has attempted to bring programs of that kind into the Selective Service System.

On the question of the plan, frankly none of us here in this room can write a plan of military training, and we would never attempt to set up what constitutes basic military training; and the military, I am sure, would not attempt to lay down today what constitutes an unchangeable plan of military training, because the nature of war might change tomorrow and then they would have to change the nature of their training. It is not possible for us, we are not military experts. We are setting up a Commission which is dominated by civilians—three civilians, one of them to act as Chairman, and two military men. How could it be possible for us to write the details into law? It is no delegation of legislative authority when we say that the Commission is going to say how many hours of close order drill they must give the men who go under training in this program, how many hours of maneuvers they shall have, how many hours of classroom work. Those are only administrative details, and in order to avoid some of the things that very unfortunately have grown up in our country and the minority groups are able to put over their will on certain branches of the Government, we wrote in the power to go over the plan and see to it that it was military training.

The bill of the Senate is now under heavy attack because the contention is made that the bill provides for national service. Our bill provides for a system of military training, but not compulsory national service. So when the Commission gets together they are to find out from consultation with military men and with civilians to see that the military side is not overemphasized, that there is no danger of militarization of our youth, and they are going to determine the moral welfare. How can we determine what number of chaplains should be furnished for every thousand men? How can we determine the amount of recreation there should be and the moral environment in which these boys should be? That is the purpose of the Commission, and in every program that has ever been suggested for military training until the Department's bill came up it has been expected that this program would be under the control of a civilian Commission, and one of the primary objections, certainly one that I had to the bill that was sent up here by the Department, was that it provided nothing other than military control of our youth; and I would not stand for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. I know you would not stand for that, and the members of the committee would not stand for it. We went back to the Compton Commission report and got a civilian commission to be in charge of this program to the end that these boys would not be brought in and placed under the immediate control of the Regular service. That bill also contemplated that when the 18-year-old or 18½-year-old boys came in they would be integrated with troops of the Regular Army. That is the kind of a bill that the Department asked for here. We did not want that to happen and we did not want the great social programs being brought in. We wanted to watch both of them and we provided that a plan should be sent up here so that we would know we were getting what we intended to get and what the people were paying for, military training of the youth to go into the Reserves and be ready should they be needed.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. This Commission to be established shall serve at a per diem rate of pay, showing it is only a commission that is set up at intervals. Who is going to call it into session after they have set up this thing? Who is going to run the whole program? If they are scattered throughout the United States and called at intervals, who is going to run the program when they are not in session?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me say to the gentleman there are things in that section which I would like to have changed. I would like to have the provision that the Commission shall act under the direction of the President eliminated. I may say that I am somewhat responsible for the per diem instead of an annual salary. I made the suggestion in committee and it was agreed to. The original provision called for an annual salary. Very frankly, some appointments made recently to positions paying $12,500 to $15,000 a year on a permanent basis have been given to the type of men I do not want to see run the UMT program. I want men like Karl Compton and other great educators, men of integrity, men in religion, who might not be able to give up their present occupations in order to serve on a full-time basis. But if the House wants to make it on a full-time basis, very well, I think you will probably get a couple of defeated Congressmen on your first Commission.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask a question on this point: The Armed Services Committee has the policy-forming duty for the services now, all of them, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. Under you right now you have millions of men in training, in basic training. You do not have a commission to tell you how to make policies now. Why, then, should you need it in the future?

Mr. KILDAY. We have men in training now, yes; but only as an incident of service. The men we have now are in the service for combat, they are there to serve as soldiers, to go where they are told, and do what they are told. We do not want any commissars with the Army in the field. But when you come to training annually 500,000 youths out of high school, we do not want them to be subjected to complete rigid military control for the very same reason we exempt them in this bill from action by court martial. Should anyone be charged with any serious crime or major offense, he would, of course, be triable either in the Federal court or in the State court, depending on whether jurisdiction had been ceded.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman is missing my point. May I make it a little clearer?

Mr. KILDAY. I think it is quite clear.

Mr. FULTON. We set the policy for the training of these youth. The Armed Services Committee set that up. They are the ones who did it without a commission advising them.

Mr. KILDAY. I shall not yield further. I get the gentleman's point. We have never at any time said what character of military training there should be. We have never said he shall be trained in close-order drill or trained in tanks or anything of that kind. That has always been left completely with the military. But in connection with a long-range program and considering the unfortunate experiences we have had in the past of people attempting to use a worthy program for some special idea they had, in my opinion, perhaps changing the ways of our society, we wanted to make sure that when the entire youth of the country was going into this, it was going

to be a limited period of military training and under civilian control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. In the gentleman's opening statement he was very frank, and I admire him for the position he takes, in saying that we might as well get down to the crux of the question. That is the question of whether or not we establish UMT. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. My position has been this, not whether or not the individual is for UMT or whether we should pass a draft bill at this particular time, but UMT should come in here and stand on its own merits, on its own feet, at the proper time.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman knows I insisted from the beginning, and made General Marshall quite angry with me, that the bill be in such a position that it could be separated, with a separate vote on UMT and the other. I hope to have some time when it is germane under the proposal of the Barden substitute to explain in detail why I think it is essential that we have a UMT program to follow the draft, so that in an orderly fashion we can build up the Reserves as we diminish the active duty force and thereby eventually create a strong Military Establishment, backed by adequate Reserves.

(Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since some confusion has apparently resulted from the introduction of the amendment by the chairman, I feel it best that there be some explanation of the events that led up to this amendment. When this bill was originally reported to the House by the Committee on Armed Services it contained a provision that the Commission was to submit a plan to the Congress, which plan was to be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. However, neither these committees, nor Congress itself, was permitted to change the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" in that plan. We had to accept the plan of the Commission as written by it or reject the plan in its entirety. That we were required to do by concurrent resolution. Obviously that was an unconstitutional delegation of power. If the bill had remained in that condition, the Commission would do the legislating, the Congress would either rubberstamp what the Commission suggested or reject the same entirely. We would have nothing to say about the plan after it had been adopted except, of course, Congress would always have the authority to consider any bill that might be introduced by any Member to repeal the law or to modify it in any respect.

After the bill reached the floor it became apparent to the chairman of our committee and to others that that phase of the bill was highly objectionable and unconstitutional. The chairman drafted an amendment, which he presented last Friday afternoon at a time when I was expressing my opposition on this phase of the bill. That amendment provided that the plan was to be submitted by the Commission but that it was subject to amendment by the Committees on Armed Services or on the floor of either House. However, under this proposed amendment after the plan had been amended in committee or on the floor it had to be accepted or rejected in its amended form by a concurrent resolution. I objected very strenuously to that provision on the theory that a concurrent resolution does not have the force of law, and I cited some authorities to support this contention. If we were to adopt the plan by that process, it would necessarily mean that the constitutional power of the President to approve or veto legislation would be circumvented. So after that objection was made, the chairman, who is always willing to compromise, called the Committee on Armed Services together and we unanimously agreed on the amendment that is before you today.

The amendment as now drafted gives the Congress the right to amend any plan that may be submitted by the Commission and provides that it shall be done in a legislative way and not by concurrent resolution. Therefore, in my judgment, if the pending committee amendment is accepted, Congress will have every opportunity to consider any plan that may be submitted by the Commission and amend it the same as we would amend any other legislative bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman comment on the relative merits of the Sutton amendment and the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ELSTON. Frankly, I do not see a lot of difference between them. The amendment of the committee does circumvent the Rules Committee. It permits whatever bill we may report out to be called up as a privileged measure. The Rules Committee would have nothing to say about it. Whether that is a wise provision I am not prepared to say. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, as I understand it, simply provides that the Commission shall make a report, which report I assume is in the form of recommendations. That is what would be done under the committee amendment. The committee amendment indicates that the report shall contain recommendations, which recommendations may be accepted or rejected or amended as we see fit. We can do the same thing under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. We can take the recommendations or we can reject them. We may change them in any manner we see fit, except that after the committee has considered a recommendation from the Commission, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, a legislative bill would be reported and it would be referred to the Rules Committee and would be called up in the regular way. I think that is the principal difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman will yield, in the amendment now suggested by the gentleman's committee is any automatic power provided for the plan of the Commission to go into effect if the committee or the Congress does not act?

Mr. ELSTON. No; as I understand it, if the Commission submits a plan to our committe and our committee does not act, there is nothing for the House to vote upon. However, there is nothing to preclude the Commission from later submitting another plan. Furthermore, there is nothing to prevent any member of the committee or any Member of the Congress, for that matter, from introducing a universal military training bill and having it voted on in the regular way.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the gentleman missed the point of my question. Could the report of this Commission automatically go into force and effect if the gentleman's committee did not act in 45 days?

Mr. ELSTON. No.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understood the proposal of the gentleman from Georgia and his explanation of it, he spoke of preventing the Armed Services Committee from pigeonholing the proposition. Clearly that would indicate that there is contemplated in his amendment mandatory action as against the Armed Services Committee. If the gentleman from Georgia is correct, then the gentleman from Ohio in his last statement did not quite have the effect of the Vinson committee amendment correct.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman will read the Vinson amendment he will find that the House will consider only such resolution or bill as may be reported by the committee. In view of this language if nothing is reported by the Committees on Armed Services we would have nothing to consider or vote upon on the floor of either the House or Senate. That in effect would be pigeonholing the bill in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, both under the Vinson amendment and the Sutton amendment, this language would remain in the bill and become law:

At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

Mr. ELSTON. There is no question about that.

Mr. VORYS. What is the status of that corps?

Mr. ELSTON. As soon as we pass the bill and create the Commission, and as soon as the Commission is appointed and confirmed by the President, the National Security Training Corps is automatically established.

Mr. VORYS. The Commission does not have to be confirmed. When they are appointed we have a National Security Training Corps. What is the status of the corps at that time?

Mr. ELSTON. I say "confirmed" because one of the committee amendments provides that the 6-month period for the submission of the Commission's recommendations shall date from the Commission's appointment and confirmation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the gentleman will admit the proposed Vinson amendment was very carefully considered and debated by the committee; is that not correct?

Mr. ELSTON. There is no question but what it was carefully considered. While there may be objection to it, it is unique and it is decidedly to be preferred to the previous amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. That amendment required only a concurrent resolution. Certainly the pending committee amendment is to be preferred over the present provision of the bill which allows the Commission to submit a plan which Congress could not change in any respect.

Mr. GAVIN. I might further point out to the Members of the House that the Vinson amendment was reported out unanimously with not a dissenting vote.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct, and it is a definite improvement of the bill as it was originally reported.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not perfectly apparent to the gentleman and to all others hearing this debate that those opposing the UMT provisions of the committee bill have won their fight and that the Vinson amendment means this and nothing more—an expression of concern or an expression of interest or desire for further exploration of the subject, all in the interest of establishing a basis for the enactment of a law if it is the will of the Congress to so legislate?

Mr. ELSTON. That is true to a certain extent. Whether you are for universal military training or against it, the amendment, in my judgment, should be adopted. The committee amendment had the support of both the proponents and the opponents of UMT.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not the Sutton amendment or the Vinson amendment is agreed to, there is language on page 36 of the bill which is very interesting and which I would like to ask the chairman of the committee as to what effect it may have. On page 36, beginning at line 8, it says:

The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act—

And so forth. I take it, and I ask the chairman whether or not this is true, whether we have any other language in the bill as to the Commission making a plan and reporting it, or the committee itself making a plan and reporting to the House, that this subsection (5) beginning on line 8 of page 36 and extending to line 22, gives the Commission full power to do anything that it wants to in respect to training.

Mr. VINSON. It has no authority until the Congress approves the plan.

Mr. HINSHAW. It does not say so.

Mr. VINSON. If the Congress approves the plan, then the Commission carries out the plan that the Congress has approved.

Mr. HINSHAW. Where does it say so?

Mr. VINSON. It says that no person shall be inducted until the plan has been approved by the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I understood the previous language in the bill, the President could order a person inducted into the Security Training Corps just as soon as he eliminates the age limit of 18½. That is on a previous page. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. VINSON. Let me say this, that no man can be inducted into the Training Corps at the time he is being inducted for service. The bill provides when one shall terminate and the other commence.

Now, get this in mind. On page 37 the bill says:

No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

And then this amendment comes in—

until after the Congress has approved the plan.

It is up to us, not by resolution, but by law, signed by the President and approved by the Congress by a majority vote.

Mr. HINSHAW. I cannot put my finger on the exact language that I had in mind. I am thinking about a different amendment, but with the gentleman's statement that they absolutely cannot be inducted until the Congress has adopted a plan, I will take it that way.

Mr. VINSON. Well, it is on page 37, at the bottom of the page, "No person shall be inducted" until these things happen.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think I share the gentleman's concern. The gentleman has pointed out that on page 36 there is certain authority given to the Commission. That authority has not been amended in this amendment. That authority does become law right now, except that it cannot be exercised until after the plan is adopted. But unless changed, when the plan submitted by the Commission has been adopted or a new bill passed under that plan, this authority on page 36, subsection (5), remains.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to ask both gentlemen, who would the Commission have any authority over? It would have no authority over anybody until the Congress approves the plan.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. What becomes of paragraph 5 on page 36?

Mr. VINSON. After you begin to induct, then it says the Commission shall run the organization by direction of the President.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Then it says:

The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training—

And so on. That will be in effect.

Mr. VINSON. Nothing can happen until the Congress approves a plan. When the Congress approves a plan, then the Commission is authorized to go to work.

Mr. HINSHAW. At the bottom of page 33, where the second provision comes into effect for calling up this training corps, there is this language:

Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 26 months, which may be designated in such resolution, or whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section—

And so forth.

Mr. VINSON. I invite your attention to line 19, where it says:

For induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established.

You cannot induct men into the corps until a plan has been approved. If the committee will understand this, there will be no more confusion. All that is being accomplished by this amendment

and by the bill is establishing the machinery, the vehicle. We are building the house.

Mr. HINSHAW. I get the point. I have talked it over with the gentleman before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the Members must well realize that if we wait until the time the emergency is over before we make up our minds what we are going to do about this UMT program, that it is going to take at least 6 months thereafter in order to arrange such a program. I think that the committee has allowed the Commission too little time; I think it is going to take the Commission a year rather than 6 months to do its work, and if we adopt this 6-months idea, we will just be expecting the committee to bring in a bill extending the time for the Commission to submit its plan. Actually, if you cannot tail these things one onto the other you are going to have a very serious lapse of time which I think this country can ill afford.

I am not saying that the Vinson amendment is any better than the Sutton amendment so far as its force and effect is concerned. In all probability the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] will do the same thing as the Vinson amendment without quite so much rigamarole involved in it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not significant, though, that the Committee on the Armed Services brought in by unanimous agreement among that committee the amendment that is offered here by the chairman on behalf of the committee?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; it is very significant indeed, and I for one appreciate their action in doing it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Under the amendment by the gentleman from Tennessee, there is no assurance that it would go to the Committee on the Armed Services; there is no assurance that all of these yardsticks on page 37 would ever be considered by the Commission in making its report.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman realizes that the Committee on the Armed Services gets all legislation relating to military matters.

Mr. VINSON. Not necessarily; it could go to the Committee on Expenditures; as a matter of fact the unification bill went to that committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. I had forgotten about that; the gentleman brought up one I had not remembered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for two additional minutes, that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman is correct in his statement that a matter pertaining to the Armed Forces goes to the Committee on Armed Services. The gentleman from Georgia would raise the holy devil if it did not go to his committee, and he knows that as well as I.

Mr. HINSHAW. It probably would be rereferred if it did not go to his committee in the first instance.

Mr. SUTTON. And in the second place there are some of us who believe that the Congress of the United States should legislate instead of letting committees outside of Congress do the legislating that we are elected to do.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Committee on the Armed Services is such a splendid committee and they have had so much experience that I am a little surprised that they did not bring in something like the Towe bill to be tailed right onto the end of this bill. I wish they had done it so we could have acted on it now and not wait for 6 months from now.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman from Georgia is trying to do us a great favor here by taking some Members off the spot. Personally, it does not bother me very much one way or the other.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Let us vote on it and get off the spot now; the Members have been on the spot long enough.

Mr. HINSHAW. That suits me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be again read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Sutton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 93, noes 163.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we just adopted refers to lines 3 and 4, page 37. I have an amendment to page 37, lines 5 through 9. Will I be permitted to offer that amendment after we vote on a subsequent section of the bill? If not, I desire to offer the amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. No; not after voting on a subsequent section of the bill. The gentleman would be entitled to recognition to offer an amendment after the committee amendments are disposed of, just as other Members having amendments would be entitled to recognition.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Even though they come after my amendment on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Why, certainly. An amendment is in order to be offered to any part of section 1 of the bill, which consists of 50 pages.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 38, strike out lines 1 through 20, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) the legislative recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law: *Provided*, That such recommendations shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services, and both Committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to their respective Houses: *Provided further*, That any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged; and."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as I stated to the committee when the other amendment was being considered, this amendment would follow, and this is what the committee unanimously recommended yesterday. This follows out the procedure by which the Commission will be governed and the Congress will proceed with reference to inaugurating the plan. The Commission, as I have stated, will make its report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Armed Services will send it to the floor of the House. Then it will be considered just like any other bill on the floor of the House and be open to amendment. It must be signed by the President of the United States and, as I pointed out when the gentleman from California was addressing the House, no inductee can be put in the training corps by the very language of the bill until the Congress approves the plan. So, I repeat again, here is what is accomplished by this bill as far as UMT is concerned. We establish the vehicle, we establish the Commission, we establish the training corps, and then Congress

must step in at some future date and prescribe the type and character of the training. Even after that another thing must happen before anyone can be inducted. You must stop inducting for service; in other words, you stop the draft and you induct for training. Now, that can either be done by the Congress or it can be done by the President. Why do we put in there that it has to be done by the Congress? It is because it is costing $35,000,000,000 a year now to run the armed services and after awhile the Congress might get tired and say, "We want to inaugurate another program, and we want the Armed Forces reduced," so therefore Congress passes a concurrent resolution and says, "We will stop drafting people in the country for the armed services; we will draft them for the training program." We are wise in doing that; we are on sound ground when we do that because it is the Congress that writes it instead of some commission. It makes no difference how ably it may be staffed. So I am hoping that this amendment, which is the amendment that was approved unanimously as was stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be accepted, because it is along the right line, and then later on we will have a clean-cut issue between the Barden amendment and those who believe in universal military training.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say awhile ago that any legislation presented by the Committee on Armed Services on this subject could not be pigeonholed by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. VINSON. It cannot be pigeonholed by anybody. It must come back to the floor of the House for the majority of 435 Members to work its will.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am just curious to know this: There is one thing to be made permanent under the gentleman's plan, and that is the name of the thing.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. The name that everybody in the country calls UMT, which has the word "military" in it, is now going to be called national security training?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. Who invented that name?

Mr. VINSON. I wish I could have the honor of inventing it. It is a very appropriate name, but I would say the combined wisdom of 38 men on the committee invented it.

Mr. VORYS. Was it the purpose to eliminate the word "military"?

Mr. VINSON. No; not at all, not one particle. That is just the proper name for it.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that was the name given to the training corps in the Towe bill in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. VORYS. Is that where this came from?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. Universal military training is to be called now national security training.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. It was based on the Compton report

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I was the one raising the question of the functions of the Committee on Rules with respect to this legislation coming back on the floor of the House. Why is there any intent to bypass the Rules Committee?

Mr. VINSON. There will be no bypassing the committee as long as I am a Member of the Congress. I will go before the Rules Committee. However, to be absolutely sure that there could be no opportunity anywhere to bottle it up, we make it privileged. That is all.

Mr. FULTON. That is a good statement.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Would this be a majority of the elected Members or a majority of those present?

Mr. VINSON. It means a majority, just as we are going to vote here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 39, strike out lines 2 through 7, inclusive.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the amendments adopted, this language comes out, because this has reference to the other system we had. It is purely in the interest of proper language.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 51, line 23, after the date July 1, 1954, strike out the period and add the following: "except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this really is a perfecting amendment, but I think a word of explanation may be necessary for the information of the Members.

As the committee progressed with the final drafting of the bill, the continuance of the provisions for draft for service was left on an indefinite basis subject to termination either by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress. During the deliberations in the drafting of the bill with respect to the deferment of individuals within the 18½ to 26 age bracket who might be deferred for agriculture or college or one thing or another, the committee amended section 6 of the present Draft Act to provide that every individual who may be deferred would be liable for service up to the age of 35, so that no college student or other deferred person would escape his liability for service because of his deferment. If he is under 35, he is still subject to the draft.

Subsequently the committee wrote a definite time limitation on the bill, July 1954. Of course, the result of that would be that all these men who are being deferred during the period between now and 1954 would escape liability completely after 1954. This amendment is offered to close that gap and make certain that those individuals who have been deferred will not escape their liability for service even after July 1, 1954.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 51 strike out lines 11 to 20, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps, and no person shall be ordered to active duty pursuant to section 6 (d) (1), after July 1, 1954. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior thereto shall, not more than 6 months after that date be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself, and does not require very much of an explanation. If you examine the bill you will find there is a definite termination date as to the selective-service features of the bill but none as to the universal-military-training program.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I did not hear the date of termination. What was it?

Mr. ELSTON. As to the selective-service features of the bill there is a definite termination day.

Mr. VINSON. What is the date of the termination of the selective service? I did not hear it.

Mr. ELSTON. July 1, 1954. As to the universal-military-training features of the bill, there is no termination date. Obviously the fixing of a definite termination date for selective service will require the Congress to reconsider the whole program sometime before that date. Since these two measures are being enacted as one, it seems logical and reasonable that a termination date should be considered as to both. My amendment means that Congress must review the entire program sometime before July 1, 1954. If Congress is satisfied that the program is working well and should be continued it is a very sim-

ple matter for the Congress to continue it. Just as we have continued the Draft Act a number of times, so can we continue the universal-military training part of the bill if Congress after appropriate and full consideration decides that it should be continued. It makes no difference whether you are for the UMT program or against it. That is entirely beside the question. There should be a definite termination date so that those who are for the bill and so that those who are against it will have an opportunity to consider the whole program sometime before July 1, 1954. Who is in a better position to determine whether or not the program should be continued than Congress itself? If we adopt the bill without this amendment, we will pass on to the Commission the authority to go ahead with the program for an indefinite period, limited only by our approval of the Commission's plan and by congressional appropriations. The only way Congress can terminate the program, as the bill is now written, is by the passage of a concurrent resolution. By such a resolution we can either terminate the program or suspend inductions for a certain period of time. But is that the proper way to legislate on a matter as important as universal-military training? Why should there be any fear of congressional review?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The section to which the gentleman's amendment pertains refers to the term "Reserve component." As I understand the purpose of the training program, an inductee in the Training Corps will remain under universal military training for 6 months, after which he will go to the Reserve component.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Is that an inactive Reserve component or an active Reserve component? What is the nature of the Reserve component into which the graduate from the training corps will go?

Mr. ELSTON. The bill merely uses the term "Reserve component." I presume that will be one of the subjects included in the Commission's plan or it could be taken care of by future legislation.

Mr. YATES. Has he a choice?

Mr. ELSTON. Not under the terms of this bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Naturally he will continue his training as a member of an active Reserve unit by attending drills and taking summer training.

Mr. ELSTON. I certainly hope that is the way it will be.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I could not hear the amendment when it was read. What is the termination date for induction in the National Training Corps?

Mr. ELSTON. The amendment provides that there shall be no inductions in the National Security Training Corps after July 1, 1954.

Mr. VINSON. Then you are making the termination of the draft and the termination of the UMT the same?

Mr. ELSTON. Exactly the same. I feel that when we consider the extension of one phase of the program we should consider both phases. I cannot have any sympathy with the claim that if we set up UMT we must make it permanent in order for it to succeed. I consider it the duty, the obligation, and the responsibility of Congress in a matter of as great importance as UMT to review the program from time to time. By July 1, 1954, the emergency may be over, but whether it is or not, Congress should review the program in the light of conditions as they exist at that time. I believe the Commission will do a better job if its members know that their actions are to be periodically reviewed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object at this time owing to the fact that this legislation is before the House, but after this week I expect to object to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday until we get our veterans' legislation through the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## APPROPRIATION FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement what my colleagues from California and elsewhere have said this afternoon about the great danger which is involved in the drastic cut made by the House committee in the recommended appropriation for civil defense.

Some of us represent districts which have been described as high-priority targets in the event a bombing war should be waged against the United States, but I know that the whole American people would join with us in outraged protest against any form of misguided economy which might be construed by our potential enemies to mean that this Government regards certain areas of our country as expendable, if atomic war should come, and that Congress thinks it useless to spend sufficient money to give these areas an adequate system of defense.

I am sure that the House Appropriations Committee did not indulge in any such fallacious reasoning, and I am glad to read in the committee report on the deficiency bill that another estimate will be submitted to Congress in the near future to carry forward the civil-defense program. I earnestly hope that this promised estimate will assure a strong program of civil defense in every section of the country.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## PAUL DILLON

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I made certain factual statements about Mr. Paul Dillon, of St. Louis, to wit, that he was Mr. Truman's campaign manager at one time for the St. Louis area and that he was a social guest at the White House.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, then proceeded to castigate me, as he said, for attacking the President of the United States by innuendo.

I did not think I was using innuendo. I thought I was making it very clear that Mr. Truman was allied in a political way with Mr. Paul Dillon and that the acquaintance extended socially. These facts are pertinent to the political difficulties which have arisen in the State of Mississippi mentioned on the floor of the House. They are also pertinent to the success Mr. Dillon has attained in many of his other political endeavors.

I draw no conclusions. I merely say these are pertinent facts. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] believes that these facts reflect upon Mr. Truman, that is for him to say. Certainly the Members of Congress

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 12, 1951
For actions of Apr. 11, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 65

CONTENTS

Buildings and grounds.....2
Civil defense.....9
Claims.....3
Committees.....15
Cooperatives.....27
Defense production.....24
Dispersal.....2
Electrification....10,15,25
Expositions.....6
Foreign affairs, aid..18,23
Forests and forestry.....4
Grain.....18,22,23
Labor, farm.....1
Lands.....4,5,6
Livestock and meat.....16
Loans.....3
Military training.....13
Minerals.....19,28
Organization, executive... .....30,31
Personnel....8,14,21,29,30
Prices, control.....28
Purchasing.....3
Rehabilitation, rural.....6
Report.....16
Research.....5
R.F.C.....7,26,31
Taxation.....17
Trade, foreign.....12
Transportation.....10,25
Water utilization.....20
Weed control.....11

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported farm-labor bill. Senate committee reported buildings-dispersal bill. House committee ordered reported bill to extend export controls. House debated military-training bill.

## SENATE

1. FARM LABOR. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 984, to provide for emergency recruitment of farm labor, etc. (S. Rept. 214) (p. 3718).

Received a Calif. Legislature recommendation that persons now employed as pilots and aircraft mechanics be deferred from the armed forces (p. 3714).

2. BUILDINGS DISPERSAL. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. 218, to provide for dispersal of Government buildings in the D. C. area (S. Rept. 216), and Sen. Holland indicated that it may be debated immediately after the RFC reorganization plan (pp. 3735-6). The "Daily Digest" states: "The amendments would provide for the reduction of sites for dispersal purposes to 4, decrease authorization of funds to $107 million, authorize decentralization of 25,000 Government employees, provide for demolition of temporary buildings put up during World War II, and set up a joint committee on demolition, dispersal, and decentralization"(p. D277).

3. DEFENSE CONTRACTS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendments S. 998, to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, etc. (S. Rept. 217)(p. 3718).

4. FORESTS. Passed as reported S. 109, to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway within the Kaibab National Forest, Ariz. (p. 3735).

Passed without amendment H. R. 3040, to authorize USDA to reconvey to the Chamber of Commerce, Ogden, Utah, a tract of land which had been donated to the Federal Government but was not used (p. 3732). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Received from the Interior Department a proposed bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3713).

5. RESEARCH LANDS. Passed without amendment S. 271, to authorize the transfer of a tract of land from USDA to the Vermont Agricultural College, for agricultural purposes (pp. 3725, 3736).

6. RURAL-REHABILITATION LANDS. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 35, to permit Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the police jury of Rapides parish for livestock and agricultural expositions (p. 3732).

7. RFC. The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee reported S. Res. 76, disapproving reorganization plan 1 of 1951 relating to RFC (S. Rept. 213) (p. 3711). This measure was made the unfinished business (p. 3735).
Sen. Anderson spoke in favor of continuation of RFC (p. 3720).

8. PERSONNEL. Received from the Commerce Department a proposed bill to promote the rescue of civilian employees of the Federal Government who are lost in the performance of their official duties, to continue salary payments of such employees, etc.; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3713).

9. CIVIL DEFENSE. Sen. Kefauver discussed the importance of civil defense and expressed concern about the House Appropriations Committee's reduction in the amount for the Civil Defense Administration (pp. 3766-7).

10. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Received a Md. Legislature recommendation against this project (p. 3717).

11. WEED CONTROL. Sen. McCarran spoke in favor of Federal help in eradicating noxious weeds, particularly halogeton, and inserted a recent Nev. law on this subject (pp. 3717-8).

HOUSE

12. EXPORT CONTROL. The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. J. Res. 197, to continue authority for export control through June 30, 1953 (p. D277).

13. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military training and service bill (pp. 3778-808). Rejected an amendment to end the training program in 1954. Adopted amendments designed to repeal the Executive order on deferment of students with high scholastic grades and to leave educational deferments up to each local draft board; and to strengthen the provision prohibiting the sending of inductees into combat areas prior to 6 months of training. The pending question is a substitute offered by Rep. Barden providing for an extension of the draft with no provisions for universal military training.

14. PERSONNEL. A Judiciary subcommittee approved for reporting to the full committee S. 15, amended, making it an offense for private employment agencies to solicit or accept fees when referring persons for Federal employment (p. D278).

15. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. The Foreign Affairs Committee announced appointment of subcommittees to consider various bills, including H. R. 3400, relating to disposition of electric power at Falcon Dam (p. D278).

sions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

*To be second lieutenant*

Lansing G. Scofield

The following-named person for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

*To be second lieutenant*

George R. Loftis, 532986 USN.

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 26), 1951:

### IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. James Clyde Fry, O15023, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), to be brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, O4731, United States Army.

Col. Anthony Joseph Drexel Biddle, Jr., O544174.

AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The officer named herein for appointment in the Air National Guard of the United States of the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Earl Thornton Ricks, AO395254, Arkansas Air National Guard, to date from March 7, 1951.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A.
Brig. Gen. George Warren Mundy, 358A.
Brig. Gen. George Robert Acheson, 335A.
Brig. Gen. Edward Julius Timberlake, Jr., 603A.
Brig. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham, AO343889.
Brig. Gen. Edmund Clayton Lynch, 77A.
Brig. Gen. James Franklin Powell, 128A.
Brig. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., 294A.
Brig. Gen. Dan Clark Ogle, 602A.

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. George Ferrow Smith, 380A.
Col. Joe William Kelly, 612A.
Col. Russell J. Minty, 224A.
Col. James Ferguson, 1530A.
Col. Harold Hanson Twitchell, 19034A.
Col. Gilbert Hayden, 218A.
Col. Richard August Grussendorf, 543A.
Col. Clyde Lemuel Brothers, 19027A.
Col. Wycliffe Eugene Steele, 491A.
Col. Ralph Orville Brownfield, 399A.
Col. Robert Oswald Cork, 523A.
Col. Leighton Ira Davis, 1111A.

### UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

*To be lieutenant generals*

Maj. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A, United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Fifth Air Force, Far East Air Forces, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A, United States Air Force, to be deputy commanding general, Far East Air Forces, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Robert Wells Harper, 53A, United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Air Training Command, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A, United States Air Force, to be commander, Military Air Transport Service, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent, 57A, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Headquarters, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Kemper Warren Baker et al. and the nominations of Edward August Dvorak et al. for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 27, 1951, and appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Kemper Warren Baker, the first name appearing in the first group mentioned, and which is shown on page 3016, and ending with the name of Inez Velma McDonald, which appears on page 3023, being the last name of the second group mentioned.

### IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

# House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. O. L. Fontaine, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Mangum, Okla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we pause at this the beginning of an important day's work to ask Thy blessing upon all that is done here that Thou mayest use it for the betterment of all mankind.

Save this moment from being merely the perfunctory performance of a routine matter but may it be a time when we genuinely recognize Thy presence and offer ourselves to Thy leadership.

For Thy wisdom, O God, is far above that of our own. Thy law is above all our laws, and Thy truth alone is sufficient to lead us in these difficult times. And only Thy love can guide us wisely. Save us, O God, from even the slightest relinquishing the hope of a better world and tomorrow, a world built upon the proposition of the inherent dignity of every individual. Despite every difficulty, every disappointment, set our hearts steadfastly toward the accomplishment of this hope, though it take a thousand years.

Make us to know that unless we stand for something we may fall for everything.

Bless, O God, these leaders of this great country of ours—to the end that this country under God, may have a new birth of freedom, justice, and love. In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I inquire if the Speaker would agree that the House would take a recess of 2 hours. I make this request because of the tragic situation that prevails in the world. I should like, if I could, to have a Republican conference. If the Speaker will permit me to make that request, I shall do so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that that is a very unusual request. The Chair does not think it has ever been made in the history of the Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, these are very unusual conditions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is perfectly willing to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts on that point. However, there is an amendment coming up to the bill that the Chair thinks will take some hours, in all probability.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Chair understands that in accordance with his policies and the policies I have previously agreed with, too, we desire all our membership to be on the floor when these various bills are being read for amendment. Because of the tremendous importance of the situation in the world today, I should like to submit that request, but, of course, I shall not insist on it if the Speaker is not agreeable to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts poses a very hard question for the Chair. For the moment the Chair thinks he will not entertain the request.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Hébert | Powell |
| Armstrong | Kersten | Radwan |
| Blatnik | Mack, Ill. | Scott, Hardie |
| Boykin | Martin, Iowa | Sieminski |
| Buchanan | Miller, N. Y. | Tollefson |
| Celler | Murray, Wis. | Widnall |
| Deane | O'Konski | Woodruff |
| Dingell | O'Neill | |
| Gillette | Phillips | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 51 strike out lines 11 to 20, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps, and no person shall be ordered to active duty pursuant to section 6 (d) (1), after July 1, 1954. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior thereto shall, not more than 6 months after that date be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be able to explain to the Committee, so that they can clearly understand it, what the Elston amendment does, and I hope I will not be forced to use more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the bill there is a termination date for induction for service, that is, the draft. Under the bill the draft only runs for a period of 3 years. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment to make the termination date for induction for training the same, making the length of time 3 years. Here is the fallacy of the gentleman's amendment at this time. In the first place we do not have any training program. No training program has yet been adopted. Consider what we would be doing. You would be saying that before a training program has ever been submitted to the Congress, and before the Congress has ever approved a training program, that whatever we do in the future can only be done for a period of 3 years. In other words, you are saying that something which will be created in the future can only live for a period of 3 years. I am frank to admit to the House that when the plan comes to the Congress it would be properly within the province of the committee to determine then how long the plan should be in force. But to adopt the amendment now, before the Congress has even approved a plan, is killing it before it is created. That would be the absurdity of adopting such an amendment.

The proper time to do it is when the Congress considers the plan.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Under the gentleman's amendment, and under the bill itself the Commission would be appointed by the President and the training corps would come into being immediately. Within 6 months the Commission must then submit a plan to the Congress. After the Congress has approved or rejected the plan, is there any provision in the bill

for a review of the program thereafter, if the amendment which I have introduced is not adopted?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's question somewhat evades the issue involved in his amendment. There is a provision in the bill providing that every 6 months the Commission must report to the Congress as to the type and character of training.

Mr. Chairman, getting back to the gentleman's amendment. He proposes now to say that a plan which will be adopted in the future, a plan which has not yet been submitted, can only be adopted for a period of 3 years. Of course, it is inopportune to do that now. The time to do that and to put a termination on it is when the plan is laid before the committee and before Congress. I am frank to say that in all probability the Committee on Armed Services, in studying the plan, would write a termination date on the plan, but certainly some flexibility would be allowed to try it out for a reasonable period instead of so short a period as 3 years.

So I hope you will not do this now and that you will not say that before this is born, if you do create it, you can only create it for a period of 3 years.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the gentleman's amendment so worded that it would make it impossible for the Committee on Armed Services to change the date in the bill which they may later report?

Mr. VINSON. The Armed Services Committee would have to say notwithstanding any other law we fix the date, or else they would be bound by the 3-year limitation.

Mr. KEATING. But would not the Armed Services Committee have power to fix the date later than we fixed it in the bill?

Mr. VINSON. Of course the Armed Services Committee and the Congress could say 6 years; the Congress could say 5 years; the Congress could say 8 years when the plan comes before the Congress.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask the gentleman whether the gentleman agrees to some termination date?

Mr. VINSON. When the issue comes before the committee it is pertinent and proper that a termination date at that time be considered by the Congress. But do not say now, before you even create the plan, that when it is born you will knock it in the head 3 years from that date.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no Member of this body could offer a stronger argument against this bill than its own sponsor, the distinguished chairman of our committee. He said, "It is an inopportune time now to set a termination date." I say it is an inopportune time now to pass this legislation. Let us cross that bridge when we get to it. We can pass this legislation if and when it is needed.

There have been Members of this body on both sides of the aisle who have criticized the opponents of this measure as being hostile to the "brass" and the "braid." I want to say that the pictures of admirals and generals hang on my wall, and I hold in my mind and heart the highest admiration, the deepest and fondest affection for many of them. Forever I shall be grateful to them for the great victories they have won. I do not believe in blind, subservient obedience. I will follow them when I think they are right and I will leave them when I think they are wrong. To refresh the memory of Members without trying to befog and becloud the issue and muddle your minds by saying that we are up here fighting the "brass" and the "braid," I want to read you what I said in this very spot on September 17, 1945, almost 6 years ago, just a little more than a month after VJ-day. That was the hour when the fathers and mothers and the people all over this country were clamoring, "Bring our boys home, not next year, next month, or next week, but brings them home now; fly them home." And I was one of only two or three Members of this House who was opposed by some of my Republican colleagues when I stood up and spoke against too quick demobilization. I want you to hear me on September 17, 1945, on page 8631, of the permanent RECORD:

We took 5 long years, gentlemen, to build up the mightiest war machine in the history of the world. About 12,000,000 men and women are scattered all over this universe—on every continent and on every sea. It has taken years to get them out there. Now, after four long years of war and after glorious victory over three of the mightiest, most determined, and most ruthless military powers the world has ever known, we stop fighting the Italians, the Germans, and the Japs and start fighting among ourselves and start kicking around the "brass hats" and the "gold braids" who, in spite of all their faults and shortcomings, have won important renown. Heaven knows that I have never claimed infallibility for any of our generals or admirals. No member of our committee has more violenty opposed them at times. I know that they are not perfect, and that they have and will make mistakes. Nevertheless, it must be conceded that they are free from many of the pressures that elected officers are subject to and that they can, with sympathy and resoluteness, decide certain problems peculiar to their own field.

It does seem strange that only a few months ago when the fate of this Nation hung in the balance, when our very lives were at stake, that we were praising to the skies our generals and admirals. You know, I wonder how in the name of God, Leahy and Marshall, King, and Arnold, Eisenhower, and Devers, Bradley, Patch, Hodges, and Patton, Simpson, Brereton, Doolittle, and Chennault, Spaatz and Kenney, Eaker and Somervell—I wonder how in the name of heaven Nimitz or his commanders in the Pacific, Mitscher, whom we will soon see in this House, along with Admirals Halsey, Kinkaid, and Spruance—I wonder how in the world these gallant marines under Vandegrift, and the forces under gallant and colorful MacArthur, able Kreuger——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the membership of this House for their kindness, consideration, and generosity, which goes to prove that after all here in America, much as we might violently differ not only between parties but among ourselves on both this side and that side of the aisle, every American has the opportunity to stand up and speak his mind. I continue to quote from my speech on this floor on September 17, 1945:

I wonder how in the world these gallant marines under Vandegrift, and the forces under gallant and colorful MacArthur, able Krueger, suffering Wainwright, patient Eichelberger, ever won this war without these parlor generals and pink tea strategists back home who are now willing, after they have saved our necks, to kick them all over hell's half acre. But it is only natural after a war for everybody to want to come home. And it is also natural to cuss the generals and admirals. They expect it. And I say this as one who I do not think has ever kow-towed to them or been subservient in the least—I know that the generals and admirals make mistakes; even Members of Congress do sometimes, because all of us are human.

I do want to say that I think the Army was not prepared for demobilization as it was for war. Why should it be? The primary interest, the paramount duty of the leaders of our Armed Forces on land and sea and in the air was to win this war. It was not to think, plan, dream, and waste time about setting up machinery to demobilize. It was to win the war quickly and stop the bloodshed immediately. This they have done. Now then, we are so darned impatient, we are not willing to give them a few weeks to adjust themselves and find out where they really are. MacArthur has to take inventory.

Mr. Chairman, I could continue that speech, but, oh, we have reached the sad, tragic hour when you have got to fire Acheson or fire MacArthur. You who have been criticizing us for differing with the admirals and generals, what are you going to say today when instead of firing Dean Acheson, who refuses to turn his back on Alger Hiss, a convicted perjurer, a traitor now in prison, Harry Truman refuses to turn his back on Dean Acheson but fires Douglas MacArthur, one of the world's greatest generals of all time. Oh, where are you defenders of the brass and the braid?

Where are you? Where do you stand? Shall we hear any voices on the floor of this House in this tragic hour? You can have your Acheson. He, as well as MacArthur, will be remembered, but for different reasons. You know, Abraham Lincoln once said:

I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to do right. I will follow any man as long as he does right, but when he goes wrong, then we part.

But that is the difference between Honest Abe and Dean Acheson and little Harry from Lamar.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no delusions that I am going to bring you from your seats during the 5 minutes

I propose to speak on this amendment. On the other hand, I do propose to speak 5 minutes on the amendment.

I stated here last week that this is a matter affecting the security and defense of the country and should be considered calmly and dispassionately. At that time I expressed regret that every controversial issue which was then current in the country had been brought into the debate on a question which should be calmly and deliberately considered without partisanship. We now see that the very latest and the hottest controversial issue gets into the debate before we barely get started.

Let us talk about the bill and the amendment. I still have no delusions but what throughout the day and for days to come we will be diverted from the bill by highly controversial matters, which I insist do not determine how any Member should vote on this highly important bill in the interest of national defense, as I see it—maybe you see it the other way—but it is certainly one that should be considered without these controversial issues.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio strikes out the language on page 51 of the bill from line 11 to line 20. That language reads:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than 6 months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.

The gentleman's amendment would substitute for that language a provision that no one should be inducted into the National Security Training Corps subsequent to July 1, 1954. I submit that the committee has brought you here a provision leaving the duration of the induction into the National Security Training Corps in the hands of a majority of the Congress, not subject to veto by the President, because, as a concurrent resolution, it would not go to the President. Conceivably, Congress could terminate it prior to July 1, 1954, not that I think that would be done, but to illustrate to you the fact, under the provision that the committee has brought you, Congress has complete control as to how long the program shall continue. I believe, and it is evident, that the provision we have here is preferable to that of the gentleman from Ohio.

I submit further that even though the Commission should be appointed immediately upon the approval of this bill and secure prompt confirmation, that the question of the 6 months would be involved, so no matter how quickly the National Security Training Corps would go into operation, by July 1, 1954, we would not have had an opportunity to see whether the plan works or whether it is acceptable to the American people. You are going to terminate it on the date of the termination of the draft. Of course, it is conceivable, even though this may be used as an argument against my position, that the National Security Corps inductions would not begin before July 1, 1954, because, by the provisions of the bill itself, no one goes into the National Security Training Corps until such time as the President by Executive order or the Congress by concurrent resolution finds that inductions for service under 19 are no longer required in the national interest, so that it either provides an inadequate period for test to determine whether the program is acceptable and workable or it provides that it shall never go into effect.

I submit that the provision in the bill is the proper provision; that it retains control in the hands of a majority of the Congress without interference of the President by way of veto which might require a two-thirds vote to overcome.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Since the bill puts all of the persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps into a reserve program, with a total service of 6 years, is there any reason that the gentleman knows of why the entire matter should not be reviewed in a little more than 3 years from the present time?

Mr. KILDAY. As to the extension of the existing law, I agree that there should be a termination date; there has always been. In the 1940 act, and all through the various extensions up until the 1948 act, each contained, of course, a termination date. As to the draft for service, I agree, but if you are going to start with a long-range program, you ought not have it appear as if boys in the 3-year-age brackets, during three particular ages, are subject to the bill, and that the others are not. You should have it on a basis where, on a long-range basis, each boy should know what was required of him and not be terminated in 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there was a meeting this morning of the Republican leadership of the House and the Senate. As a result of that meeting this statement was given out to the public:

(1) That the whole question of the conduct of foreign and military policy be investigated by the Congress in the light of latest tragic developments;

(2) That the Congress should have the complete views of General MacArthur and he should be invited to return for that purpose forthwith.

In addition, the question of possible impeachments was discussed.

As a result of this agreement Senator WHERRY will introduce in the Senate, and I have introduced in the House, a resolution calling for a joint session of the House and the Senate for the purpose of hearing the distinguished general.

I may say that I have communicated with the office of General MacArthur in Tokyo, and I am authorized to say that General MacArthur would be delighted to have an invitation from the House and the Senate to speak at a joint session. He would consider it a great honor. If that invitation is given, he can be here in about 3 weeks.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman should modify his first proposal to mean an investigation of the State Department, I think he might go forward in the feeling of probable success.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That would naturally go with it.

I should like to make one more statement: The Members will recall that I was hopeful we might have a recess for 2 hours in order that we could have a Republican conference in which we could discuss these latest developments. That request was not granted. May I say, however, that I think the Speaker acted wholly within his province when he did not entertain that request, I know it was neither personal or partisan because I can understand how it might lead to abuses. I am not finding any fault, but I am giving notice that following the adjournment of the House today there will be a meeting of the Republican Members of the House in this Chamber.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a happy position in which I find myself to feel constantly required to appear in opposition to some of the attitudes and proposals of some of my own very close friends on the minority side who are members of this committee. However, my feelings on this subject are so deep that I feel I have no other course. I should not like the impression to be created with the minority Members of the Committee of the Whole that the pending amendment has the support of all the minority members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Whatever the purpose behind this amendment may be, which I shall not attempt to characterize, the effect of it is to kill universal military training before it ever starts. In passing upon this amendment I urge that we all have in mind just what the purpose of a program of universal military training is and how important it is that the machinery be started now for its commencement in order that the military may begin to make its plans with respect to dealing with its own responsibility in our national defense.

It is expected that after the universal military training program has been in operation for a reasonably short period of time it will not only be possible for the military to release reservists who are now involuntarily on active duty but it will be possible for the military to reduce the size of the standing military establishment below the figure of approximately 3,500,000 men.

So, if the effect of this amendment is as I say, that it will stop universal military training before it ever starts, then we can expect the prospect of continuing the draft of young men for military service far beyond 1954, unless world conditions improve tremendously, and the

prospect of improvement is not at all bright, as I am sure all of you will agree.

If this amendment carried a time limit within reasonable limitations which would give the program of universal military training an opportunity to be put into operation and tested to determine whether or not the American people want that kind of system, none of those who favor the system would resist it. But the time which has been fixed by the gentleman's amendment is so very brief, that we not only make it impossible to give universal military training a fair trial, but we make it impossible for the military to make their plans for the future.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. May I state to the gentleman in the first place he is entirely wrong in his assumption that the effect of this amendment is to kill universal military training. Certainly that is not the intention of the author of the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. That may not be the intention of the author of the amendment, but that is the effect of the amendment. Under the bill, if the Congress accepts the bill as it is now written, and under the most optimistic circumstances universal military training could not possibly get started within a year or a year and a half. Consequently, under the gentleman's amendment, universal military training could not operate for more than a year. It would take 6 months for the commission to be appointed and organized and make its plans, and it would take an indefinite period of time for the Congress to act upon the plan. After Congress has acted on the plan, the military must have some time to make preparations to receive these boys and house them and train them and construct facilities for them. Therefore, I say, under the most optimistic circumstances you could not operate UMT for more than a year.

Mr. ELSTON. Does not the gentleman realize that the effect of the amendment, instead of doing as indicated, actually does nothing more than to require a congressional review of the UMT program after it has been in operation for perhaps a year? Is there any reason why the Congress of the United States, the duly-elected representatives of the people should not sit down and calmly review the program in the light of conditions as they exist at that time? Certainly no future Congress is going to be bound by the actions of this Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the provision in this bill which permits the Congress, the representatives of the people, to review this program at any time, and it can stop inductions into the UMT on the day after inductions start if it wants to. Therefore, the gentleman's argument that his amendment is needed to permit the Congress to review UMT is completely baseless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am also sorry to have to oppose this amendment. But I want to take these few moments to present to you my view. The argument of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, the ranking member of our committee and a very good friend of mine, is the very argument that you should keep in mind when you vote on this amendment. If you carry out the necessary lessons to be learned from the too rapid demobilization in 1945 and 1946 I believe you will inevitably come to the opinion that if America is to have a sound, long-range security policy, we must have some form of universal military training.

Two times in my lifetime I have seen America build itself up to the pinnacle of military strength and to the pinnacle of world leadership. Twice we just let all our strength drift and disintegrate. In this small explosive world I firmly believe we must have some long-range policy for our national protection. I cannot sit still and allow an amendment to go to the House without protesting against it, since it would have the effect, as our chairman said, of killing the proposition before it is ever born.

I would like to have a UMT program continue for at least 6 years so that we can get a fair sample of what it will do in building up a sound security program, which will filter into the Armed Forces of the United States men who are trained and who will be ready for any emergency.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a good thing for the Congress periodically to look into these matters? And does not the gentleman believe that in 1954 the succeeding Congress, of which the gentleman from California may be a member, should have the right to come in and take a look at it? Maybe they will say it is all right and they will take it again and possibly they may say it is not working and let us stop it.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is a good thing to review those things, but if you review them too often and too quickly before they are tried, they will never have a chance to prove themselves. I want to point out to you, sir, that the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States imposed certain restraints on the Government and on future Congresses, because they thought that the Congress might do things which would interfere with the liberties of the people or would take rash and precipitous action.

Mr. ARENDS. And the big thing that they put in in a legislative way was that you and I have to go to the people every 2 years and report back to our people before we can return to this body.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right.

Mr. ARENDS. The actions of the duly-elected representatives of the people are reviewed every 2 years, and the same thing should apply here.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is not comparable at all, because this policy that we are trying to inaugurate will take several years to develop and prove itself or disprove itself. Of course, if you do not look at the world as I look at it, I believe that the world is small and explosive and in a dangerous situation; if you do not realize that the people that we gambled on as being our allies, who twice held the enemy at bay, are gradually losing their strength and the time and the space that we gambled on no longer exist, then you will come to a different conclusion. Therefore, I want to do all I can to give this idea a chance which some of our great leaders that my colleague from Missouri emphasized as being the one proper solution of our security problems. That will then have a chance to live and prove itself, and I think if it has that chance it will show to us that it is the one way that we can protect the future of America. We are the trustees for the future, and that is why I am so anxious to have this plan tried out.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what we do about the review of UMT must, of course, depend largely upon what we do about the number of people we take in. It is my purpose a little later in the evening to offer an amendment that will authorize the enlistment in the American Army of the nationals of other countries, specifically including those of Germany and Japan. I do not suggest that these foreign nationals shall be in lieu of the induction of all American boys, because I recognize we will still have to have American boys, but I offer it with the idea that every time we can get someone else to help us, we make ourselves that much stronger; with the idea not that America will shirk her share of making the world strong, but with the idea that it is proper for America to call upon everyone who will to share in making the world strong against aggression.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has spoken about using anyone who wants to help us; what is the gentleman's idea about allowing the forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to help us in Asia?

Mr. POAGE. I am in favor of enlisting any man who can render service to the United States and carry on our struggle against aggressors anywhere. I am in favor of enlisting men in Asia and in Europe, and I am in favor of putting them in the American Army where we will know that we can control them, not where they will be maintained at the expense of the United States, but under some questionable authority, but where they will be under American control as well; where we can use them and direct them; and I am in favor of bringing them in voluntarily where they can serve as volunteers in the American Army. Certainly they will not replace Americans man for man, but maybe three of them will replace one American. If we can replace a hundred thousand American boys with three hundred thousand foreigners, it would be a sound thing.

Now, do not tell me that you are afraid to hire somebody to do a job for the United States. Wherein is it so moral for you to go out and draft some American boy who does not want in the Army—and I am going to vote to continue the draft because I can see no alternative—but where is it so right to go out and grab some American boy by the nape of the neck and so wrong to go out and hire a German national or a Japanese national or a national of some other country who wants to have the job and desires it? What is it that makes it so moral in the one case and so immoral in the other?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. How would the gentleman feel about including certain types of prisoners who would like to volunteer? There are thousands of men in our State and Federal prisons who would volunteer for military service and if the authorities were permitted to use descretion in accepting them under certain conditions, it would seem to me most worthy of consideration. It would furnish manpower; it would afford opportunity for prisoner rehabilitation.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am only talking here of the matter of authorizing the enlistment of foreign nationals; I am not trying to extend this proposal and accumulate any more opposition than necessary. The gentleman may have a good idea but it is not what I shall offer in my amendment. I am interested at this time only in getting the policy established of employing foreigners who would like to serve in the United States Army. I am simply asking that you give them a chance where they request it so that we can replace some of these boys whom we are going to have to draft.

Even with this amendment we are still going to have to have the draft; do not ever get me wrong; we are still going to have to draft our own boys, but if we can relieve some American boys by spending more American dollars then I am in favor of spending the dollars, especially if we can save American lives by doing it; and I am going to offer an amendment to that effect shortly. I do not propose to bribe these foreigners by any offer of American citizenship. In fact my amendment will specifically provide that such foreign nationals as accept our offer of good pay, food, and quarters, shall acquire no preference toward American citizenship and shall not be entitled to veterans' benefits. I simply offer them a job if they want it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. Despite what our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia, has said against this amendment, despite what other Members of the majority and minority side have said against it, I am convinced that his amendment is a meritorious one. I think the Congress not only would want to, but I think they should be required to take a look-see at this proposition some 3 years from now when the Eighty-third Congress will be in session. Despite what you or I think about it, it is going to be one of the major factors in the next election. Soon there will be an intervening election which will afford the Congress and the Nation an opportunity to get a line on what the people think about this proposition. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it will probably be late in the afternoon before I shall have an opportunity to present what I consider to be the most important question before the country and before the people who are affected by the presently pending draft bill, a question that is of more importance than any other in this entire debate. I refer to a proposal I am going to make that anyone who is drafted into the armed services or who comes in under UMT or any other measure which we pass in the Congress shall be given the privilege of the vote.

I submit that this question is bound up with everything which our Constitution holds dear to us. If these boys of 18 you are going to draft are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote. We went over that whole question during World War II. There were a lot of people who on the one hand were in favor of bringing these boys into the armed services, yet on the other hand deliberately prevented them from casting their ballots, from entering into participation of running this Government, who would deny them their constitutional prerogatives in accordance with the law of the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman, if a man is old enough and qualified to fight, he ought to have the privilege of voting, but with the Constitution as it is now, how can this Congress legislate on that subject?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This Congress has great power.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Again I agree with the gentleman, but we do not use it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Here is an opportunity to use it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How, under the constitutional provisions as they now exist, can we do it?

We passed the soldier vote bill in World War II. That was constitutional.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let us give these boys a chance to vote now. I hate to see them being shanghaied into the services without being given this constitutional right to vote. I expect to go along with the proper defense of our country, I expect to go right down the line in doing everything we can to make a strong Army.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I suggest that the gentleman read the letter written by Lord Macaulay to Mr. Randall, of New York, of May 23, 1857.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If he is a Britisher he does not reflect my attitude at home. I represent the Americans in my district, not Great Britain or any other foreign power. I represent the Americans of the Thirty-seventh Congressional District of New York and I expect to fight in their interests on the floor of this House and to vote to the very best of my ability for Americanism right on down the line.

That is why I am here today to plead with the members of the committee, with the Chairman, and everyone else, that when my amendment comes before the House giving these boys the opportunity to vote, regardless of age, the young men who are brought in under this proposed draft bill, my amendment will not be declared out of order. This amendment will be ruled to be germane to the bill, because I know of nothing more germane or nothing more appropriate at this time than giving these boys of 18 that you are drafting into the Armed Forces of the United States, and bringing in under universal military conscription, the opportunity of voting. I know of nothing which would be more appropriate than this House agreeing to my amendment, which I shall present later in the day. I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What would the gentleman do with the boys in ROTC and in high school?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If they are old enough to fight they are old enough to vote.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the suspense of waiting for the gentleman's proposal will be trying.

This bill of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Chairman, was put to sea in the midst of a storm which is this morning at its peak. I confess that I, too, am possessed of that feeling of indignation expressed by so many throughout the country today. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to permit my passion, my indignation, over what has taken place to influence my judgment against what I know in my own heart to be a wise proposal. The Committee on Armed Services has fought a gallant fight. The committee is symbolic, in a sense, of the strength and of the will of this country to contend with an active and hostile force operating all over the world.

I had intended making an appeal directed to my friends who take an independent attitude on public questions, having no regard whatever for the aisle that divides the minority and the majority, on behalf of the UMT provisions of the bill. But that provision, under the assault made by the opposition, has been so modified that it is at the present time hardly more than an empty shell. However, I know that the psychological effect of turning down this committee even on that synthetic proposal would be bad, bad not only here at home but bad all over the world.

Our military people, referred to as "the brass," are taking a terrible beating in this debate, a beating wholly undeserved. I am not particularly interested in the so-called brass, but, Mr. Chairman, in a time of stress as that in which we now live, if there are those upon whom we can safely depend for guidance, for leadership, and for direction in the struggle that confronts us and the struggle in which we are engaged, it is our professional military people. Mr. Chairman, they cannot get the results that the country expects and that the country must have if it is to survives, if they are to have no part in the making of the program under which they operate. If the politician is to write the program, if the politician is to lay out the campaign, then our professional fighting men in the Armed Forces and the young men of the country under their command will put at a great disadvantage.

Mr. Chairman, I do make this appeal to those who, as I say, ordinarily take an independent attitude, let us not make the mistake of throwing down this great committee sponsoring the legislation now before this body. They are entitled to better support than we are giving them at this moment, and I do appeal to you to stand by the committee in the position which it now takes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to consume the time of the Committee any longer than is necessary, but I think before we go to a vote on this matter—because there have been so many interruptions in the course of the debate—we should at least fully understand exactly what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, I have profound respect for the ability of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] as a lawyer, as a jurist, and as a legislator, and I think he knows what he is doing in presenting this amendment. I have been for UMT and supported it for a period of over 30 years; and I naturally have followed the course of the arguments, pro and con, in reference to this matter. This amendment will call for another vote on UMT by the Congress July 1, 1954.

If we put through the bill as it has come before us, it means this: We will vote on it during the course of this week and pass it. Then later—under the terms of this bill, 6 months from now—we will bring up the question of a report from the Commission, and again the Congress will vote, within 6 months, on universal military training. Then if it goes through at that time and if Congress approves it, we are confronted with the question of getting money in the year 1952 for universal military training to be started during the fiscal year 1952–53. Then, within 6 months after we start the program, the Commission which we create in this bill is required by the terms of the bill to come back to the Congress and give us another report on how the program is operating, and the Congress again will have an opportunity to go into the matter and investigate how it is operating.

Then, in spite of all those checks and investigations, and our timidity to be sure that nothing wrong happens; in spite of all of that, under the terms of the Elston amendment, although the program cannot be established before the fiscal year 1952–53, in 1954, the following year, we go through the same procedure again. In other words, we have one clear year during which universal military training can proceed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the bill bringing in the plan for universal military training could contain an amendment taking out the 1954 date, or extending it, so that we would not have to go through the same procedure again?

Mr. BROOKS. The Congress can do what it wants. The Congress can hear this question every 6 months if it wants to, or every 10 years. The Congress can do whatever it wants. But under the terms of the bill, I tell you now that universal military training will have one clear year of operation before we will then hear the matter again. We will be scampering around every solid month from the time we vote on this bill today to the very time when the gentleman's amendment takes effect to investigate and reinvestigate the operation of a program that is not even fairly commenced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Following up the observation of my friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and knowing the legislative processes and procedures here, the logical course to follow is to wait until the Commission's recommendations come up and the committee considers them. That is when the whole primary question will be before the committee and the House. The very argument the gentleman advances redounds against him. This amendment should be defeated now. The proper time to consider it is when the bill is before us.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much for his very fine remarks.

May I say in conclusion that if you were a reckless driver in an automobile running down the street and you hit somebody head-on you would kill him, but if you were that same reckless driver and sideswiped him you would spin him around in the ditch and maybe break his neck, but you would kill him just as dead. The Elston amendment is going to kill this bill by sideswiping it just as dead as if we repealed it by a special clause.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Elston amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Since the Constitution provides that no appropriation of money for the military forces can last for longer than 2 years, does not the gentleman think we are not out of line in attempting to review all kinds of conscription every 3 years?

Mr. WERDEL. Yes, and I thank the gentleman for calling our attention to that provision. I am particularly concerned with the assumption that there is no particular difference between the desires of the gentleman from Ohio and those as expressed by the gentleman from New York. Of course, the Congress can reconsider these subjects whenever it wants to. The effect of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is that we must renew it or it discontinues. We do not have a situation such as exists in England where they can experiment with these ideologies. We are under a written Constitution, whereas they have an unwritten constitution, and a legislative body controlled by one house. They can experiment and throw it off if they do not like it. They owe allegiance to a king, and we owe allegiance to the meaning of a written Constitution. We have a two-house legislature and if we pass a universal military training bill, it will require a majority of both Houses to repeal it, that is if we pass it for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, that brings me to the point which I expressed last week. I agree this morning with most of you that we must immediately extend the Draft Act. There is disagreement among many of us as to what the form of universal military training should be. I abhor any such authority above the State level in peacetime. I will never support any other bill in my present frame of mind. I ask you, however, to assume that the desires of many of the Members of the House and the Military Establishment be accomplished and that we set up universal military training at the Washington level. I ask you to assume the bill gives them the power to drain off manpower from the States, so far as the State defense agencies are concerned, the National Guard. Then I ask you to assume that 10 years from now there is a plan in Washington for action to which some of us disagree. Then the burden will be on those of us from the West or the North or the South or the East or the rural areas to overcome the political pressure in the metropolitan areas, or the burden will be on those from the metropolitan areas, as the case may be, to overcome the pressure from the rural areas in the other body.

This is an important problem. This problem can shift with the shifting contingencies affecting national defense. It changes with each hour and each year. I think the gentleman's amendment is well worth our support. Certainly there is nothing wrong with saying that the

Congress, and that each man from each area, has to express himself in regard to the effectiveness of universal military training at a reasonable time after the law goes into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELSTON) there were—ayes 83, noes 132.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ELSTON and Mr. KILDAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 186.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: Page 46, line 13, add the following: "Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by any agency or department of the Federal Government."

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for the purpose of eliminating the issue which has arisen recently with reference to the deferment of college students on the basis of a national examination. That Executive order is based upon the recommendation and regulations of the Selective Service System and calls for an examination to be held not by the Selective Service System itself but by a contract which it has made with an examining service at Princeton, N. J.

My amendment, if adopted, will insure by law that students will be deferred no differently from anyone else entitled to deferment. The amendment takes quite a few words in order to repeat the language of the bill itself. It takes quite a few words to make sure they cannot contract with any other agency, but, boiled down, it simply says that no local board shall be required to defer any students on the basis of any national examination. Therefore the college student will report to his local board just as anyone else. He will apply for deferment just as anyone else, and the local board has the absolute right to grant or to refuse deferment as it would in the case of a farm laborer and industrial employee, a person who has dependents, or any other ground for deferment that is within the jurisdiction of the local board, subject to the same appeal as any other deferment. So that this brings it back entirely to the local board and to the appeal system of the Selective Service System. Students will be treated as everyone else. There will be no danger of students being deferred by orders of the National Selective Service System based upon an examination.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that under the gentleman's amendment a local draft board, if it sees fit, can defer a man to go on to college under the same conditions as are contained in the Executive order of the President and the Director of Selective Service?

Mr. KILDAY. The existing law and the 1940 law have always been that the President has the power to create categories of persons to be deferred in the national health, safety, and interest. My amendment will preserve the law as it always has been.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I live in Rensselaer, Ind. We have a local draft board there composed of very high-grade men. Under the gentleman's amendment could they defer all of the boys who want to go on to college and who can meet certain qualifications, while the draft board in some other area, say New York City, says: "No; we are not going to defer any of these boys because we think they should all go into the service."

Mr. KILDAY. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that the result he states is correct, except that this is subject to appeal by the Selective Service System. The same situation exists as to every other person applying for deferment, and has always existed. My amendment will insure that the law remains as it is and always has been. It will insure that students applying for deferment will be on exactly the same basis as anyone else applying for deferment. The local board has jurisdiction in the first place, and they have the appeals as in all other cases.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows when you get to the matter of appeal there is not much that can be done about it. Personally, I recognize that great latitude must be left in the local draft boards. They have a terrific job to do, but at the same time, when it comes to this broad category of deferment, why should the boy in Indiana be denied deferment to go on to college and in some other places all of them be deferred, which, as I understand, is what could happen under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. That is what could happen in any instance. This puts these students on exactly the same basis as every other person registered under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not think it does that, if I may say so to the gentleman, with all respect, because I recognize his great capacity in these matters. But he just said to me, in response to a question, that his amendment would still leave in the local boards, if they saw fit, authority to defer any boy who wanted to go on to college under the regulations presently in effect.

Mr. KILDAY. The point is that everybody in the United States has been subject to the same law. Suppose one of the people in your town in Indiana goes in and applies for deferment because he is working in an airplane factory, and they deny it, but the man in New York goes in and they grant it. That has been the case and will always be the case unless you want to abolish the jurisdiction of the local board, and I do not believe anybody wants to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. The matter of coordinating that must be the same as it has always been and as it worked satisfactorily during the war and under the 1948 act, that the Selective Service System, through its agents, will appeal those cases in which they feel that deferment was not justified. I know of no other way to handle it. I do not want the Federal Government choosing who is to go to college, and the only thing I know of, is to put the thing right back in the local boards where it belongs, where the friends and neighbors are passing on it, in accordance with true democracy and the way we have always run selective service and the way it has operated successfully.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the gentleman explain to the committee the difference between his amendment as first enunciated and printed in the RECORD last week and the amendment he proposes today, and will he inform the House why he has changed his amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. The result of the amendment that I proposed originally and the result of this amendment is identical. The other one was drawn rather hastily and after consideration I found that there might be a possible construction under the amendment I originally proposed, that if a man passed this examination and his local board had held he should be deferred, I would have deprived his local draft board of deferring him. I possibly covered too many agencies in the first amendment which I drew.

Mr. HOEVEN. But the gentleman's first amendment was stronger in that respect.

Mr. KILDAY. Not one particle stronger.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it will have the effect of doing away with Gen-

eral Hershey's order passed a few days ago; is that not right?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, he may hold the examinations, but they are not going to be binding on the boards down in Georgia, or in New York, or anywhere else. They are going to pass on it with all the evidence before them just as they would do if a farmhand went up for deferment or a worker in an airplane factory or anybody else.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. As I understand, under the gentleman's amendment the taking of the examination would merely be advisory to the board and not binding; is that right?

Mr. KILDAY. That is all. Not even necessarily that, just an item of evidence to be considered in the whole case in passing on the question of deferment.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman says it does not change the power of the draft board one bit from what the law has been heretofore?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. It will be just as it was during the war when we took in so many millions of boys, and we did it rather satisfactorily, and as it has been in the 1948 act. It insures that no agency of the Federal Government on the basis of an examination is going to require a local board or an appeal board to defer a man simply because he is a student and has enough money to go to college, when the other boy has to go in the service.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Will not the taking of this examination be rather an influence on the board that they should exempt these students and treat them differently than they treat the average American citizen?

Mr. KILDAY. It should not be.

Mr. KEAN. Why have the examination at all?

Mr. KILDAY. The Senate passed a bill that is pending in this House calling for the deferment of 75,000 people every year. We do not know which law is going to take effect. If the Senate provision should be adopted, then there is going to have to be some basis for the 75,000 selection. So the time is running out. This has to be ready by fall. Whether they will go on with the examination or not, I do not know, but if they do, this assures that the examination does not determine the deferment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The effect of this amendment is that there will be no discretion in the authority of the local draft board. The examination will simply give the board more evidence on which to base their position for possible deferment for a college student.

Mr. KILDAY. It preserves the integrity and the autonomy of the local board.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that if we do not pass the gentleman's amendment and the present Presidential order stands, the number deferred will presumably be greatly beyond 75,000?

Mr. KILDAY. Under the Presidential order?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, I am sure it will be.

Mr. KEATING. Does it not run into the many hundreds of thousands?

Mr. KILDAY. It is very difficult to get a figure as to how many there are, considering the IV–F's and the ROTC people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. If a very much larger number were deferred, would that not necessarily result in a larger number of the noncollege boys being called?

Mr. KILDAY. Certainly. Every time you defer one man somebody else has to go.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to refer to some examining board. What was that board?

Mr. KILDAY. It is the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under what supervision is it?

Mr. KILDAY. It is a private institution that conducts examinations on a Nation-wide basis for a lot of different clients, including the Navy in connection with its ROTC-Holloway plan, and things of that kind.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman tell me what justification there is for General Hershey's having these so-called "smart boy" examinations in the light of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. If I could be assured that my amendment was going to be enacted into law that would be one thing, but we have another body to deal with. All I am interested in is trying to see that he is not going to defer "smart boys" on the basis of a national examination, and I think I have accomplished that by the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The amendment offered by the gentleman deals with one of the most complex and difficult aspects of this whole program. I think it is as meritorious, fair, just, and equitable as human nature can make it. The only thing I think the gentleman should bring out, so that it will be clear in the minds of some of our colleagues, is that they are going to be selected on a percentage basis. Perhaps three-fourths of the seniors in college will be deferred, about two-thirds, as I recall, of the juniors, and about 50 percent of the freshmen. That will apply in all the schools and universities all over the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Without regard to any mental test and without any Government agency's going out and getting them. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. KILDAY. It is not to exceed those percentages in those cases.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri how you are going to bring about that result if the gentleman from Texas is correct in saying this leaves the matter completely and wholly in the hands of the local boards? What do they know about what percentage they are entitled to?

Mr. SHORT. Where else can you place it?

Mr. KILDAY. It is still in the local board. It is permissive and not mandatory.

Mr. SHORT. Is is an advisory capacity.

Mr. KILDAY. It is advisory, not mandatory in any sense of the word.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think most of us have been somewhat disturbed about the prospects for deferment and possible eventual escape from military service of the so-called bright boys or the wealthy boys. I should like to know just what the gentleman's amendment does other than actually nullify the directive from the Selective Service?

Mr. KILDAY. That is all it does. It simply provides that the board is not bound by any examination, no matter how many they give. It is still up to the people in Texas, Florida, Missouri, Indiana, or wherever they may be.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite possible and probable that the position I shall take on this amendment may not meet with the agreement of a majority of the House, but I would hope that they might take the same position.

I appeared before the Committee on Armed Services on this subject. I here call your attention to the fact that we are setting up, even including the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a system of priorities of persons entitled to college educations that his amendment does not touch at all. The first priority goes to

those whom we, the Members of the House and Senate, and the President, appoint to West Point and Annapolis. They become entitled to a college education and they get it. They also get graduate courses if they are sufficiently high in the ranks of graduates at West Point and Annapolis. That is the first priority which is being established regardless of the Kilday amendment. The second priority goes to those who may achieve an ROTC appointment, whether it be the regular ROTC or by contract. They likewise will be entitled to complete their college education. Let us not forget that—there are quite a number of them, too. Their only qualification aside from their being able to pass this same test which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is referring to, is that they are practically physically perfect specimens, because their physical examination is identical to the examination given to candidates for West Point and Annapolis.

The third category of deferments of course goes to those who cannot pass the 1945 January 1 test, the physical test, for induction into the armed services. Obviously they will be entitled to go on to college if they can gain entrance. Therefore, you are creating a group who may be physically qualified for induction into the armed services, but not physically qualified for admission into West Point or Annapolis, or for acceptance into the ROTC, but who likewise may be just as intelligent as any of those persons accepted for ROTC. I want you to get that and get it carefully because you are setting up a system and a scale of priorities here for education which is a vitally important thing.

If we are looking forward only to 2 or 3 years, or perhaps 4 years, of emergency conditions throughout the world where we need to exercise the Draft Act, then that may not be so bad, but if we are looking forward to a period of 10 years, as many people in high places say, or perhaps 20 years, then this is social legislation of the first order because now even with or without Mr. KILDAY'S amendment you are setting up priorities for those who may achieve a college education.

In that circumstance you are making an exception of a group which is good enough to be inducted under the January 1, 1945, schedule of physical ratings but who are not physically qualified for admission to West Point or Annapolis or the ROTC on the other hand and you say to that group, "You get no deferment because you are good enough to be enlisted in the armed services, but you are not good enough to go to West Point or be in the ROTC—not good enough physically—not mentally."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Referring to the Kilday amendment, the question is this: Suppose you have a son, or twin sons, let us say, both going to medical school; one in the University of Southern California, and one at the University of California. Could one local board say to one of your sons that he must go into the service, while the other local board in the other city say that he does not have to go?

Mr. HINSHAW. Exactly so. That is why I am opposed to the Kilday amendment. As long as we are going to set up physical standards that are constant over the entire country regardless of brains and ability, then if you are going to make that kind of a selection, let us also set up a national standard for mental ability, so that we may have the best-trained people in the country. What we need in this country is brains and ability. We need to develop brains. I am going to quote to you from the RECORD part of a statement of General Byers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, General Byers said this before the committee, while I was present, and I heard him:

> We feel we are responsible to furnish to the youth of the Nation the best possible trained officers that we may get them, and we feel we should be very derelict in our duty if we did not plan to take 4-year college men to lead these boys, rather than use the emergency of taking those that happen to come into officer-candidate school. I am not criticising the product of the officer-candidate school, but they are not required to be college graduates.

Then later he says:

> The officers-candidate-school graduate was a very, very sound small-unit leader. He had been thoroughly trained in all elements of detail and performed small-unit leadership in an outstanding degree but his utility beyond that was in direct proportion to the education which he had had before he started the OCS.

What you are doing here, if you do not have some such examination as General Hershey has proposed, is that you are going to definitely limit the number of men who can get, let us say, 2 years of college education. Therefore, you are going to limit the quality of the officers in the service. That is a very vitally important matter.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman has failed to point out this fact, that a man has 4 years of service once he graduates from Annapolis or West Point; also, under this measure and the amendment we adopted yesterday offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], if a man is deferred for physics, chemistry, or some other subject, and he continues his college education for 4 years, he is still subject to service under this measure of 26 months or whatever number of months we adopt in its final form up to the age of 35 years.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; I agree with the gentleman entirely. The fact of deferment to obtain this education, the benefits of which the country needs so badly in large quantity, does not mean that he escapes service. It is quite possible that the service he may have to perform after he graduates will be a good deal worse than the service that is being performed now in Korea by so many of our boys. No one can foretell the future, and anyone deferred under this provision is liable for service until he is 35, not until he is 26, as is the case of the enlisted draftee under this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not the gentleman giving this amendment too wide an interpretation? And is not that perhaps the reason for the gentleman's disquiet? Is it not a fact that even if this amendment is passed General Hershey by a general order or a particular draft board by individual order can take certain classes?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct. But the thing that disturbs the young manhood of America more than anything else today is uncertainty as to the future—I think I know, because I have boys of my own—uncertainty as to the future, what he may do and what he may not do, and when. That is the thing that upsets him; it is the thing that makes some boys go out and commit misdemeanors in order to be jailed to avoid service, and a lot of other things like that. It is the uncertainty as to what they are going to be able to do.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I thoroughly agree with the statement that these boys have been off-balance for the last 6 years and are going to be.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. Certainty is the only thing I see that will bring them back onto balance. Among other things they should be in a position to know that if they are qualified to obtain an education within the operation of this law they will be able to proceed with it, even though if they do proceed with it they may have to serve 10 years longer in the Reserves.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman speaks of certainty; how will the certainty come about?

Mr. HINSHAW. By testing; it will take the same identical procedure as testing for acceptance into the ROTC.

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore the gentleman feels that to get certainty you need this testing procedure.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think you have to have some uniformity in the administration of the Draft Act in this country so the boys may know that if they can pass a certain examination, meaning that they have brains and ability, that they can proceed and the next year if they can pass another examination they can go on and so on to graduation before they are called into military service.

I am opposed to the Kilday amendment because it will eliminate the only assurance the young man can have of uniform treatment across the country;

and because it will, in my opinion, result in a lower educational level for our country in years to come. We need to increase the general level of education—not decrease it—if for no other reason than the very obvious fact that we live in a highly technical and scientific age. Who will deny that warfare itself is most highly technical and requires all the scientific brain power we can muster for the invention, the design and manufacture—yes, and the use and maintenance of the equipment of armies, navies and air forces.

One good brain employed in science can save thousands of bodies and the lives those bodies were born with. The British recognized that fact long ago and I have no doubt that the Russians did likewise. Are we too dumb to see it?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Kilday amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: On page 29, line 4, following the words "(including the Canal Zone)", strike out the period, substitute a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining any person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title in violation of the provisions of this paragraph."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the point at which this amendment is offered is at the end of the paragraph requiring 4 months of basic training and prohibiting the sending of any of these inductees into a combat area less than 6 months after entering the service.

The bill as drafted provides that they shall not be sent into a combat area within a period less than 6 months after entering the service. This amendment is designed to strengthen and make doubly sure that they are not sent under any contention whether it be right or wrong that the President has the power to send them where he pleases. We prohibit his using any funds appropriated by Congress to transport or maintain any of these inductees in violation of the prohibition that they shall not be sent into a combat area or outside the United States for training except into the Territories. It is doubly safe; he cannot use the money in addition to being prohibited by law.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman advise the House what remedy an individual might have who finds himself on a transport destined to some foreign area in violation not only of the committee provision but of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. I think he would probably find himself in a pretty unfortunate situation. But it certainly is not weakening the prohibition when we give the Comptroller General the power to charge back any money that may be expended in violation of law.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman consider this amendment will take care of the powers of Congress to restrict the President so far as an appropriation bill is concerned?

Mr. KILDAY. I believe it would constitute a valid restriction on funds appropriated for any purpose. You might restrict the military in an appropriation bill and you might restrict funds which may be appropriated to the Maritime Commission, or something of that kind, in the operation of ships. This would catch all of them.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman feel the same type of amendment should be offered to the appropriation bill for the armed services?

Mr. KILDAY. It would not weaken it any.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As members of the Military Appropriations Committee we have seen some instances, not exactly like this, but they could be similar. You can find occasions where some of these men, contrary to an act of Congress and its expressed will, were being placed on ships bound for Europe. Under the gentleman's provision for 2 months they could not get any pay, they could not get any food, they could not get any lodgings, they could not have any rations of any kind. I know what the gentleman means and it should not be necessary to put in an amendment like this. The military should heed the directives of Congress. But if you find one or two or a hundred or a thousand of these men who are shipped over contrary to the will of Congress, where will they get their relief or pay for this period of time?

Mr. KILDAY. My experience has been that if you vote an amendment of this kind, if you have this provision in the bill, it will be followed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We have had similar instances, for instance presently where you have a large group of disabled marines who have been serving without pay for a period of 3 months because of a violation of the use of funds. They cannot be paid.

Mr. KILDAY. I am not familiar with that case.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So the situation could arise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago I stood with the Members of this House on the left and applauded the name of the great General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. I did that out of esteem for this great American, this great military commander, whose picture, I might say, is on the wall of my office, because when the Philippine Islands were liberated I stood as close to him as I am to this rostrum on the day the official ceremony took place turning Leyte Island, the first one liberated, back to President Osmeña of the Government-in-exile of the Philippine Islands. But when the gentlemen on the left allude to impeachment and say nothing more, I think it behooves some of us to speak out on the question that has arisen.

Mr. Chairman, it seems obvious that General MacArthur desired to be relieved of his command. As a great military leader, he most certainly knew that his continued open defiance of civilian authority could end in no other way, unless, of course, our civilian authorities and our entire Military Establishment were willing to surrender to General MacArthur their right to decide upon and direct the foreign and military policies of this Nation. It seems evident that the general preferred dismissal to the execution of policies in which he lacks faith. He could, of course, have resigned, but such a course would be less consistent with his singular personality than the more dramatic course which he has forced upon the President.

As one who served for 2 years under the general, part of the time at his headquarters, and as one who has the highest regard and admiration for him, I deeply regret that he has made his dismissal necessary by his refusal to work as one of the team, even though he could not direct the entire team. Teamwork is essential to military operations, and to the execution of foreign policies. This Nation cannot afford to permit military commanders in the field to have complete freedom to do as they please in the matter of over-all world-wide strategy.

The dismissal of the general does not end the differences of opinion over our policies, and I hope that his freedom from command duties will make it possible for him to vigorously espouse his views in the political arena, which is the proper forum for the foreign policy debate, which he could not and should not carry on as a military commander in the field.

It is no secret to those who have served close to the general that he has little regard for the ability of his contemporaries in our Military Establishment. He probably has even less regard for our contemporary political leaders who must, at all times, give consideration to public opinion. I venture to guess that the general will be disappointed with the reaction of the public when he is compelled to present his views outside of the privileged sanctuary which he has occupied for so many years. Much water has flowed under the bridge since the general visited his native land.

One cannot help note that some of the Republicans, who now stress their admiration for the general, gave him almost no consideration when his name was presented to the Republican National Convention as a candidate for President of the United States.

General MacArthur and many others apparently feel we should take the risk of seeing the controlled fire in Korea expanded into a world-wide conflagration by launching direct attacks against China, thereby bringing into operation the Chinese-Soviet agreement for mutual assistance which we believe to exist. This is a crux of the issue.

Most of the leaders of the free world feel that we should try to keep the Korean conflagration localized, at least until we are better prepared to deal with world-wide hostilities. They feel that time is now on our side. General MacArthur, and those who support his views, evidently feel that time is against us, and that we should not hesitate to throw down the gauntlet to Russia immediately. Many of those who are recommending more war in Asia are decrying even our augmentation of the growing strength of Western Europe. This is a strange paradox, because even General MacArthur has indicated that he views the war in Asia as a means of conquering the west, which would seem to indicate that the west is the final important objective. It seems to me that it may be possible, although exceedingly difficult, to defend the Western World if all Asia falls to the Communists, but certainly no defense of Asia would be possible if Western Europe were allowed to come under Soviet domination.

The fortunes of any one man during his short stay on this whirling sphere are unimportant compared with the great policies and decisions which shape the course of history for millions yet unborn. The expansion of hostilities which the general favors involves the lives of millions of people, and these policies and decisions should be and must be decided upon deliberately and in accord with our regular constitutional processes. History may show General MacArthur's views to have been correct, but the people of the United States retain the right to direct their ship of state, even though future generations may decide that the contemporary one erred in choosing its course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from California that earlier in the current week, the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives told our country we were never in greater danger, and that the Russians were concentrating here, there, and everywhere. At about the same time General Ridgeway, who now succeeds General MacArthur in the field, made it plain in a statement that we just could not possibly win under present conditions and policies.

Now, what does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. YORTY. I think exactly as I said. Most of the world leaders, with few exceptions in the free world, believe that we are better off at this time to keep the fire that is burning in Korea localized until we are ready to deal with a world-wide war. Most of them also feel that if we launch a direct attack against the Chinese mainland now we may set off a world-wide war; that we may lose Japan and the Philippines immediately, and I think we all know that the consequences are so great that the point I want to make is this: You cannot decide those policies in Japan through a supreme military commander in a particular area. They have got to be decided here, and I am glad the General is coming here to give us his views.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, but I would like to ask him this question, because it has been running through my mind for a long time. If we are not going to fight to win in Korea, then why fight there at all?

Mr. YORTY. I agree with the gentleman to this extent, that we have got to try and find a solution to get out of the Korean situation. But we cannot, in my humble judgment, get out of it by setting off a world-wide war right now—a war for which we are not ready. We are perhaps better prepared to establish a stalemate and, if possible, negotiate a means to get out. I do not know whether or not that can be done, but I do know that General MacArthur cannot decide the matter in Japan in defiance of the civilian authority in this country.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Kilday amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Kilday amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HALLECK, Mr. GROSS, and Mr. O'HARA asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. JUDD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels it would only be fair to point out the fact that the gentleman from California secured unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate may proceed out of order for these 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the arguments of the gentleman from California are very appealing. They are the arguments that have been used by the administration constantly during this whole Far Eastern struggle, the naive belief that somehow we can prevent the spread of the Korean war by yielding to or being soft toward the aggressors outside of Korea.

In my judgment, the number one fallacy that is responsible for our difficulties today as it was after World War I and World War II is the notion that we can get peace by weakening our side and building up the other side. The real tragedy of the President's dismissal of General MacArthur today is that it will weaken us in Asia and allow the Communists there further to build up for the expansion of the war which they have long proclaimed as their firm objective.

The removal of General MacArthur represents the Kremlin's greatest victory since Yalta. That deal, too, looked as if it brought peace with the Kremlin; but it brought war instead. It weakened the free world and built up the Soviet world, and led right straight to the invasion of Korea. Because it was at Yalta that the Russians were brought into Manchuria. If there had not been Russians in Manchuria there never could have been a Korea, some 8,000 American boys who are now dead would be still living and we would not be at war.

The President's unwise action greatly strengthens the Soviet position in Asia, greatly weakens the position of the United States, and thereby makes far more likely the world war that you and I so genuinely and sincerely desire to prevent.

I do not hesitate to predict that the danger of all-out war in Asia, and in Europe and the Middle East, too, is much greater today than it has been before. No one should be surprised if Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and much of the rest of east Asia now come quickly under Soviet control—unless even more of America's limited military strength is thrown into action against it. It was not MacArthur, but the very people who say they want most of all to save Europe who followed policies which got most of our military strength bogged down in Korea and Japan so that it cannot be used to help save Europe. And today's action will make it harder to get our forces extricated unless we let all Asia go to Red control. The security of

Japan is particularly endangered. Here is fist-shaped Hokkaido, the northern island of Japan. Coming down to the northwestern corner of that island is Sakahalin, the southern half of which was given by us to the Russians at Yalta. It was not ours, but we gave it to them anyway. Coming down to the northeast corner are the Kurile Islands, also given to the Russians at Yalta. It has been known since January that the Russians are building up their strength in those two positions where they can almost see across to Japan. I am not telling them anything they do not know when I say that if the confidence of the Japanese in us should falter, the Russians could take Japan within 2 weeks, and with bombing of Pusan and submarines in the straits, could cut off practically all of America's trained land forces in Korea. They could eliminate us as a first-rate land power for a year or more while they did whatever they wished in Europe or the rest of Asia. That is why, at this time, it could be fatal to crumble our position in Japan, a position that belongs uniquely to General MacArthur. It is not because he is an American; it is not because he represents the allies that he maintains stability in Japan; it is because he is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In a sense, he moved into the position in Japanese minds that the Japanese Emperor formerly occupied. To destroy his position in Japan, which is bound to be before long the focus of the far eastern situation, is flirting with disaster.

It is argued by the wishful thinkers, "Well, let us make peace with the Chinese Reds. Let us negotiate some kind of a deal and end the war in Korea." General MacArthur, from what he is reported to have said, obviously and rightly believes that you cannot end a war with people bent on world conquest until you win the war. Some other countries tried at Munich to get peace with aggressors. Our Government tried at Tehran and at Yalta and Potsdam to get good relations with Communists by giving them what they said they wanted. But always what they say they want is not what they want. What they want is conquest—most of all conquest of the United States of America because we are all that stands between them and world domination. There is nothing that we can give them in a political deal or compromise which will end the war; it would only move the conflict to another country and make it more difficult. This act of the President's will so weaken our position in Asia and the strength there built up at such terrible cost that it will be a miracle if war does not soon spread all over the area. In short, I fear the action will do just the opposite of what the administration has claimed it is trying to do. That is, it will expand the war in Asia, rather than contain it in Korea.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from California spoke about peace. Of course we all desire peace. Some of us have regretted the fact that the course of conduct of our Government in recent years has not been such as to achieve peace. No man has spoken out more vigorously in respect to this matter as it has gone along than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], who is now addressing the committee. He also spoke of political decisions and of civilian control. Certainly everyone in this country would want civilian control maintained in those spheres that are properly the subject of civilian control. Of course I want the political leaders to have the power to make the political decision but by the same token I want military decisions in this country to be made by military leaders. Nothing, in my opinion, could be more frightening to the American people and more terrifying than to know that the judgment of our military leaders in respect to military matters bearing on our national defense is to be superseded and overruled by the political leaders, Truman and Acheson.

In my opinion the basic difference between General MacArthur and the President and those others with the President in the political department of the Government who sought and have brought about his firing has been basically the difference as to military decisions which have been differences of opinion on how to fight and win a war. When American boys are dying in Asia and in Korea, then certainly the opinion of the military leaders is of extreme importance to the Congress and to the country. I would regret to see the day when the Congress of the United States, with our great responsibility, should be deprived of the advice and judgment and convictions of the military leaders in whom we have faith and upon whom we must depend.

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. No one questions the President's right or power to do what he has done. What we question is the wisdom of his action.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union and its satellites are at war with the United States and with the whole free world. Some people say we must not start a war or strike first. No one need worry longer about that one. It is too late for us to strike first. The other side has already struck. The only question we face, and have faced for years, is how and where and when we shall strike back in order to be most effective. That is the only decision we have—unless we are to surrender piecemeal.

They are at war with us. They are committed to our destruction. Where are we going to fight them? How are we going to fight them? With what and with whom are we going to fight them? Do we want to do it all alone in Asia, which is where they are already fighting openly? The urgent question is not whether there is to be a bigger war after awhile, but how we can win the war in which we already are, that is the best way to prevent the bigger war after awhile.

If you were a citizen of a country under Communist threat in Asia today and saw the No. 1 bulwark against Communist expansion in Asia abruptly withdrawn, what would you conclude? Surely, that Communist victory in Asia is practically certain; and that there is nothing to do but to give up and get on the Red bandwagon. And this fateful turn in our fortunes comes at the moment when Communist China is much weaker than it has been, with terrible losses in Korea and powerful uprisings at home. We are presenting it with an unbelievable reprieve. It will be a miracle, I repeat, if today's action and those that will follow do not lead to a deterioration of the whole far-eastern situation, with country after country going down like nine pins, then, indeed, we will have world war III—and worse, very possible defeat in it.

In my humble judgment that is the disaster which General MacArthur saw ahead for his country; and that is what has driven him to do and say some things which go against all of his strict military traditions and training and which must have wrenched his soul. He saw the danger both to the lives of men under his command and to the security of his country, and he was trying to get out into the open before the public a realization of the peril to the United States of America of a policy of drift, or a policy of doing just enough to get men killed, but not enough to win, or a policy of trying to end the fighting by making another deal which would look like peace, but which would strengthen the enemy and weaken ourselves and lead to more costly fighting.

My concern is not for General MacArthur. He is a giant whom the pygmies cannot tolerate because he has been so consistently right about Asia and they so consistently wrong. His place in history is secure. It will vindicate him and condemn his opponents who threw away in five short years the magnificent victory in the Pacific which he and 4,000,000 Americans won at such great cost—108,000 of them with their lives.

My concern is for the peace and security of the United States.

Few people seem to realize the completely unique position of prestige and confidence which General MacArthur commanded in Asia, and especially in Japan. His removal is likely to open the way for the Communists to chip away and destroy the faith of the Japanese people in us and in the United Nations. If that happens, then a "settlement" in Korea will not end the war, it will just move from Korea to Japan. If we abandon Formosa in a futile effort to buy the Reds off, we do not end the struggle; we simply shift it from Formosa to the Philippines. And if we let the Philippines and Japan go, "in order to avoid war with Communist China," do we solve the problem? No. We just move the conflict to Alaska and Hawaii. And if we sell them out "in order to get peace," we do not avoid world war III; we just make certain much of it will be fought in the northwestern States of our own country. You have to stop this glacier somewhere. We did not stop it at the 50-yard line at the end of the last war. Instead we moved back to our 40-yard line and invited the Russians to take Eastern Europe, Manchuria, North Korea, and the strategically placed islands north of Japan. Now we are down to about our 30-yard line due to the idiotic attempt to make the Chinese Communists our friends by walking out on our Chinese allies. Now it is pro-

posed, in line with British ideas, to move back to the 20-yard line—the move MacArthur opposed so strenuously. Just where are we to stop retreating? At our 10-yard line when only Europe remains? Or the 5-yard line when only the Western Hemisphere remains? Or the 1-yard line when only the interior of the United States remains?

I do not want to have to fight at the last ditch for the sheer survival of the United States; that is, the real issue: not the fate of MacArthur, but of ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from California, I, too, stood in the presence of General MacArthur on the steps of the capitol on the island of Leyte in the Philippines. I have known MacArthur for many years. In all my 34 years' military experience I have yet to meet a grander military man than the general.

Yesterday I introduced a resolution to the effect that the President of the United States should direct General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur to return to the United States and report to a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the problems and probabilities of the Korean situation.

In view of the action taken by President Truman in relieving General MacArthur of his command I have introduced another House resolution which states as follows:

*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur return to the United States immediately and report on the progress, problems, and probabilities of the Korean situation at a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, President Truman's action in relieving General MacArthur of his far-eastern command has shocked the American people and reveals that the administration is more interested in the socialistic government of Great Britain and her trade with Communist China than supporting the MacArthur program for a speedy and complete victory in Korea.

The action of President Truman will have a stimulating effect on the forces of Communist Russia who now can expect Red China to be admitted to the United Nations—a move that has been encouraged by Great Britain.

General MacArthur's position took into consideration the best interests of the American people and especially the mothers, fathers, wives, and sweethearts of the boys serving under him in Korea where already 9,000 of them made the supreme sacrifice and nearly 60,000 more are on the casualty list.

It is a downright shame that the American people must wait until 1952 to express their indignation at the polls over the shabby treatment accorded General MacArthur and the Americans serving under him. Make no mistake about it there will be a wholesale housecleaning in the White House and the State Department in 1952 because the American people have never been sold on the Truman-Acheson-Hiss brand of international diplomacy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] is recognized.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, the tragic news that President Truman has removed General MacArthur as the United Nations commander in the Far East has shocked and stunned many of us here in Washington just as it has the American people throughout the Nation. The President announced his dismissal of MacArthur at 1 a. m., Washington time, on Wednesday morning when most of the people in the Capital City were asleep. The announcement apparently came at this time in order that administration forces in the Congress could have time to prepare to meet the storm of protest from other Congressmen who are now speaking out against this tragic action.

The President has declared that MacArthur was relieved of his far-eastern commands because he was unable to give his full support to the policies of the United Nations. But the real reason MacArthur has been fired, has been because of the conflict between MacArthur on the one hand, and Mr. Truman and Dean Acheson on the other, in regard to United States policy toward Communist China and the war in Korea. America's great fighting general, under whom I served as an enlisted man in the South Pacific during World War II, has demanded the right to bomb concentrations of Chinese troops and supplies in Manchuria to slow down and cut off Chinese Communist forces now killing our boys in Korea. Truman and Acheson refused this request. MacArthur has asked for the authority to use in Korea some of the more than 600,000 Nationalist troops now on Formosa and has even suggested a Nationalist attack against the Chinese mainland to ease the pressure on the American forces now fighting against a numerically superior enemy in Korea. Truman and Acheson have refused. MacArthur has called the Korean conflict a full-scale war where we have suffered nearly 60,000 casualties. Truman and Acheson have called it a police action. MacArthur has demanded that the British and other United Nations countries stop sending supplies to Communist China through Hong Kong and other ports and has called for a full blockade of the China coast. Truman and Acheson have sided with the British who continue to send war supplies to the Communists to be used in the killing of Americans in Korea. In the years before the Korean War began, MacArthur constantly spoke out, warning this Nation against appeasement of communism and urged that a positive foreign policy be carried out to check aggression in the Pacific and other parts of the world. Truman and Acheson abandoned China to the Communists and said the Reds were our friends and just agrarian reformers. They appeased and appeased and appeased. They were helped in this task by Alger Hiss and other pro-Communists they had appointed to serve in the State Department.

Thus the controversy between the Truman administration and MacArthur raged. Mr. Truman charged that MacArthur has refused to take orders from the President as Commander in Chief, but many others charged that it was Mr. Truman who was refusing to take orders from the American people, who demanded that our Government cease its policy of appeasement in the Far East. This week the President made a decision. The issue was clear. Should he accept MacArthur's suggestions and recognize the realities of the war in Korea, or should he dismiss MacArthur and once again bow to the demands of Dean Acheson, who has made so many mistakes in the past? Mr. Truman took the second course. He fired MacArthur, the hero of Bataan, and bowed to Acheson, the man who said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss and who called the Chinese Communists mere agrarian reformers.

This was a tragic decision. The majority of the American people would be far happier and would have far more confidence in our leadership if Acheson had been fired, not MacArthur. For many months now the people have demanded the removal of Dean Acheson, but when the show-down finally came, Acheson emerged triumphant, and America's valiant soldier, General MacArthur, became the martyr of the Kansas City political machine which has seized control of the executive branch of our Government. There was another great American general who was a martyr, and he, like MacArthur, tried to speak out in an effort to strengthen the miiltary forces of this Nation. You will remember him, General "Billy" Mitchell, who dared to urge the brass hats and the Nation's leaders to develop a powerful Air Force. MacArthur now joins Gen. "Billy" Mitchell as a martyr and as a hero.

Since the announcement of General MacArthur's removal public opinion has begun to mount in opposition. My office has already been flooded with telegrams protesting this arbitrary action. By repudiating the wise and inspirational leadership of General MacArthur, Mr. Truman has done more than any Communist bomb could do to disunite and weaken our American people at this hour of national emergency.

As this confusion sweeps across the Nation, I should like to suggest the following affirmative steps to be taken by our Government:

First, the Congress should bring General MacArthur back to this country and to Washington so that he might speak out without fear of further reprisals by the White House and advise the American people of the true facts of the war in Korea and make recommendations for the development of a positive and affirmative policy for the Far East. And when MacArthur returns to this country, he should be given a hero's welcome, unparalleled in our history.

Second, after General MacArthur has given us the benefit of his wise counsel, and if he so recommends, we should authorize our new commander in the Far East General Ridgway to bomb the concentrations of Communist troops and

supplies in Manchuria. If General MacArthur so recommends, we should authorize General Ridgway to send to Korea some of the hundreds of thousands of Chinese Nationalist soldiers now on Formosa. As part of our new policy, we should demand that the British and other United Nations members stop sending vital supplies and materials to the Chinese Communists. We should demand that the United Nations impose enforceable sanctions against any shipment of supplies to Soviet Russia and her satellite countries. As part of this new policy, we should begin at once a blockade of the China coast.

Third, we must proceed with full vigor and speed to develop our national defense program. We must demand that the President take immediate action to rid our Government of the corruption and political favoritism which has hampered our defense effort and seriously jeopardized the lives of our fighting men in Korea. We must demand that the President select able statesmen and not mere politicians to guide the destinies of our Nation at this hour of national emergency.

Finally, in order to restore some of the confidence in the administration which is so lacking at this hour, the Congress and the American people should demand that Dean Acheson be replaced as our Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the things that I have to say on the merits of this controversy will be said presently in the Republican conference this afternoon. Removal of General MacArthur from his command will have unpredictable and most serious consequences, that much is clear.

The two things that I feel called upon to say now are these: First, on the question of responsibility, that we are dealing here with foreign affairs questions—and that the man who is charged by the Constitution with the conduct of our foreign affairs is the President of the United States. He is the one—and his administration—whom the people of America can and must hold accountable. Let us keep our eyes clear as to where fault is to be found and how correction is to be made.

Since I have been in the Congress, I have been fighting for a decisive Far East foreign policy based upon a Pacific Pact for self-help and mutual cooperation in the defense against communism by all the non-Communist Asiatic peoples, and a Far East recovery program for improving conditions of health, education, and food production, and so forth. If we had taken this course looking to the military defense of China and to the improvement of the economic conditions of the Chinese people, we would not have been left in the lurch with a discredited Chinese Nationalist Government as far as the people of mainland China were concerned or faced the catastrophic defeat of the Chinese Nationalist forces at the hands of the Communists. Since that time I have opposed appeasement of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations, or elsewhere, or permitting them to get Formosa. I have also urged that we should have government in Formosa based upon free institutions and economic development. The administration's handling of the Far East foreign policy has been bankrupt and is largely responsible for our present troubles. It is this administration which must bear the full responsibility for that bankruptcy of policy and from which our people must demand their accounting.

Second, on the question of power, let us remember that we are dealing with military discipline, that there are tens of thousands of troops throughout the world under the command of our generals, and that to these troops the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and that he has the power to remove any officer from his command. That is the essence of civilian control of the military. If the President is wrong in exercising his power as Commander in Chief, he must answer to the people and Congress. I am for putting the responsibility to account squarely where it belongs—on the President—and not getting off on any tangent of the power of the President to act as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

In the interest of the future of our Nation let us not go overboard on these two points.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permisison to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a cardinal principle of American democracy is the supremacy of civilian control over the military. General MacArthur has defied that cardinal principle when he refused to conform his actions as a military man in the field to the policy set forth by the United Nations and his Commander in Chief.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have only 2 minutes; I cannot.

In American democracy we do not adhere to the principle of a monarch, a man of destiny, or a man on a white horse; we still reach our conclusions through democratic processes, and we do not have to have any god on horseback to mold the foreign policy of the United States and the United Nations. In my opinion the President is infinitely stronger with the American people, and I for one am perfectly willing to uphold his right as Commander in Chief to remove any general from any spot when that general refuses to conform to the policy set forth by the Commander in Chief and the General Staff, not only the General Staff of the United States but the General Staffs of the United Nations members now waging the war in Korea.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. In speaking of keeping military policy under the control of military commanders, did not the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], overlook the fact that the leadership of the military in this country is the Secretary of Defense and the General Staff, and not some subordinate commander overseas?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman overlooked that. As far as the political decisions of the American people are concerned in 1952, I am willing to stand up behind Mr. Truman and uphold his policy of removing General MacArthur and take my chances in the political arena.

On Wednesday of this week President Truman took forthright and courageous action to remove General MacArthur from his various military positions in the Far East.

The President was compelled to take this action when it became clear that General MacArthur was getting too big for his military breeches.

General MacArthur was not content to carry out his duties as a soldier. He aspired to be a statesman and a politician. He set himself up above the policy of his Government. He set himself up above the United Nations, even though he was designated by the United Nations to command the armed forces in Korea.

General MacArthur should have been removed several months ago when it became evident that serious military blunders had been committed in Korea.

As the President pointed out in his statement about MacArthur's removal, the general's place in history is well-established. It is not wise on General MacArthur's part to jeopardize his place in history by immersing himself in partisan politics and by attempting to formulate policy in the Far East.

The general acted in a unique capacity. He was the commander of the United States Armed Forces and civil servants in Japan. He was the supreme commander of the allied occupation powers in Japan, and commander in chief of the Far East Command, and commanding general of the United Nations armed forces in Korea.

In none of his various military or civilian roles did General MacArthur have the authority or responsibility to formulate or carry out independent or contradictory policy. In all of these capacities he should have executed his duties in harmony with the policies outlined by his superiors. He was charged only with the execution of military or administrative duties under the policies formulated by the President of the United States, the Far Eastern Commission, or the United Nations. General MacArthur had a perfect right, yes, a duty, to convey information, suggestions, and advice to his superiors, but these communications should have been confidential, and not public utterances. Once his superiors had evaluated his advice in relation to the world problem, it was up to General MacArthur to execute their directives or resign his post. The President was very patient with General MacArthur, but patience has its limits.

General MacArthur stepped out of his jurisdiction as an executor of policy and arrogated to himself the role of policy maker once too often. The general is a man of great egotism. He considers himself a man of destiny, and is loath to take orders or suggestions from others. He expects implicit loyalty and obedience from his own subordinates, but apparently dislikes taking orders from his own superiors.

Twice in recent months he has overstepped his authority by making public pronouncements on matters of policy. The letter to Congressman MARTIN was a third offense. The Cease Fire Commission of the United Nations had been working for months toward peace in Korea. The representatives of 14 United Nations members were working on a draft of a new peace offer, when, suddenly, and prematurely, MacArthur went over their heads and offered to meet the Chinese Reds on the battlefield to arrange a truce. without consultation with his superiors. To make it worse, he coupled the offer of a truce with a veiled threat to extend the war to the costal areas and interior bases of China, if the truce offer was rejected. In this instance, his superiors, the members of the United Nations were outraged. Not only did they resent his uncalled for interference in the delicate process of negotiation, but they feared his threat against the Chinese mainland might commit them in an unauthorized military action. When MacArthur jumped the gun this time—with a preliminary draft of his superiors on his desk—he committed the final and unforgivable sin of insubordination.

The mistrust which our friends in the United Nations now have of General MacArthur has caused mistrust of the good faith of United States foreign policy.

The President was justified in removing MacArthur. A new commander has been appointed who is willing to execute the policy of the United Nations. No man is greater than the team, and the team in this instance is the United Nations. General MacArthur could have been part of the team, but he could not be allowed to continue to create confusion and resentment among the nations which are actively participating in the Korean War.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provisions in this bill for universal and compulsory military training in peacetime. It has no relation to the urgent dangers confronting us. The draft is the most fair and efficient and flexible method of providing men for our armed services. Compulsory universal military training would establish a system of military control and indoctrination of the youth of the country as a permanent institution. It is no guaranty of military victory because every nation that has resorted to it has met defeat. In a century and a half this Nation has made better progress than any nation in the history of man and I think the main cause is that we have here preserved the utmost freedom for the greatest number of people over the largest area that has been known in all history. Thus the initiative and enterprise of the people were brought into play and we grew into the successful and prosperous Republic that men all over the earth now look to with hope. Let us use all the strength of the Nation to resist and overthrow any enemy, but let us not impair or destroy the chief source of our strength which is our freedom.

(Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment to S. 1: Strike out all of the language of the committee substitute and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the "Selective Service Act of 1951."'"

"(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 19 and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided,* That any such person who has not attained the age of 19 shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces upon his attaining the age of 19. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States.'

"(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is hereby amended to read: 'The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this act.'

"(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: 'No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided,* That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945.'

"(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than 4 months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this 4 months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone).'

"(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of 24 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title.'

"(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Any enlisted member of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided,* That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further,* That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such Reserve component: *And provided further,* That any person who was a member of a Reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such Reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such Reserve component.

"'(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"'(3) Any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).'

"(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces and in a Reserve component for a total period of 6 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force.'

"(i) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

"(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'twenty-four.'

"(k) Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(k) (1) Upon the finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"'(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"'(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title shall be decreased by any period less than 24 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"'(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title shall be eliminated, the period of active service of the age group or grounps designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be.'

"(l) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ': *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.'

"(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out 'the effective date of this title,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 1, 1951.'

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words 'six months' a comma and the words 'prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,'.

"(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after 'subsection (b)' a comma and the following: 'paragraph (1) of this subsection,'.

"(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said act is amended by inserting the words 'midshipmen, merchant marine reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer-procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;' immediately following the words 'cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;'.

"(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer-procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training: (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed 1 year.

"'(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"'(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.'

"(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the

names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.'

"(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"'(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided,* That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.'

"(r) Section 7 of said act is hereby repealed.

"(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniorty, status, and pay; or.'

"(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"'(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"'(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by him employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within 30 days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated.'

"(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said act is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the words 'or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board.'

"(v) Section 10 of said act is amended (1) by amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: 'There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President.'; and

"(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"'(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this act; and the number of deferments granted under this act and the basis for such deferments.'

"(w) Section 17 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"'(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate, or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954.'

"(x) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by striking out 'July 9, 1951,' inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953,' and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: 'Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 90 days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of 12 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the 81st Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the words 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'July 1, 1952' and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: 'No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act.'

"(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953.'

"SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act, except members of the Reserve components.

"SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 26, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided,* That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written preference to discharge their obligation for training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race, which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit.'

"SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the '1951 Amendments to the Selective Service Act.'"

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ascertain if the substitute offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina is the same as H. R. 3364 introduced on March 20th? If it is, I shall ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the language is the same as in that bill, and in view of the fact that the language in that bill was taken from the bill which the gentleman introduced and which appears in his bill, I have no objection to dispensing with the reading of the substitute at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina be printed in the RECORD at this point without further reading of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There is no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] be recognized for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the graciousness of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and if I have the opportunity to do the same thing for him, I shall be glad to do it. I do not have to restate my fondness for the gentleman. You know, we have been wrestling with this problem and I have had no small task in keeping up with the happenings.

When we first started with the bill it was so obnoxious that I could not even point out my objections to the Armed Services Committee in an hour and a half. It was then revised, and it came back to the floor. I still did not like it. I was getting along all right, however, until I began to get a little confused as to what was happening.

My distinguished friend, the chairman, has always employed the tactics, if I may use football terms, of a line bucker or line plunger. When he came into the House he just went through. But this time he adopted the skill and tactics of the Doak Walkers and the Charlie Justices and opened up with end runs and forward passes. I thought I was getting along with that all right, too. But when he employed the old Carlisle Indian hidden-ball trick I thought it was about time to begin to take real notice. And I found he had hidden the ball so well with his amendment that he could not find it himself.

After the amendment was offered, of course I was asked my opinion of it, and I was not at all reluctant to give my opinion. There is no question in my mind as to the purpose of the amendment. It was introduced simply for the reason that it was pretty generally understood the bill as it stood would not be adopted. But whether that be true or not the amendment was offered. Which is an improvement, but still falls short.

I have continued this fight. And in response to the wishes of many including my own I have introduced this substitute. I have a very deep conviction about the questions involved. Anyone knowing me knows full well that I do not abandon a conviction. I do not talk very much in the well of the House. The membership has always been kind to me, but I can assure the membership of this House that at no time in my career have I ever made a statement from this well that was not my sincere belief and conviction.

We now have this committee bill, S. 1, which carries what some have referred to as a shell of the universal military training bill. Frankly, I have some difficulty in naming it. I do not know what it is. I know this one thing, that with the exception of the vote that those of us cast when we declared World War II, you have never cast a more important and far reaching vote in this House or one that comes any closer to or affects any more people, and probably could have a good deal to do to change our American way of life as we understand it. That being the case, my friends, I think we should be doubly careful in passing on this piece of legislation.

The substitute that I offer here does this: It takes the draft bill from the combination bill now sponsored by the committee and sets it apart. It changes the age to 19. Which is exactly the same age in the existing draft law. It changes the length of service to 24 instead of 26, 24 being the length of service prescribed by the Senate, and 21 months is the present law, and it eliminates the universal military training feature. This is not a fight for or against military training, make no mistake about that. It is whether we approach universal military training with the degree of caution and care and good, cool, calm judgment that we should, or whether we attempt to mix it up and hide it in a bill of this kind. You have the idea that only just a few lines in this bill set up the skeleton of this kind of a makeshift UMT provision—and I would not call it what my friend from Georgia did—but there is something in there, my friends, that is not so easily understood. If you will observe this bill and the sections of it that are marked red, you will find the so-called universal military training provisions throughout the bill. There they are, page after page, page after page, and yet the proponents say that they are marking out all except a little bit.

My friends, at this time we are in a serious situation, and make no mistake about that, and that is not any scarecrow. We all know that. Every child knows that. Why can we not deal with the emergency problem that is now confronting us? Why should we drag in this all-controversial proposition now and not even one-third do the job? Everyone is in favor of a draft bill. Then is it not a good idea to do something at this time that will harmonize with the views of the American people? Is there not enough confusion in this world and in this country at this time without digging up and partially dealing with one of the most controversial issues in this country at this time? Yes; I think so.

Now, they have completely abandoned the argument that they could not raise the men. We have not heard any talk about that recently. I do not know whether this article put the fire out yesterday or not, but I am going to read it to you now. This appeared in the press yesterday, on the 10th:

DRAFT CUT LOOMS

The Army is expected to announce a deep cut in its May draft call of 60,000 men—possibly 50 percent—because it already is more than 100,000 over strength, the Pentagon disclosed yesterday. With more than 1,500,000 men—at least 100,000 over its June 30 goal of 1,400,000—the Army has been slowing its intake of draftees.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. They cut the present call down from 80,000 to 40,000.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say this: I do not believe there is a single man in this Hall at this time who honestly and sincerely believes that it is necessary to lower the age to 18½ years in order to raise the number of men to the 3,500,000 they say are necessary. I make that statement on my responsibility as a Member of this House, and I have gone into it pretty thoroughly and I have a lot of figures here that will support that statement. It is their own figures and their own talk, and there is only one reason for putting 18½ in there, and that is to couple the so-called makeshift incomplete universal military training in with it, and they know it. Mrs. Rosenberg virtually said that and General Bradley made virtually the same statement.

This job of coupling these two bills together was brought up in the committee. I disagree with some things that my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], advocates, but I think he is honestly and sincerely in favor of some kind of universal military training bill. I do not know what kind, and I doubt if he does at this time, but he was a very able and strong advocate against pinning these two bills together. He gave General Marshall tough going before the committee because he did not regard it as a wise move. I do not believe he regards it as a very wise move today. I certainly do not call it a wise move.

I say to you in all frankness, I do not know what is in this committee bill. I do not know how it is going to operate, and no one has explained it very clearly. We begin reading on top of page 35 and we find this:

There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members—

Then it states in line 18:

At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

You find provisions of that kind all the way through. Then they say it cannot go into operation because they do not have the men, yet you turn over to another page and you find that when the President finds that they do not need certain ages he may invoke it, or it may be done by concurrent resolution.

I do not know whether that is a proper interpretation of it or not, but I say if it confuses me there certainly must be a few Members in this House with as little judgment as I have and certainly they, too, must be equally confused.

We have in the bill the setting of the $30 pay. What do you want to set the pay for? Why do we want to set the wages? Why do we want to stir up those things in a bill in which we do not finish? Who is it that does not want this Congress to vote on the whole bill at one time, and why?

Yesterday I listened to the lecture about courage, about why we did not do something, and that came from a member of the committee. Possibly that is a little out of turn. If we are going to debate a universal military training bill we should be able to debate a complete universal military training bill, and this House is the place to do it. My argument is that that must be done before

the American people will be satisfied with this action.

I am a strong advocate of the 19-year-old provision, yes, but I want to say something right here. I do not know of any one thing in this world, and I speak as one who has experienced close observation, that comes as near to tearing the heartstrings out of a mother as for an 18- or an 18½-year-old boy to be taken. When he grows a little older, then she has faith in his judgment and in his ability to take care of himself. She does not feel it so much. In the case of a mother who let her son go into the last war when he was young, and he now has gone back into this war, 6 years older, there is an entirely different feeling, because she feels that now he has the judgment to sustain him and that he can take care of himself as he goes along.

The bill I have offered is the straight, outright draft bill. We took it from this bill, mind you, by taking a pair of scissors and cutting it out. Why they went to so much trouble to entwine and entangle it I will never know, unless it was put in the bill for the purpose of tying it onto the tail of the kite in the hope that the breeze would be strong enough to take it up.

If it will not pass this body in an hour of cool, calm, and deliberate consideration, when we are dealing with every right of the average boy, then it should not be law. Who are we to allocate unto ourselves all the wisdom that future Congresses may have? Who are we to say that we have more patriotism or more love of this Nation? We have our share I am sure, but certainly no monopoly. I am for national defense. But the so-called UMT provisions in this bill will not add one thing to national defense. All it will do is keep a lot of people over in the Pentagon busy working on it when they ought to be busy doing something worth while.

When we pass my draft bill it will be in effect until 1954. Then we have discharged our duty certainly in that field. If we want to study this UMT program and bring it in for cool, calm deliberation, then we can do it. But I will not confuse my people, I will not mistreat my people, I will not attempt to fool them into thinking that we are not passing something that is going to creep up on them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. In revising his remarks, the gentleman should not say he is going to raise it to 19 years. The present draft law is 19 years of age, and the months of service are 21. The gentelman's proposal, however, is to increase it from 21 to 24 months.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right. I reckon that sometimes our tongues do work a little faster than our brains, and that is probably what happened to me.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman's brain and tongue can take care of themselves any time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, before this watering down amendment was offered, the same gentlemen who proclaimed the virtues of the amendment were here trying to support the original provisions to bring in a commission's report which would be rammed down your necks and which you would not have had an opportunity to amend. Then inch by inch ground is given, and now it is to come in as a privileged resolution. How it will be handled on the floor, heaven knows. They say, "We will work that out." Of course, you will have 1 hour to consider it. Sometimes, who controls the hour and who controls what will be worked out will have a great deal to do with the kind of consideration that you will give the most important piece of legislation and one of the most controversial pieces of legislation in this Nation at this time. I say to you it is an unwise procedure and I believe you will agree with me. Imagine 4 days debate on this bill and probably 1 hour on the real bill itself. It is absurd.

Now we have the provision here where the Armed Services Committee must report in 45 days. At times I have thought perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services should have a Federal law to stop him, but I never dreamed he would advocate a law to hurry him up. I never thought that he would advocate a Federal law to make him do something he is going to do anyway. I do not see any need for that kind of harness on this legislative body, and you do not, either, and we know it is not a very wise action. Would you, since I am chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, would you care for me to turn the same thing over to the Federal Security Agency, or to the Department of Labor that we are asked to turn over here? Certainly not. This is a dangerous precedent. I say to you my sincere concern in this matter springs from my devotion to the educational system of this country. Any universal military service plan that is either proposed or put through must give careful and cautious consideration to the educational system of this country, else we will overlook that great source from which many, and probably a greater part of our contributons have come to promote, sustain, and build up our American way of life, that every man on this globe admires. If you do not believe that they like the American way of life, go to any country across the seas. The chief topic of conversation is how they can get over here. Yet we toy with it, and would write in this skeleton. Then speculate on what will happen. I do not know whether it is just a machine waiting for the gas or whether it is a machine that has the gas and the spark plugs and does not have a steering wheel. I know one thing—who is that comedian who says, "It don't look right to me"?—and it does not look right to those of us who are serious about this thing.

When you begin to think for one moment that the educators of this country are not alarmed, you are badly mistaken. I alone in the last 5 days have received, I would say, probably 200 letters from college presidents and college administrators, and a stack of letters from school administrators, probably a foot high. They are alarmed. If this country cannot keep building our educational institutions, for goodness sake, let us not take a chance on tearing them down.

I think the merging of these two bills is unfortunate; I think many of the Members think it is unfortunate. It is not an issue between Selective Service and universal military training, or against universal military training—that is not it. I plead with you to adopt the sound and sane and orthodox manner of dealing with one of the most serious problems and one of the most controversial issues. We have enough controversy. I, for one, cannot put our school system and American way of life in jeopardy. Without more facts, and a more complete bill, let us divorce universal military training from the draft bill. Pass my draft bill, which will furnish every man necessary for our national defense according to National Defense Department figures.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOWE: Page 4, line 11, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "And persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for any duty in Europe in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty unless Congress by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its approval of the assignment for such duty of the persons so inducted."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. In the consideration of the pending legislation will the original bill S. 1 and the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina both be subject to amendment? And in the event of the adoption of the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will it after adoption be subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is adopted it will not then be subject to amendment.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered goes to the very heart of one of the vital questions facing the American people today—the extent of the authority of the President of the United States to disperse troops to foreign soil, and in effect, to make war.

I have approached this problem with the utmost care and the deepest thought. These are critical times, and it is imperative that Americans be as united in spirit as possible in the fight against communism. I am convinced that it is incumbent upon us to do nothing that will embarrass General Eisenhower in the delicate negotiations which he has undertaken, nor impair our relations with the free nations of Europe.

Popularly, this issue has become known as the troops-to-Europe question. I think it has been misnamed. I think the question should be rephrased to read "Shall we have a garrison state in America?"

The essence of the problem is to what degree the President of the United States functions as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. Does this authority give him the right to disperse our troops in unlimited numbers to any corner of the globe he pleases? Does this authority give him the right to precipitate us into war when such dispersals are made on the basis of erroneous judgment? Does such authority give him the right to ignore Congress, despite the fact that the Constitution spends only three words conferring this authority upon him, while the much broader powers of the Congress are spelled out clearly and plainly in an entire section of our organic document?

The answer to all these questions is "No."

I do not believe that a single Member of this House, having subscribed in his oath of office to uphold the Constitution, can, as an elective representative of the people, idly stand by and permit the present occupant of the White House to claim any such powers as are now being claimed for him. If we are willing to concede that he has such powers, then obviously we no longer have a republic of free men, but instead, a garrison state in which one person, the President of the United States, can, by his judgment, whims, or caprice, plungs us into war in any corner of the globe at any time.

That is the fundamental issue. We are faced with the practical fact, however, that the President has already committed certain acts and taken certain steps which go beyond the authority granted him by the Constitution. We are also confronted by the practical fact that General Eisenhower, acting in the best of faith and under orders from the President of the United States, is in Europe conducting negotiations relative to the security of the North Atlantic community.

The amendment I have offered was drafted with the utmost care to give General Eisenhower the free hand that he may need to fulfill his mission. This is accomplished by the fact that the amendment specifically states that—

> Persons inducted into the armed services under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for duty in Europe in implementation of article 3a of the North Atlantic Treaty unless the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its approval of the assignment for such duty of the persons so inducted.

This means that all persons in the armed services, either through voluntary enlistment or induction, up to the time that this bill shall become law, namely, June 30, 1951, will be available for service in Europe without referral by the President to Congress. However, those inducted after that period shall not be available for such service unless Congress gives its approval as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

There are more than a million men in our Army alone. The other body has indicated its approval of the dispatch of four additional divisions to Europe without referral to Congress.

My amendment in no way conflicts with the sentiment of the other body. If anything, it goes further in an effort to strike a balance between the necessity to preserve the constitutional functions of our tripartite form of government on the one hand, and the necessity for us to exhibit a spirit of unity behind General Eisenhower and his mission abroad on the other hand.

It should be added, of course, that the main objective is not to prevent assistance which we may feel obligated to give at any time, but to be certain that the number of men who will be required to go abroad in any large number, or the matériel to be furnished will be approved by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, the proper place to write this provision into the law is in this bill. I see no other practical way for the House to act.

Certainly, if it is the opinion of the White House that the constitutional authority exists for the President to send unlimited number of troops anywhere anytime, it is time that this Congress eliminate that opinion by expressly writing into law a limitation on such authority.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman from New Jersey should explain to the committee that the effect of his amendment would be that it would not apply to anyone who volunteers.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Therefore, you would have regiments that would be made up of inductees under the bill and volunteers. There would have to be a census or a division of the regiment to see who would be affected by this amendment?

Mr. TOWE. Of course, under the gentleman's interpretation he is stretching it quite a bit. The whole point of the amendment is to make certain that before any large number of troops are committed to Europe after the passage of the law the Congress will be consulted, and I might add to the chairman, for whom I have a great deal of respect, perhaps if that had been done before we got involved in the Korean war we might not be in the position we are in today.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman can find no fault with one being sent to Europe by the President who volunteers?

Mr. TOWE. Yes, I do find fault with it, but there is no way in this bill to stop it. If there were I would be happy to try to do it.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman think the proper way to stop it is by a resolution somewhat along the line that the Senate has passed?

Mr. TOWE. No, I do not think so.

Mr. VINSON. That deals with both of them.

Mr. TOWE. No.

Mr. VINSON. Now here you are in this kind of a fix: The inductee cannot go but the volunteer can go. If you are sound in keeping the inductee out why should you not also keep the volunteer out?

Mr. TOWE. If the House adopts this amendment, and I hope it will, I am certain that the President will not send anybody unless he gets the approval of the Congress and I am sure that the Congress will approve reasonable commitments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. I may ask the gentleman, in all fairness, why is not the proper way to debate this, and it is a debatable question—it is an important question, on the resolution that the Senate has just passed which has been referred to the committee that deals specifically with this and applies both to the volunteer and to the inductee?

Mr. TOWE. Of course, the Senate resolution does not have the weight of law. It is merely an advisory opinion.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the gentleman knows that as far as actual effect is concerned it has the same stability that a law has.

Mr. TOWE. No, I would not say that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the chairman of the committee to which that resolution has been referred is reported to have announced that it will stay there forever and never be brought up for consideration?

Mr. TOWE. I do not know.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that in the 1940 extension of the Selective Service Act there was a flat prohibition against sending troops abroad, so that at that time you had the combination of volunteer and draft forces.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct. In this present bill you have a provision that you cannot send anybody in certain age groups inducted under this bill, out of the country for a certain length of time, but you can send young enlistees or volunteers out of the country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to point out the language of the first Selective Service Act which I take it was very much under the control of the very able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] at the time of its enactment. It specifies these words:

> Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under this act shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the Territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to say that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Judge KEE, stated that this resolution which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs would stay there until doomsday. Now, as a matter of fact, I have never heard the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs say that. He has made no such announcement to the committee, and, so far as I know, he has the inclination at the present time to have that resolution considered at the proper time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I said that the chairman was reported to have said that. I read in the public press that he said that.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think he did. The chairman is not here, but his conversation with me was certainly not along that line.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad to hear that, because if it is not true I am glad to have the story in the paper corrected.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is it not possible for the gentleman's committee to consider a resolution pending before the committee without the chairman calling it up?

Mr. RICHARDS. Certainly. That is not the usual practice, but it could be done. I am replying to the allegation made by the gentleman from Minnesota that the chairman had taken this position when he has not, from all the information I can get.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has been interrogated as to the possible inconvenience of mixing troops drafted under this law with volunteers. Is it not perfectly true, that none of the troops drafted under this law are permitted by the terms of this bill to go abroad until 6 months after they have been drafted, so that no troops under this bill could go abroad under any circumstances during the period that General Eisenhower has said he wants them—the four divisions, I believe it was.

Mr. TOWE. Four divisions, roughly; that is, until they reach the proper age.

Mr. VORYS. So that even without the gentleman's amendment, this new draft law would not be available to carry out the presently announced plan of our needs abroad, but if this is adopted, it will insure that if there is to be a substantial change in the plans of our leadership for action abroad, that it will require concurrent action by the Congress before these conscripts can be sent abroad, under that new plan.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman just said, in response to a question by the gentleman from Ohio, that it has no application, we will say, to the four divisions; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. All right. But it would prohibit any person inducted being sent as a replacement to the four divisions. In other words, if by death or by casualty anything would happen to any of those troops in the four divisions, nobody inducted under this bill, if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, could be sent to take their place?

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman is correct. While he is on his feet I would like to ask him if he thinks that the President of the United States should have the authority to send troops all over the world without Congress approving it? Will the chairman answer that question?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; I will answer it, and I will tell you what I think about that, because I have not reached this decision right off the cuff. I honestly believe that the Committee on Foreign Affairs should give careful consideration and report that resolution back to the House.

Mr. TOWE. Well, the gentleman has not answered my question. Does the chairman think that the President should send troops all over the world without the approval of the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. I want the Congress to have an opportunity to pass on everything possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Will he answer the question?

Mr. VINSON. I am answering, and I am modest about it. I do not want to dodge the issue, and I do not want the Congress to dodge the issue. I think this concurrent resolution of the Senate ought to be brought here and debated.

The TOWE. The chairman has still not answered my question. That is quite obvious to the membership.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot say yes and I cannot say no.

Mr. TOWE. That is a good answer.

Mr. VINSON. Because we are in this kind of a position.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. Wait a minute. I want the chairman to finish his statement.

Mr. VINSON. It may be that it would be a weakening of his strength if he disturbs it too much. I hate to see the strength of America weakened at any time, anywhere.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey addresses itself to the question of the power and authority of the President to send troops wherever he deems it necessary in the interest of national security. I do not agree with the gentleman or any Member of the House who would seek to amend this legislation to require congressional approval to send troops to Europe or anywhere else in the interest of national security. They are at once attempting to read the minds of the masters of the Kremlin and failing to read the Constitution of the United States.

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution asserts that the President shall be "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." I do not recall that ever before in our history has the authority of the President to command, thus delegated by the Constitution, been questioned. The authority of a field commander to deploy his troops can scarcely be limited, if the commander is to win victory in the field. The authority of the Commander in Chief to deploy his troops cannot be limited to a geographic area.

Whatever the mistakes American generals may have made in the past, whatever mistakes have been made in the current Korean conflict, neither Congress nor the President has presumed to set up rules governing the deployment of troops. The number of troops employed in any campaign or battle—North Africa, France, Ardennes, North

Korea—has always been governed by factors quite different from congressional legislative act. In a world in which the threat to our security may come from almost any direction, it is folly to tell the Commander in Chief how many troops he may send into any theater or battle; or when he may send them. What Congress can say to a general, and what Congress does say when it approves his commission is, "We have faith in your ability in a way to justify our faith." But it is the people themselves, not Congress, who say this to the President.

It is ridiculous, and worse, to presume to tell the Commander in Chief how he is to deploy the troops he commands, it is also ridiculous to assume that the next aggression of the Communist overlords of Europe and Asia will break out in Europe. Why not in India? Why not in Iran? For Congress to enact an amendment governing the deployment of troops to Europe, is as ridiculous as it would be for a householder to ask a single policeman to guard his front door only, leaving the back open to a gang of thieves. No man in the United States, indeed, no man outside the Kremlin knows where communism may strike next, or in what force, or what effort will be required on our part to meet it. What we need is a riot squad, ready for action anywhere.

I cannot believe that the sponsors of so foolish and ridiculous an amendment as this we are considering are interested in doing anything more than creating an embarrassment to the President of the United States.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Does the gentleman think the President should have the right to send large land armies any place in the world that he desires to send them?

Mr. PRICE. The founding fathers thought so. They gave him that right in the Constitution.

Mr. TOWE. Of course, they never gave him that right in the Constitution.

Mr. PRICE. They definitely did. I think if the gentleman will read the Constitution he will discover that.

Surely they are ignoring the functions and the prerogatives of the Presidency, and the safeguards established in the Constitution, and operative under the American system. Surely they are proving their ignorance of military strategy and presuming to direct the actions of field commanders as well as of the Commander in Chief. But most tragically, they are displaying a lack of faith in the American system that has served us so well for almost two hundred years. Do they fear the President more than they trust the system and the electorate that has made his Commander in Chief? Do they think that he alone can do what no American President has ever done, or ever presumed to do, and commit us to an untenable situation without the advice of military leaders? Do they think our future as a Nation is threatened more by maintaining unaltered the historic functions of the President than by the growth of communism? Do they think that war is played, like football, with a fixed number of men?

Mr. Chairman, there seems to me only one interpretation of this proposed amendment. It is an action taken to embarrass the President, to handicap our military leaders, and to create national security by statute rather than by strength in being.

If war comes, the United States cannot win it alone. We won neither World War I alone, nor World War II. In another war, we would have even fewer allies. And those allies will fight only if we give them hope and confidence.

Those allies will not fight if we tell them that only a limited number of divisions will be sent to them, and that even that limited number will be sent not by the Commander in Chief but by Congress, after prolonged debate. Those allies will not fight against a Russian Army of limitless manpower, certain to overwhelm them, unless they have confidence the United States will support them. But what confidence can they have in us, when we display so little confidence in our own system, our own President, and indeed in ourselves?

Mr. Chairman, the Roman Emperor who fiddled while Rome burned was guilty of no greater offense against the world in which he lived than the Members of this Congress who, by this or any other amendment to this bill, would have us prepare against unlimited aggression with limited effort; or who seek to handicap and embarrass in any way whatsoever those charged with providing the common defense and security of the United States.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I shall in the 5 minutes at my disposal try to contribute something further to the debate. I rise in support of the Barden substitute.

I think as has been so well stated by the gentleman from North Carolina himself [Mr. BARDEN] and others, that this is one of the most important decisions that we in Congress will be called upon to make in many years because of the effect of this legislation on our way of life.

I spoke the other day relative to the point that this is not only a universal military training bill but also that it is legislation that will establish a national service program.

There are many Members here today who did not hear me last Friday, so I will repeat some of the testimony given before Senate and House committee hearings relative to thinking on a national service program.

I want to recall a statement by Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, before the Senate committee in reply to questions as to conscription under this legislation for nonmilitary duty. Her reply was:

> It is his (the President's) concept, and that of the Department of Defense, that this must be a universal program and that every man physically and mentally and morally capable of performing a service, either in the military or outside, must perform that service. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Mrs. Rosenberg explained that she was talking about those men who would be left after they had drafted all those capable of only limited duty military service. She estimated, incidentally, that the number liable for nonmilitary service would be from 100,000 to 150,000 annually.

Then she said:

> We, however, want to make sure—and that is not the Department of Defense's program, but I know those are the President's instructions—that when a program is submitted to you it will not be a made-work program, but one of real usefulness to the national effort. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Still further on she said in answer to a question as to the program:

> The President will have a program. (Senate hearings, p. 148.)

Subsequently Labor Secretary Tobin was asked if he agreed with the program for nonmilitary service for 18-year-olds, and he said:

> It would be a very difficult program to administer, and I would want to have an opportunity to see a specific plan before me before I would want to commit myself. (Senate hearings, p. 340.)

Dr. Karl T. Compton, who we all know has been an enthusiastic supporter of "really universal service," told the committee that he believed the plans proposed by the Defense Department "are aimed in that direction"—that is, in the direction of such universal service, military and nonmilitary—Senate hearings, page 436.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer one more quotation from the Senate hearings, and I hope you will pay particular attention to this. Another witness came to the same conclusion and announced his complete and violent disapproval. He was James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO. He told the Senate committee:

> We believe that a change in the title to "Universal Military Training and Service" will leave the door open to the drafting of individuals not qualified for military duty to perform functions normally carried on by civilians. To this we are unalterably opposed. (Senate hearings, p. 1051.)

Mr. Chairman, last Friday I said that General Marshall is seeking a beachhead to put over this program. This Vinson bill is the beachhead.

If we are to prevent him from gaining that beachhead, we must adopt the Barden substitute.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Towe amendment should have the firm support of every Member of this body on both sides of the political aisle. It has but one purpose and only one—to give the American people a direct voice on the question whether American troops are to be sent abroad to be integrated into an international army under the North Atlantic Pact.

The people's right to participate in the decision—that is the issue and the sole issue which the pending amendment presents. All other questions are secondary or collateral.

We are not now called upon to debate whether Russia and her satellites constitute a threat to our national security. No one denies this threat. We are not now called upon to debate whether a free Europe is important to us in resisting this threat to our national safety. No one denies its importance.

By this amendment no question is now being raised as to the value of the North Atlantic Pact or to what extent and by what means it should be implemented. Nor is any question now being raised by this amendment whether American troops should be stationed in Europe, whether 4 divisions, 6, 10, or 12.

These are secondary or collateral questions subsequently to be decided once, by adopting the pending amendment, we have determined the primary question that the people shall participate.

The amendment we have before us should be supported by both the proponents and the opponents of the proposed Atlantic Pact program. Even the most ardent advocates of putting American troops in a European international army should support this amendment. It seeks to do nothing more than to guarantee to the people a voice in this historic decision through their representatives in Congress.

The large volume of mail each of us has received on this subject in recent weeks clearly indicates that the people want to have a voice on this all-important matter. Every national poll of public opinion I have seen indicates the same thing.

I am not a lawyer. And I do not intend to engage in any legalistic argument whether or not the President has authority under our Constitution to take the step he proposes without authorization from Congress.

The President claims he has such authority as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. On the other hand, section 8 of article I of the Constitution very clearly sets forth in successive paragraphs that it is the Congress which has the power "to declare war," "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and "to make the rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

I suppose it is impossible to draw a hard and fast line, as in most constitutional questions, as to where the authority of the Congress ends and the power of the President begins. But I think we can all agree that, at the very best, the authority asserted by the President is questionable. It is most unfortunate that the President should stubbornly stand upon what he conceives to be his constitutional rights and refuse to permit the Congress to participate with him in this decision. In taking this position he callously disregards his assurances to the Congress, when the North Atlantic Pact was ratified, that the Congress would have a direct voice in the implementation of the treaty.

But even assuming that the President's constitutional power to take the step he proposes were beyond any question, it would more likely make for the success of the program if he would automatically, on his own initiative, ask the Congress to participate with him on deciding the course to be followed in our national self-interest. When our national leaders refuse to allow the people any voice whatever in such a program of such far-reaching importance, it can hardly be expected that the people will gladly give their united support, and make whatever sacrifices may be necessary, for the success of the program. By following the course which the President has unfortunately decided upon, he is dividing the country at the very time when national unity is a paramount need.

By this amendment we are not seeking to deny the President any powers that may be rightfully his. We are not seeking to repudiate any treaty obligation. We are simply seeking to demonstrate that in the United States we have a government not of one man, or a few men, but a government of all the people.

If this amendment is adopted and enacted into law, the Congress can then promptly proceed to act upon such authorization legislation as it may deem necessary and advisable for carrying out the program in question. It is beyond my understanding how the free representatives of the free people of this country can possibly oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has quoted from the Constitution. I want to quote from the Supreme Court in the case of *U. S.* v. *Williams* (302 U. S. 46):

> The power of Congress (under this clause for regulating the land and naval forces) to determine how armies shall be raised, whether by voluntary enlistment or forced drafts, the age at which the soldier shall be received, and the period for which he shall be taken, the compensation he shall be allowed, and the service to which he shall be assigned is plenary and exclusive.

That is the Supreme Court of the United States talking, interpreting the Constitution.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Would the gentleman agree with me in this? In adopting this amendment we will make it possible for the President to go to war with the advice and consent of the Congress. We will make it impossible for future Presidents to make war as they have done in the past.

Mr. ARENDS. Absolutely. That is the very point.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I often find it difficult to defend the constitutional powers of the President, and possibly that feeling is more tense and pronounced at this moment than at any time heretofore, but I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the members of this committee fully realize the meaning of what is here proposed.

I think the President should live closer to the Congress, both the House and the Senate, and that the situation which culminated in the resolution adopted by the Senate some few days ago might have been avoided if the President had exercised himself in the interest of maintaining a better relationship with that body. But whether he did so or not, I know in my own heart that the resolution was a terrible mistake, and here it is proposed that this body repeat in effect what the Senate did.

The decision of the Supreme Court quoted by my friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has no bearing whatever upon the question of the right of the President as the Commander in Chief to place men in the armed services at the point he in his judgment as Commander in Chief believes advisable. Nobody will contend that in the absence of a declaration of war on the part of the Congress it would be within the right of the President to engage the country in war, but whether at war or at peace, it is within his constitutional power to move people in the Armed Forces in such manner as his judgment dictates to be wise. However, this is a power that he should not exercise in defiance of congressional will. On all such matters of grave importance the President should consult the Congress.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would my friend say that the prohibition in the draft law of 1940 against sending draftees overseas was an unconstitutional prohibition?

Mr. COX. I would say it was an infringement upon the constitutional powers of the President, and that he was not compelled to obey it. Of course, we must assume that the President would not send troops to other parts of the world, in the absence of a declaration of war, where such action might involve us in war. But for the implementation of treaties I think that within the limits of reason he might properly exer-

cise such power. I would say, perhaps, that the fulfillment of our engagements entered into with Western Europe is reasonable. Do not gentlemen realize that we have lost China, Formosa included, and that we will probably lose all of Asia? We are desperately battling now to develop the strength of Western Europe which may be used as an adjunct to our own power. To develop the strength of the great peoples of that part of the world with whom we can make common cause in the endeavor to hold back the tide of communism that threatens to engulf the entire world.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. Do I understand the gentleman is stating to the House that we are not now engaged in a war in Korea?

Mr. COX. Of course we are in a war in Korea; yes.

Mr. TOWE. Was it declared by the Congress?

Mr. COX. No; it was not declared by the Congress. It is unfortunate that it did develop. However, it may be a situation which nobody could possibly have avoided.

But, Mr. Chairman, returning to the amendment which we are now considering, I beg gentlemen, who declare allegiance to the fundamental law of the land, to ponder well this question before voting for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee when does he anticipate closing debate?

Mr. VINSON. I hope that after probably half an hour more of debate we may be in a position to get the acquiescence of the committee to agree to a limitation of time. We do not want to shut any Member off. After consulting with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, who is now about to address the committee, if he wants to run on a little bit longer, all right, let everybody have a chance to talk.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are some 374 Members who desire 3 or 4 minutes to talk on the matter. We do not want to be cut off later on.

Mr. VINSON. No; we will never cut the gentleman from Michigan off. He will get the time anyhow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was just thinking of some of the other Members.

Mr. VINSON. I think if we proceed now, we may make some progress.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have given this matter a great deal of serious thought. I realize full well that the developments of last night, as they affect our situation in the Pacific, and as they affect our national welfare, perhaps overshadow in immediate interest many of the other issues involved in this legislation now before us.

However, may I point out that in my opinion the events which have happened in the Pacific in the last 24 hours and the things that have happened there leading up to the events of the last 24 hours impress upon this amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey a greater importance than it might otherwise have ever assumed.

We are now in a war in the Pacific. We are in a war which the decision to enter was not a matter of participation by the Congress of the United States. For a long time things did not go very well there, and then they went a little better. Apparently, some folks think now that they are going too well—I do not know. But in any event it seems as if we are getting ready to pull out of Asia, or at least go into neutral. Would that not indicate that possibly the Congress should have been consulted before we went into Korea? Possibly a little debate here would not have been a bad thing. Possibly the understanding of the people about why we were there might have been a little clearer, and it might not have been necessary for a young man in the service to write to the Secretary of State to ask why we were in the war in Korea. I served a little time in a war once myself, and I never found it necessary to inquire as to why we were in that war.

We are talking about troops to Europe. General Eisenhower has been named supreme commander. Are we to understand from what has just happened to General MacArthur that if General Eisenhower and his military leaders should come to certain decisions about how best to fight and win in Europe if war there should come, that he will likewise be removed from his command? We had better find out about some of those things before we go very much further.

For myself I want General Eisenhower to feel free to tell the American people whatever he thinks they ought to be told in respect to the way we can defend ourselves and our security best.

The gentleman from Georgia says we lost China.

We did not lose China; the administration gave China away.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? I accept the correction.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to see the gentleman is regaining some of his good sense.

There is another basic question involved, and right here is where we ought to make a start. The Congress of the United States, I think, is entitled to be advised from time to time by our military leaders. We put up the men and the money with which they fight, and I think we ought to be advised. So, let us be advised about this great new venture before we get into it too far. As I say, I have given this a lot of thought and I want to tell you what I have prepared here is as complete an answer to the gentleman from Georgia as it would have been had I known what the gentleman was going to say.

The Congress of the United States, operating under its constitutional obligation, is now engaged in the enterprise of providing for the common defense of this Nation and its people.

This defense is being raised against the possible encroachment of a government ruled from the top.

To suggest that this Congress should not participate in a major decision involving that defense is to deny the very principle of government by the people which our present effort is designed to protect and uphold.

I have always acted under, and been guided by, the basic assumption that ours is a representative form of government, that what distinguished America from so many other less fortunate nations of the world was our constitutional privilege of making vital decisions as a people—through our Representatives in the Congress—after honest and forthright debate.

To me the great distinguishing feature of our form of government has been the fact that the conduct of our affairs has its origin on the broad base of the people, in sharp contrast to those governments which are ruled from the top down. It is high time that feature was reemphasized.

Now, however, we are facing another major departure from this fundamental precept: It is proposed that the administrative branch of the Government shall on its own initiative, by its own judgment and through its own action embark on an adventure unprecedented in the history of our Nation: The dispatch of American troops to the frontiers of Europe to participate in the establishment of a continental army in a time of nominal, if not official, peace.

In recent weeks the Congress has been engaged in what the press has aptly termed "The great debate."

In all the arguments I have read and heard incident to the current debate in no case has anyone challenged the constitutional right of the Congress to declare war. No one has suggested that there is any ambiguity whatsoever in article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution which sets out in unequivocable terms that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

Does anyone here contend that the framers of the Constitution intended that such power should be a purely academic aftermath of Executive action? Was the historic role of the Congress meant to consist of an accessory after the fact?

Let me recall to you the words of James Madison, our fourth President who said, commenting on the work of the Constitutional Convention:

> The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. It has, accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature.

I submit that it was precisely because the matter of troop deployment is so

closely alined to the power of declaring war that the Congress was given iron-clad assurances by the administration, during the Senate discussion of the proposed Atlantic Pact arrangement, that acceptance of this treaty would in no way involve this country in a commitment of troops.

The answer to a straightforward question on that score, you will recall, was the unqualified—the absolute—no.

Now, however, the administration is proposing to take the very step the people of this Nation were assured would not be taken. The administration is proposing to send Armed Forces to the continent of Europe without the prior authorization of the Congress. These troops are being sent in contemplation of combat. And combat is war.

Let me ask this question: With American combat troops on the continent of Europe what happens if an aggressor attacks a European nation not signatory to the Atlantic Pact? What happens if an aggressor attacks Turkey or moves on Yugoslavia? Does anyone contend that the President could commit our Armed Forces, stationed on the Continent—to the protection of such nations without a declaration of war by the Congress? Does anyone want to predict that he wouldn't?

We must face up to the fact that we are living in a time when a declaration of war has become an old-fashioned device in the minds of many. Wars today culminate in shooting after a step-by-step process in which the representatives of the people are being increasingly euchred into impotence.

The founders of this Nation realized full well the grave implications of a declaration of war; that the power to make such a declaration—a move which plunges any nation into the darkness of death and destruction—should never be vested in a single man.

Is it conceivable, then, that in placing this great responsibility on the shoulders of the Congress, the framers of our Constitution meant that the Congress should exercise no authority in that great twilight zone between peace and war? Was the Congress meant to sit idly by, waiting for the darkness of conflict to fall?

The issue before us is simple: Shall the Congress abdicate its historic and constitutional right and obligation to make major decisions affecting the lives and resources of the people it has been elected to represent? Shall momentous decisions be usurped by the executive branch of the Government, leaving to the Congress purely academic powers of providing the wherewithal in men and money to carry out the designs and adventures of the administration, whatever they may be?

Can anyone here deny that the issue of sending American ground forces to the frontiers of occupied Germany constitutes a decision which can have far-reaching effects on the history of this Nation?

Can anyone here deny that once units of our Armed Forces have been dispatched to the continent of Europe on executive initiative the position of the Congress in making whatever subsequent decisions may necessarily result will henceforth be prejudiced by our very abdication of responsibility in this initial step?

Certainly the easiest course for us to follow today would be to turn our backs on the grave responsibility of participating in the decision of sending troops to Europe.

The easiest course for us would be to say, "the administration is willing to do this thing on its own initiative. The President says he has the authority to send troops to Europe. It is none of our affair. Let him answer to the people for this action."

That would be the easy way. But it would not be the honorable way. It would not be worthy of a man or woman sworn to perform the duties of the office to which he was elected.

Our position demands that we participate in this decision. For every argument that can be mustered in support of the administration's contention that the authority is vested in the executive office, an equally sound argument can be submitted in support of the contention that the Congress has a like authority. This fact has been amply demonstrated in the debates which have taken place in recent weeks.

It is a fundamental error to base our position purely on the technical aspects of this situation.

A far greater and vastly more important consideration lies in the moral implications of the argument over authority.

Wrapped in those moral implications are great traditions, the fundamental issues of unity, of popular support, of public conviction, all of which are derived through consent of the governed. How else is such consent achieved in our Government except through action by the elected representatives of the people? How else does anyone in this Chamber believe it can be achieved? And how else would anyone in this Chamber today have it achieved?

Casting aside the purely technical aspects of the question, it can be safely stated that no President should be required to make a decision of this magnitude on his own; no President should want to make a decision of this gravity on his own; and, finally, no President should be allowed to make it on his own.

Moreover, beyond the technical issue of authority, we may fairly ask: For what reason does the Executive insist that the collective judgment of the representatives of the people should not be allowed to pass on the question of sending American troops to Europe?

If the reply is that the administration has no faith in the collective judgment of the Congress, then this is a stark condemnation of the American form of government.

If I am asked, in return, why the Congress does not have faith in the administration's judgment on this issue, my answer is that many heads are better than one, and that it is my honest belief that the people of the United States today place more confidence in the judgment of the Congress than in the judgment of the administration. And in support of that contention I submit that on this specific matter a public-opinion poll has established striking statistics indicating that a preponderance of citizens believe that the troops-to-Europe issue should be resolved by the Congress.

If, on the other hand, the administration insists that time is of the essence in this matter of troops to Europe, I submit that at no time in the history of this Nation has the Congress failed the people in a crisis. It will not do so now.

Today the United States is involved in complex international procedures and relationships.

This Nation is involved in what has been variously described as a "police action," "hostilities," "defense against aggression," and "undeclared war" against the people of North Korea and Communist China.

In this adventure we are presently arrived at what is perhaps best described as a military-diplomatic stalemate, in which no one seems to know what is to be done next. We find our forces, under American leadership, constricted by foreign intrigue and frustrated by diplomatic incompetence.

Operating under the auspices of the United Nations on one front, we are simultaneously embarking on an adventure linked to the Atlantic Pact, an adventure involving the creation and maintenance of a standing international army on the Continent of Europe in a situation for which there is no precedent in our history.

Can any Member deny, after reading his mail from home, that we are in a period of public apprehension and confusion, much of which can be traced to the assumption of authority by the Executive—authority which led to secret deals at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam; authority which plunged this Nation into an undeclared war in Korea; a war, by the way, which has developed into a situation serious far beyond the expectations of an administration which called it a police action?

I will not contend that the Executive power of the United States Government shall not be vested in the President, or that in the matter of convenience and facility there may conceivably be occasions when the administration may properly conduct foreign relations.

But I reject as inimical to the best interests of this Nation a trend toward government by Executive interpretation or by political expediency on issues of such grave import as we are now considering. I reject as dangerous to the welfare of our country government by Executive fiat which calls upon the Congress to follow up an administration fait accompli with the docile subservience of a servant to his master. It is high time, I say, that the Congress look to a restoration of its rightful responsibilities and prerogatives as a vital and independent branch of this Government.

I reject, as completely foreign to our traditions, government from above, government by Executive decision; government, if you please, by whim of the White House.

I do not propose to willingly abdicate what I consider to be my sacred responsibility in this regard. As a Member of the Congress of the United States I call upon those of like mind to join me in the performance of our sworn duties to provide for the common defense and to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States.

I call upon you to join me in the restoration of congressional authority in deciding matters of grave import to the Nation.

I will support the Towe amendment.

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Towe amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] during his remarks said that the people put more confidence in the Congress than in the President.

During the Civil War, reading the current history of those days, there were very few people who had confidence in President Lincoln. I remember history saying that General McClellan challenged the civil government and the President of the United States at that time. I remember history showing that President Lincoln visited the home of General McClellan in Washington. General McClellan was out attending a wedding and the President and the Secretary of War waited for General McClellan to return to his residence. Some time later General McClellan did return, and his servant told him that President Lincoln and the Secretary of War were waiting to talk to him; and General McClellan went upstairs, passed the room in which Lincoln was seated; that a half hour later President Lincoln asked the servant if General McClellan was going to see him, and the servant told him that General McClellan had retired for the night; that Lincoln then left and went back to the White House.

I remember history telling that very few Members of Congress supported Lincoln in those days. Lincoln was crucified in those days, but Lincoln's Memorial now stands as a shrine, and properly so, to which hundreds of thousands of people make a pilgrimage each year, because Lincoln now is identified as the savior of the Union.

So I think a little reference to history pointedly answers the observation made by my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, in that respect. We see history made today of 435 Americans, each of us elected by the people of our congressional districts, with a direct responsibility imposed upon us in these trying days to do those things as Americans that will be for the best interest of our country, not only today but tomorrow. It is not what we like to do but what we should do. We should face the problems with courage. We should face the issues of the day with confidence and with courage, and we should do those things and cast those votes for issues that will be for the best interests of the United States of America without fear or without regard to personal consequences politically. I have to live with my conscience and you have to live with yours, and all I can say is that so far as JOHN McCORMACK's conscience is concerned, I am going to vote on the side of strength for my country. For I am satisfied that there is only one thing that the Communists respect, and that is what they fear, and the only thing they fear is a strength and power greater than they possess.

Three years ago I made a speech calling attention to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union operating under the ideology of international communism, taking over country after country through internal subversion, the ultimate objective being the United States of America. We can have peace in the world very easily if we want to; there is nothing in the world to stop us from having peace. We do not have to appropriate one penny and we do not have to take on young man from his home. My two brothers and I left our home in World War I and enlisted as privates. We do not have to make any sacrifices. All we have to do is get down on our knees to Stalin. But what a life afterward? We can live if we want to become slaves, but we have to do those things that our judgment tells us we must do if we want to remain free men and free women.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, first I want to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that it must be terrible to be born a rascal and then be handicapped with a conscience.

I find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Georgia, which always causes me to reexamine my thinking.

There has been much reference to history today. History has demonstrated through all the years that any confederacy of nations that has no power is dangerous to all those that belong to it. Such confederacy will destroy even its largest member. For that reason our original Confederacy of 13 States was inadequate. Our Constitution was necessary to provide uniform money, an Army, control of interstate commerce, effective foreign policy, and other subjects.

Our Government of necessity was given definite and necessary powers. We divided those powers among branches of that Government. We expressly said Congress was to have the right to declare war and the President, all powers necessary to a Commander in Chief. History told us we had to do that even though there might be a conflict in those powers. However, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention that history has also told us that the same agency that declares war must raise the taxes to finance the war. To provide otherwise is to expressly provide for the eventual destruction of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., reported to the President of the United States upon completion of the San Francisco Conference, where the United Nations was set up. He told the President in his letter that they had set up a beautiful free man's legislature, but it had no power to make laws. He said they set up a beautiful court that history advised necessary for free men, but that the court they set up had no jurisdiction. He then said they set up a Security Council in which 99.99 percent of the members could not act. That was the United Nations. It is a new confederacy without powers. The American people accepted it through their legislature because if it had no powers, there was no need to discuss the extent of the designated sovereignty to the United Nations from our Government.

Even though it had no powers, we find ourselves at war in Korea because that new Government agency—United Nations—without the power to tax, was assumed by our President to have the power to declare war for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we must face the fact. That division of our Government which must finance war must insist upon its right to declare war and at least limit the number of men that a President may send outside of our borders without the consent of Congress. If we follow any other pattern today, Congress will either eventually say to the men across the oceans in foreign lands that we in this House cannot or will not finance a military expedition entered into by another department of our Government. For that reason, I submit to you that we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and insist that the Congress has something to say on the subject of whether or not our troops shall leave our shores, and if so in what numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

(Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. McCARTHY.)

(Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to analyze objectively the position taken by the Republican Party in proposing to restrict the President's power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and so to obstruct and hamper him in the execution of the military and foreign policy of the United States of America. The arguments fall into three categories: First, those arguments based on the Constitution; second, the arguments from precedent; third, the argument from principle, or what may be called the principle of limitation and restraint upon the Presidential power in the conduct of foreign affairs and in command of the armed services.

Let us consider first, the contention of Republicans that the President does not have the constitutional power to send troops to Europe in the present situation. They do not raise any question as to the power of the Chief Executive to dispatch troops outside the United States and its territories in time of war, but they do question, and are questioning his right to send them in time of peace or of undeclared war. In raising this question they are in disagreement with the great majority of recognized constitutional authorities, including William Howard Taft, once Republican President of the United States.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very pertinent, at this point, to read into the RECORD a very significant statement. Ex-President William Howard Taft, a Republican President and former Chief Justice of the United States of America, in his book The Presidency—Its Duties, Its Powers, Its Opportunities and Limitations had this to say:

> The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and of the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this, he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will. Of course, the instrumentality which it furnishes gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. Under the Constitution Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and Navy the President can take action, such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no opinion but to declare it, or to recognize its existence.

He made that statement at the University of Virginia before young men studying in the field of constitutional law.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, Taft in his work entitled "Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers" expressed his opinion in these words:

> The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. * * * Under this, he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. * * * The instrumentality which this power furnishes, gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. (William Howard Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, p. 94.)

Another expert, W. W. Willoughby, in his book, The Constitutional Law of the United States, expresses a similar opinion, which is typical of the opinions of outstanding United States constitutional authorities. On the question of the right of the President to send troops, Professor Willoughby writes this:

> It would seem to the author, however, that the President, under his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and his general control of the foreign relations of the United States, has this discretionary right constitutionally vested in him, and, therefore, not subject to congressional control. (W. W. Willoughby, The Constitutional Law of the United States (2d ed.), vol. III, p. 1567.)

Dr. Willoughby contends positively that if the sending is in pursuance of express treaty provisions or for the execution of treaty provisions, the sending could not reasonably be subject to constitutional objections. Significantly, no prominent Republican is calling for renegotiation of North Atlantic Treaty.

The argument based on precedent need not detain us long. The record shows that in the 175 years of the existence of the United States, American troops have been sent abroad in approximately 150 separate instances. Following is a brief outline of a few of such instances.

1798–1800—Undeclared naval war with France: This contest included land actions, such as that in the Dominican Republic, city of Puerto Plata, where marines captured a French privateer under the guns of the forts.

1801–5—Tripoli: The First Barbary War, including the *George Washington* and *Philadelphia* affairs and the Eaton expedition, during which a few marines landed with United States Agent William Eaton to raise a force against Tripoli in an effort to free the crew of the *Philadelphia*. Tripoli declared war but not the United States.

1816–18—Spanish Florida-first Semiole war: The Seminole Indians, whose area was a resort for escaped slaves and border ruffians, were attacked by troops under Generals Jackson and Gaines and pursued into northern Florida. Spanish posts were attacked and occupied. British citizens executed. There was no declaration or congressional authorization but the Executive was sustained.

1818—Oregon: The U. S. S. *Ontario*, dispatched from Washington, landed at the Columbia River and in August took possession. Britain had conceded sovereignty but Russia and Spain asserted claims to the area.

1846–48—Mexico: President Polk occupied disputed territory. Precipitated Mexican War.

1853–54—Ryukyu and Bonin Islands: Commodore Perry on three visits before going to Japan and while waiting for a reply from Japan made a naval demonstration, landing marines twice, and secured a coaling concession from the ruler of Naha on Okinawa. He also demonstrated in the Bonin Islands. All to secure facilities for commerce.

China: In 1927, the United States had 5,670 troops ashore in China and 44 naval vessels in its waters. In 1933 we had 3,027 armed men ashore. All this protective action was in general terms based on treaties with China ranging from 1858 to 1901.

1914—Dominican Republic, June and July: During a revolutionary movement, United States Naval Forces by gunfire stopped the bombardment of Puerto Plata, and by threat of force maintained Santo Domingo City as a neutral zone.

1918–20—Soviet Russia: Marines were landed at and near Vladivostok in June and July to protect the American consulate and other points in the fighting between the Bolsheviki troops and the Czech Army which had traversed Siberia from the western front. A joint proclamation of emergency government and neutrality was issued by the American, Japanese, British, French, and Czech commanders in July and our party remained until late August.

In August the project expanded. Then 7,000 men were landed in Vladivostok and remained until January 1920, as part of an allied occupation force.

1919—Honduras, September 8 to 12: A landing force was sent ashore to maintain order in a neutral zone during an attempted revolution:

1926–33—Nicaragua, May 7 to June 5, 1926; August 27, 1926, to January 3, 1933: The coup d'etat of General Chamorro aroused revolutionary activities leading to the landing of American marines to protect the interests of the United States. United States forces came and went, but seem not to have left the country entirely until January 3, 1933. Their work included activity against the outlaw leader Sandino in 1928.

1941—Germany: Some time in the spring the President ordered the Navy to patrol ship lanes to Europe. By July our warships were convoying and by September were attacking German submarines. There was no authorization of Congress or declaration of war. In November the Neutrality Act was partly repealed to protect military aid to Britain, Russia, and so forth.

Even Senator TAFT admits to these facts, for, as he says:

> Many cases have been cited, because the President has actually landed troops in many countries in the past.

He argues, however, that the action has been taken in every case to protect American citizens or American property. He says, further, that in no case can the President "ever involve this country in war unless it is attacked." This statement does not square with the facts. Rather it is true, as Republican Senator MILLIKIN stated in a speech in the Senate of the United States in 1945:

> In many cases the President has sent troops into a foreign country to protect our foreign policy, notably in Central and South America. This was not aimed at protecting any particular American citizen. It was aimed at protecting our foreign policy.

Certainly in no case of our intervention in South America and Central America, excepting Mexican involvements, was there any attack on the United States, and in most cases there was involvement in war, although on a small scale. Professor Corwin, in his book, The President: Office and Powers, summarizes this case thus:

> It may be argued, and has, in fact, been argued many times, that the President is under constitutional obligation not to incur the risk of war in the prosecution of a diplomatic policy without first consulting Congress and getting its consent. In view, nevertheless, of what has been said already, the supposed principle is clearly a maxim of policy rather than a generalization from consistent practice. (E. S. Corwin, The President: Office and Powers, p. 249.)

It is clear that the Republican case cannot be defended on constitutional grounds, neither is it sustained by the record of history. This leaves then the argument based on the so-called principle of the limitation of the Presidential power as Commander in Chief and as Chief Executive, with wide powers in the conduct of foreign affairs. What is actually implied in this demand is that the President secure congressional approval

for the sending of troops, is that Congress is claiming the right to a veto power over the President's determinations as Commander in Chief, at least whenever commitment of troops outside the United States is at issue. I assume that this would also include any proposal to dispatch the Navy.

The Republicans are here contending for a drastic limitation upon the power of the President in military and international affairs. This is certainly contrary to the Republican tradition. A reexamination of the record of history will show that the Republican Presidents have usually demonstrated great independence and autonomy in these two fields, military activity and foreign affairs.

Abraham Lincoln, for example, without congressional authorization, called out the militia, called for volunteers, increased the size of the Regular Army and Navy, suspended the writ of habeas corpus in certain areas and spent $2,000,000 of unappropriated funds—page 18, committee print, printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Only after all of these acts had been carried out did Congress pass an act, signed on August 6, 1861, approving and legalizing "all the acts, proclamations, and orders of the President, respecting the Army and Navy and calling out, or relating to the militia or volunteers from the States"—McLaughlin, Constitutional History of the United States, page 662.

Garfield, on the other hand, ordered the occupation troops out of the South. This action was a reversal of policy established by the Congress, as a major policy. Yet the Republican Congress permitted this order to be carried out without launching a great debate.

Again in 1900–1901 Republican President McKinley sent 5,000 troops to fight in conjunction with the troops of other nations to put down the Boxer Rebellion. China considered this a war, and declared war. Yet no great debate was launched to clarify the principle. Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States says:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Yet for 4 years, 1898 to 1902, the President as Commander in Chief exercised all the executive power and all legislative power of the Government. Congress, a Republican Congress, permitted this, and when it did act, after the act, it ratified everything President McKinley had done—Taft, Our Chief Magistrate, pages 98, 99.

Another Republican President Theodore Roosevelt, in the conduct of foreign affairs relative to securing the Panama Canal sent marines who prevented Colombian troops from stopping the revolution in Panama, without congressional approval. In his own words he described his own independence of the Republican Congress.

> I took Panama—

He said in 1912.

> It was the only way the canal could be constructed. If I had followed traditional conservative methods I should have submitted a dignified state paper of probably 200 pages to Congress and the debate would be going on yet. But I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the Canal does also. (Nevins and Commager, America: The Story of a Free People, pp. 430–432.)

Marines continued to be stationed in Panama until 1914. There was no great Republican demand for congressional consultation or approval of these actions. The principle of limitation on Presidential authority in military affairs and in foreign affairs does not shine forth brilliantly in this cloudy record of Republican Presidents.

The constitutional case having been rejected, the case based on precedent found wanting, and the argument from principle without historical justification, it appears that what is really in progress here is a partisan attack on the office and powers of the President, an attempt to weaken the constitutional position of the Chief Executive for purely temporary, partisan objectives. There is a shocking similarity between the methods now being used and those which were used in the attack of the Republican Congress on President Andrew Johnson immediately after the Civil War. Then, as now, the purpose was to make the President dependent on Congress in a field of action which under the Constitution unquestionably belongs to the Chief Executive. Then, as now, the attempt was made in the form of rider. The Congress attached to the appropriation bill of 1867, a provision that all orders and instructions relating to military operations should be issued through the General of the Army; that the General should not be removed or assigned to command elsewhere than at Washington, without the express approval of the Senate—McLaughlin, Constitutional History of the United States, page 662. The effect was to make the General of the Army—Grant—Commander in Chief, and to make his removal from office solely dependent upon Senate approval.

This kind of partisan attack on the executive branch of the Government by the legislative branch is most serious. Its effect is to weaken the structure of the Constitution, to obscure and confuse the division of powers of the branches of Government. There is grave danger in the interference of the legislative branch in the sphere of the executive, especially in the field of foreign affairs and military action. The danger is to the legislative branch as well as to the executive branch.

To attempt to usurp the power of another branch of government may force the executive branch arbitrarily to exercise its proper functions. A free legislative body is always the principal bulwark between the people and an autocratic government. For such a body to act so as to destroy the respect with which it is held by the citizens is to perform a great disservice to democracy and representative government. Such irresponsible action sustains the judgment of Andrew McLaughlin, professor of history at Chicago University—

> That democratic government is particularly endangered not so much by the intrigues of ambitious leaders hungry for power, as by legislative inefficiency, by interminable debates of which the people grow weary, by petty objections, and crafty obstruction, by blocs and factions, by party incoherence and consequent absence of assignable responsibility.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

(Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HERTER.)

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment now before us. For certain technical, but I think entirely valid reasons, the gentleman's amendment is limited entirely to troops which are sent to Europe under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Article 3, as you know, is the one in which the various parties to the treaty agreed to consult each other with respect to making mutual defense more effective. But article 3 can only be implemented by article 9 of the treaty under which a defense council is set up. The Defense Council has to recommend ways and means under which article 3 can be implemented. One of those recommendations has already been made, and that is for a commander in chief of the unified forces.

When you talk about the constitutional prerogatives of the President of the United States in this situation I feel that you have a very close question. However, when he, as Commander in Chief, implements article 3 and puts these soldiers under a commander who is responsible to a council, only one of which is an American, an alien council, if you want to call it that, they are no longer under the Commander in Chief of the United States, and his constitutional prerogatives no longer apply. While General Eisenhower is the boss today, something might happen to him and it might be General Montgomery or Marshal Jouin or someone else tomorrow, and those men are no longer under the direct control of the President of the United States.

Another point of a technical nature is this: The question of implementing this treaty came up before us last July. We passed an act, and I have it here, Public Law 621, in which we made provision for sending arms to the various cooperating nations under the treaty. We gave permission to send United States matériel for the joint defenses; but it specifically states—and I hope every Member will read the first section of that act that we passed—it specifically states that that assistance is being given under article 9 of the treaty, which provides for the implementation of the treaty; in other words, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to sending matériel of war, inanimate things, it requires an act of Congress to do it; yet today we are talking about sending human beings, our boys, under exactly the same conditions, under exactly the same provisions of the treaty, and say it can be done without Congress being consulted. To me there is a complete incompati-

bility in that situation; and for that reason, because of the limitation that is imposed by this amendment which is very carefully drawn and applies only to article 3 of this treaty, I feel that this amendment is an entirely proper one. I do not want to handicap General Eisenhower in the defense of this Nation, but I think the President ought to come to us in the case of men, just as much as he has to in the case of matériel of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am for full military preparedness by this Nation. I favor America having the strongest ground, air, and sea forces that are required to insure the freedoms and the safety of the American people.

But, while I am in favor of ample armament and adequately trained manpower, that does not mean that I am in favor of giving to one man, the President of the United States, the power to send American troops in any numbers he pleases anywhere and anytime he pleases.

No President, be he Democrat or Republican, should have the power to commit American Armed Forces all over the world without the consent of Congress. And most certainly I do not think President Truman should have such powers when he, by his letter writing and removal of General MacArthur, has demonstrated himself to be an impulsive and impetuous man of quick temper and snap judgment.

I am, therefore, in favor of the Towe amendment, which would prohibit the President from sending American soldiers to Europe without first obtaining the consent of Congress to do so.

If President Truman today has the right and the power to send four divisions to Europe, he has the power to send eight divisions there. If he has the power to send eight divisions to Europe, he has the power to send 50 or 100 divisions.

These divisions which the President and Secretary Acheson propose to send to Europe are not being dispatched overseas to bolster up, to strengthen, or to protect the two American divisions we now have in Germany, as some would make you believe.

These new divisions which President Truman proposes to send to Europe are being committed there by the President to become part and parcel of an international army. This international army will be composed, it is claimed, of the troops of 14 Atlantic Pact nations, altogether, including our own.

For the present, this international army to which President Truman and Dean Acheson would commit our American troops will be under the command of an American general, Ike Eisenhower.

Next week, next month, and next year, however, these 14 Atlantic Pact nations, of which we are only 1, may elect to put a foreign general in charge of this international army. Then our American soldiers will be under the command of a foreign general and this foreign general, not an American commander, will determine where and when our American troops shall be committed to battle.

I am not saying that the United States of America should never, under any circumstances, commit American soldiers, to become part of an international army. What I am saying is that the decision as to whether or not we commit our American soldiers to foreign soil as part of an international army should be made by the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 96 Senators and not by one man, the President of the United States, no matter who he may be. This is too much power to entrust to any one man and especially too much power for an individual so impulsive, impetuous, and quick-tempered as President Truman, on many occasions, has demonstrated himself to be.

It is the primary responsibility of the nations of Europe and not of the United States to defend Europe. We Americans want to help them. But before America commits more troops to Europe this Congress ought to have the right to inquire of these other nations what they are going to do to help defend themselves.

I do not want to see, in Europe, another Korea where our Nation, fighting under a United Nations banner, puts up 95 percent of the troops and 100 percent of the cost of the police action or war or whatever you please to call it.

Furthermore, before this Congress ever votes troops for Europe, it ought to first have the assurance of our European allies, if they are going to be allies, that they will cease this unholy trade they have been carrying on, for several years now, with Russia and her satellites.

Do you know that in 1949, the three nations of Great Britain, France, and Belgium sold more than $1,000,000,000 worth of goods to the enemy countries behind the iron curtain?

Of that more than $1,000,000,000 worth of goods that was shipped in 1949 from Great Britain, France, and Belgium to Russia and her satellites more than $200,000,000 of it consisted of such potential war materials as iron, steel, rubber, tin, copper, brass, ball bearings, machine tools, automobiles, trucks, and bobwire. The unholy business of our allies shipping war goods to Russia, to China, and to other Communist satellite nations still continues.

Congress ought to inquire into these things before the United States commits more American troops to fight on foreign soil as part of an international army.

The country will feel much safer if we today pass the Towe amendment and thereby let the American people know that Congress no longer is going to permit one man, the President, to send American troops anytime, anywhere, and in any numbers he pleases to become part of an international army.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized.

(Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this limited time is inadequate to make even a small contribution to this very important discussion. But I am not too distressed about that for what has gone before in the debate has been largely excellent, particularly the very fine and scholarly remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I hope you will reexamine his speech tomorrow morning, because it is an excellent exposition of this whole subject.

I must pass over the deplorable lack of wisdom in not always voluntarily consulting the Congress and the American people in policies of this kind and to refer to once again, and emphasize a little more the very clear provisions of the Constitution in this matter. When the framers of the Constitution met in convention in Philadelphia they had as one of their foremost problems that of getting away from one-man rule, and they were not going to make a mistake about this language. When it came to the military powers of Congress they set them forth in detail:

Article I, section 8, dealing with legislative powers, provides in part that—

> Congress shall have the power—to declare war—to make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies—to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

I have referred to these powers in detail to indicate the painstaking care used by the Constitutional Convention to make sure that the high responsibility of raising, and regulating the use of armies, was exclusively vested in the Congress, hence, by representation, in the people.

In addition, Congress had complete control of our money, without which no troops can be sent anywhere.

In contradistinction to those broad and detailed powers, article II, section 2, briefly provides that—

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.

This is the only reference to such powers. Can we infer from this a power to start and maintain a major war, as in Asia?

Those who support the President's powers rather glibly refer to a large number of precedents and Supreme Court opinions. They do not bear careful analysis. It is of course true that from 1798 on, marines and limited forces have been dispatched to protect American lives or property, usually as a result of a civil war or internal disturbance which could not be controlled by the local government. Such temporary emergencies

are hardly to be compared with a permanent policy of occupying Europe with large numbers, for long years; or with fighting in Korea the fourth worst war in our history, with 250,000 troops, 60,000 casualties and 15,000 monthly replacements; a war in its ninth month, now involving us with the most numerous nation on earth; a tragic war in which the end is not in sight.

While I am satisfied, as a lawyer, that the President is without constitutional right to fight all over Asia, or to occupy Europe, without congressional sanction, it is even more important that he should not attempt to involve the Nation in such vast projects without an assurance of the people's will, and the backing of its representatives. Obviously he must come to Congress to implement his actions. How much wiser to obtain their approval in advance.

You do not avoid war by omitting a formal declaration of war. We are presently engaged in a major war which may suddenly or by degrees become a world war. To suggest that such a course may be pursued without action by Congress is to reduce its authority, and hence the authority of the people, to a debating society, with some limited function of approving the appropriation of money demanded by the President. To so limit the Congress and exalt the Presidency, is, of course, to abandon democracy and surrender to a dictatorship.

On January 15, Senator TAFT said:

> The basic liberties of the people * * * are imperiled unless we can retain in Congress the right to pass on policies affecting—
>
> Their—
>
> very life and being.

I agree. I am not prepared to surrender in whole or in part the power of the people exercised by their elective representatives.

Neither am I prepared to deliver the fate of this country solely into the hands of President Truman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY].

(Mr. MCVEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to imagine anything more directly related to a bill for raising an army than a provision stating where that army is to serve. In the autumn of 1940 the Congress passed the first peacetime conscription. That plan for conscription contained the provision that the men to be drafted were not to be sent out of the Western Hemisphere except to our own Territories and possessions. A restriction on the deployment of the men under arms was germane to the conscription law of 1940.

Another factor which entered into that situation was that wherever our soldiers went they would be serving under American officers, responsible to our American Government. No such safeguards exist today. If our boys are sent abroad, they will be soldiers of an international army, and under a commander that is responsible not to the United States but to an international union in which our Government has but one vote. That army will have its own code of military law which may be at great variance with our manner of doing things.

Certainly, if there ever were a time when we were justified in placing a limitation on the manner in which our troops shall be deployed, it is now. We do not even know how long an American commander will be leading these troops, but we do know that they will be part of an international army, and that a dozen other governments will be exercising control over them. After the shameless way in which other nations have failed us in the Korean crisis, where the blood of our American youth by the thousands is being spilled, we shall betray our trust and be remiss in our duty to our country if we fail to retain the authority for the disposition of our troops in the Congress, where by constitutional mandate the power to declare war rests.

Oh, I know there have been cited 134 examples of the use of such power on the part of the Chief Executive since the founding of this Nation. But have you examined these citations.

They include the following:

One. The dispatch of five marines to Cuba to bury one of their comrades who died of fever.

Two. Six sailors from the battleship *Tennessee* who were sent to Paris to guard our exhibit in the Paris exhibition.

Three. Admiral Perry had an honor guard of 300 bluejackets when he went to China.

There were many others in that list of 134 citations which were of no greater significance. I submit to you there is a vast difference between such examples of the exercise of authority on the part of an executive, and a police action in Korea where casualties have reached approximately 60,000, and where we now have 200,000 troops committed to battle.

The issue before us today is not confined only to the deployment of troops; it involves the issue of peace and war. If we agree to permit the present encumbent of the White House to exercise his will in the use of our troops, we shall have abdicated the authority to declare war as vested in this body by the Constitution of the United States. If you do not believe this, look at what has happened in Korea. Are we at war there? Did the Congress declare that war?

Every day the postman brings letters asking us the question, "When are we going to bring our boys home from Korea?" and a Congressman must admit he does not know. The best he can say is, I did not send our boys to Korea. This is the President's war, and we are expected to keep hands off. The President did not consult the Congress before he entered into war in Korea, and we shall be violating the trust imposed upon us by the Constitution should we permit the Chief Executive to continue to send our troops to any part of the world without our consent. If we here decide upon this course of action, we place in the hands of the President the power to make war in any theater of the globe, and we abdicate the authority plainly vested in us by the Constitution.

We stand today on the threshold of new action. Where will that action lead us? Speaking for myself, I want the authority to make war to remain in the control of the Congress. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to embrace any other course, for I still have the haunting memories of what happened in June 1950, when our troops were ordered to Korea without the approval of the Congress. That step has led us into a situation fraught with the gravest danger. No one dares predict what the outcome will be. I do not want a repetition of episodes of that nature.

There are no precedents in our history for such action on the part of our Chief Executive. There is a vast difference between the dispatch of 90 marines to Nicaragua and 200,000 troops to Korea. To say there are 134 previous examples of this latter action is to laugh, were there not such grave implications connected with it.

In this situation I speak only for myself and with the future welfare of my country at heart. My convictions, nevertheless, are strong. The Congress has already abdicated too much of its authority, in my opinion. Let us hold the line at this point and prove that this body still possesses the virility which our founding fathers expected of us when they entrusted us with the defense of our country and the power to make war should necessity impose that burden upon us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

(Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, having lived fairly actively with this question for the last 6 or 8 months I cannot say all I would like to say in this short time. Suffice it to state, however, that I am here in support of this resolution in spite of the fact I think it is unnecessarily limited in scope. For my part I should like a general resolution clearly defining the limitations upon the power of the President to send troops abroad without the consent of Congress and not limited to the Atlantic Pact.

Briefly, there is no precedent in the books to justify the position taken by this President as to his unlimited power. His position is unique and wholly without precedent. Even such strong Presidents as Jackson, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt did not go as far as that and none of them were sissies in dealing with the Congress or construing their power as the constitutional Commander in Chief or as President.

Let me quote the gentleman who preceded the present incumbent in the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1940 telegraphing the President of the dying French Government in answer to a request from the French for military support, Franklin D. Roosevelt at the close of his message of utmost sympathy stated:

> These statements carry no implication of military commitment. Only Congress can make such commitments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope we can adopt this amendment and start limiting the President's claimed power.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, the language of this amendment is not, in my opinion, satisfactory, but I am wholeheartedly in support of the idea of some degree of congressional responsibility over the sending of American troops to Europe. We are now engaged under article III in building up strength among the members of the North Atlantic Treaty powers. At the most at the end of this year they are going to have less than 18 divisions under arms according to their present plans—not nearly enough to suppress any aggression by the Russians. The United States is going to have, according to the President, six divisions in Europe. We are going to be providing most of the equipment for these North Atlantic Pact nations. We are going to be providing most of the air and naval units. I think if the Congress can get some control over the program we may get some order out of this and if we make our aid proportionate to the efforts of the Europeans we will make far greater progress than we now are. If we proceed under the present plans and the Europeans go ahead as slowly as they are now going, it will be 1953 or 1954 before we have the 60 or 70 divisions that are considered necessary and essential to deter the Russians from attacking. If we can get some degree of control over this program, if we can make our aid proportionate to the efforts of the Europeans, we can force them to make greater sacrifices and perhaps by the end of 1952 we will have sufficient divisions in Europe to deter the Russians from attacking, and if they should attack to prevent their sweeping over western Europe. I think the Congress should have some responsibility over this. I think this is a most serious problem, and I think the Congress should exert some control; otherwise, it will be 1953 and the job will not be done and western Europe will be vulnerable to attacks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any of this short time of 5 minutes to go into the constitutional question as to the rights of the President. We all know what the Constitution says as to his power as Commander in Chief of the Army.

But I want to say this, and I want everybody to understand it, and I want to show you the fallacy of this amendment. To whom does it apply. It applies to inductees under this bill. It applies to the boys that will be drafted under this bill; there is no dispute about that. It says that any boy that is drafted under this bill cannot be sent to Europe unless Congress passes a concurrent resolution. Now, just think what an absurd situation we will find ourselves in. It permits the President to send 20 National Guard divisions over to Europe. It permits the President to send 800,000 reservists that are called back to active duty over to Europe. It permits the President to send every volunteer in the Army, or who comes into the Army, over to Europe. Now, is that not an absurd situation for this great body of the Congress of the United States to find itself in? It says that a handful of drafted men cannot be sent overseas until Congress passes a resolution, but as to the great bulk of the National Guard, the reservists and the volunteers, the President has the authority to send them over. That is how absurd you are in this position.

As I said, when the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] presented this amendment, the straight and the forward way to deal with it is to take up the resolution sent here by the Senate. This is a miiltary question as to who goes to Europe.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Acheson.

Mr. VINSON. No; it is not Acheson either. It is a military question; and yet the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said that a military question should be decided by military men and not by civilians. Of course, he just meets himself coming back right there and that is the trouble with this kind of argument that is being made here today. You are just arguing in circles. I want to say to you, do not do anything that is ridiculous. We say in this bill that the man that is drafted cannot go to Europe, the President cannot send him, but he has the right to send all the volunteers, all the reservists, and all the National Guard units, and that we impose no objection to the President doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TOWE) there were—ayes 129, noes 138.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TOWE and Mr. KILDAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 168, noes 192.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, under the measure now before the House, for the first time in our history American men will be conscripted to fight an undeclared war, be ordered into battle, under a commanding officer who receives his orders and directives, not from the Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces, but from an organization made up of the representatives of foreign nations, at least one of whom represents our enemy—is a member of the organization carrying on the war.

Our men will go forward into battle, not under the Stars and Stripes, but under the flag of the United Nations, which will be put over all flags flying at the headquarters of the supreme commander.

For the first time in our history, American youth—enlisted and conscripted—are to become mercenary soldiers, paid not by those for whom they are fighting, but by our own people, who in the opinion of many of us have no stake in this war.

General MacArthur, the implacable foe of the Communists seeking foothold in Japan; who has done so much to establish peace there, cement our friendship with the Japanese people and who wanted from the President a definite answer as to our objectives in the Far East, has been fired.

Because of his intense Americanism, his refusal to be gagged, he joins Billy Mitchell, Admiral Denfeld, and Captain Crommelin, who were removed because they failed to accept the views of politically minded superiors; insisted upon giving expression to their opinions as to the manner in which the safety of the Republic could best be guarded.

General MacArthur has failed to obtain the answer which so many men serving in Korea, so many wives and mothers here at home, have been seeking from their representatives in Congress.

The President has chosen to refuse to follow the advice of General MacArthur, whom last night he characterized in the following words:

> General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established.

The President evidently prefers the policy of an Acheson, who followed the Hiss line and who, in the opinion of many, is overly sympathetic toward the Communists; is too intent on protecting British, rather than American, interests.

The firing of MacArthur will detract from, rather than lend support to, the conscripting of American youth to fight under a supreme commander who receives his orders from the United Nations; over whose headquarters there flies—not the Stars and Stripes—but the flag of United Nations.

Discussion of the bill now before us will be made tomorrow if time can be obtained.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 13, 1951
For actions of Apr. 12, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 66

CONTENTS

Accounting.....28
Auditing.....28
Buildings and grounds.12,15
Claims.....17
Dispersal.....12,15
Electrification.....26
Farm organization.....7
Farm program.....23
Flood damage.....20
Foreign affairs, aid.3,9,24
Grain.....3,24
Health.....13,21
Inflation.....4
Labor, farm.....11
Lands.....6
Loans.....17,19
Military training.....1
Nominations.....8
Organization, executive.13
Peanuts.....27
Personnel.....13,22
Prices, parity.....4
Prices, support.....14
Purchasing.....28
R.F.C.....5
Research.....6
Surveys.....18
Trade, foreign.....2,10
Transportation.....13,26
Water pollution.....25
Water utilization.....16
Weather.....16

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Aiken discussed inflation controls and opposed "freezing" of parity for farm commodities. House committee reported export-control bill. Rep. Dawson introduced bills to carry out Hoover Commission recommendations, including USDA reorganization. House debated military-training bill. President approved peanut bill.

## HOUSE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Continued debate on S. 1, the military training and service bill. Rejected, 140-232, the Barden amendment which would continue the draft with no provision for universal military training. (pp. 3860-902.)

2. EXPORT CONTROL. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 197, to continue export-control authority through June 30, 1953 (H. Rept. 318)(p. 3913).

3. INDIA AID. Rep. Heller, N. Y., spoke in favor of shipment of wheat to India (p. 3907).

## SENATE

4. INFLATION CONTROLS. Sen. Aiken discussed means of controlling inflation, recommending stricter credit controls, reduction in nonessential Government expenditures, increased taxes, and encouragement of investment by individuals in Government bonds. Sen. Aiken also opposed the "freezing of parity for farm commodities," and said that farmers "are afraid to plant this spring for fear that the price will be rolled back on them when the crop is ready to sell." (pp. 3842-4)

5. R.F.C. Began debate on S. Res. 76, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, regarding RFC (pp. 3819-20, 3830-5, 3839-40, 3844-51).

6. RESEARCH LANDS. Sen. Morse moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed S. 271, which authorizes the transfer of a tract of land used for research in horse breeding to the Vermont Agricultural College, for agricultural purposes (p. 3819).

7. FARM ORGANIZATION. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted a Washington Daily News article

claiming that President Truman snubbed Allan B. Kline, president of the Farm Bureau, by not appointing him to the Mobilization Policy Advisory Board (p. 3852).

8. NOMINATIONS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported favorably the nomination of Richard D. Searles to be Under Secretary of Interior, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported favorably the nomination of Delos W. Rentzel to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation (p. 3853).
Confirmed the nomination of John L. Rogers to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner (p. 3854).

9. INDIA AID. Sen. Wiley inserted a Business and Professional Women's Club (River Falls, Wis.) resolution favoring the shipment of grain to India (p. 3815).

10. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Holland submitted an amendment he intends to propose to H. R. 1612, to extend the Trade Agreements Act (pp. 3816-7).

11. FARM LABOR. S. 984 as reported (see Digest 65), amends the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Labor Department to recruit farm workers from Mexico to relieve the farm labor shortage in the U. S. The farmers would be required to reimburse the U. S. up to $20 per worker for expenses for transportation and subsistence of such workers and could arrange for such employment through associations or groups. The bill also provides that its provisions shall not be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment.

12. BUILDINGS DISPERSAL. S. 218 as reported (see Digest 65), authorizes GSA to construct 4 buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of D. C., for the accomodation of Government activities. Three of the buildings would be on sites to be acquired, and 1 on part of the site of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., and each would be designed to accomodate 5,000 employees. Directs GSA to demolish temporary buildings built in D. C. prior to and during War II as soon as space can be provided elsewhere. Authorizes GSA to assign and reassign space to executive agencies in and outside of D. C., and to provide for the transfer of not less than 25,000 positions from D. C. and its immediate vicinity. All executive agencies are directed to cooperate with GSA in carrying out the project. Authorizes appropriation of $107,000,000 to carry out the provisions regarding the construction and demolition of buildings. And provides for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Dispersal, Demolition, and Decentralization composed of ten members, 5 from the S. Public Works Committee and 5 from the House Public Works Committee.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

13. REORGANIZATION. Rep. Dawson, Ill., introduced the following bills to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission: (The bills were referred to the Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee unless otherwise indicated.)
H. R. 3684, reorganization of the Department of Agriculture; to Agriculture Committee (p. 3914).
H. R. 3674, to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch. (p. 3913).
H. R. 3675, separation of subsidy from air-mail pay; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 3913).
H. R. 3676, to place in GSA various activities in D. C. (p. 3913).
H. R. 3677, creating a Veterans' Insurance Corporation; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 3913).

signed, among other things, to preserve the right of those who surrender their policy for cash to continue their insurance upon separation from service and to be eligible for full indemnity benefits while in service.

Rights under existing 5-year level-premium term insurance policies of reinstatement, conversion, or renewal are likewise not impaired by the provisions of the bill. However, in certain instances, the 5-year-term period will expire while insureds are in the active service and under conditions which would make it difficult or impossible for them to reinstate, renew, or convert their insurance prior to the expiration of the term. In order to preserve the rights of policyholders in such cases who have not applied for waiver of premiums authorized under section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, provision is made that any person in the active service having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan, the term of which expires while such person is in active service after the date of its enactment, shall, upon application made within 120 days after separation from service, payment of premium and evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age.

Section 6 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of part I. He presently has such authority under the National Service Life Insurance Act with reference to the amendments of that act proposed under part II of the bill.

Section 7 authorizes appropriations for the payment of liabilities under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

Section 8 provides that any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion, or who, because of conscientious objections, refuses to perform service in the land or naval forces of the United States, shall forfeit all rights to an indemnity under the act; also, that no benefit shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States. However, the section contains a proviso which makes it clear that restoration to active duty after commission of any such offense shall restore all rights to an indemnity.

Section 9 makes applicable to part I the provisions of Public Laws 262 and 844 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, and section 15, Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, which, among other things, would exempt the indemnity from taxation and claims of creditors; provide for the payment of benefits to minors and incompetents, with or without guardians; regulate the recognition and fees of attorneys and agents; and provide penalties for fraud. Provision is also made in this section that all or any part of the beneficiary's interest may be assigned to any person in the permitted classes when all other such persons having contingent rights of equal or greater priority join in the assignment.

*Part II—Insurance Act of 1951*

Section 10 adds four new sections, sections 619, 620, 621, and 622, to the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 619 limits the issuance of United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance to any person after its enactment except as provided in sections 5 and 10 of the bill. In addition, it is provided that the Government, after the end of the second calendar month following the date of enactment, shall no longer pay the premiums on any policies under the acts specified in this section. It was felt desirable that a specific provision be made that no further premiums on insurance be paid by the Government, inasmuch as all persons within the purview of these acts will be covered by the automatic free indemnity. They will, of course, have the privilege of continuing such insurance by the payment of premiums, if they desire.

Section 620 provides for the issuance of insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of so-called "H" insurance (health insurance) to those men who, by reason of service-connected disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, would be uninsurable according to standards established by the Administrator. It is further provided in this section that application for such insurance must be made within one year from the date the service connection is determined to exist by the Veterans' Administration. This, it will be seen, is a very liberal provision for any service-connected disabled veteran to obtain insurance. The insurance issued, in accordance with prevailing practice, would be of a nonparticipating character. In addition, those individuals who are disabled on their way to report for induction or for active military duty will be entitled to the same sort of insurance. The authorization for a new table of mortality will result in substantially lower premium rates, thus providing additional benefits to disabled veterans concerned.

Section 621 provides the basis for new post-service insurance for which veterans in the future will be eligible to apply within 120 days from their discharge from service. As previously indicated, this insurance will be of a nonparticipating type and the premiums will be based on the Commissioners' 1941 Standard Table of Mortality, with interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum. Annuity settlements will be calculated on the annuity table for 1949, described in the November 1949 issue of Transactions, publication of the Society of Actuaries. It is prepared by William A. Jenkins and Edward A. Lew, both of whom are actuaries of recognized standing in the insurance field. (This article is reproduced on pages 2045 to 2109 in the hearings of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on related bills in the Eighty-first Congress.) Premiums and other collections shall be credited directly to a revolving fund in the Treasury with a provision for such appropriations as may be necessary. A comparison of the premium rates under such insurance with the rates for existing 5-year level term national service life insurance follows:

*Monthly premium rate per $1,000 based on Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table at 2¼ percent, listing national service life insurance, and U. S. Government life insurance*

5-YEAR LEVEL PREMIUM TERM PLAN

| Age at issue | Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table | National service life insurance (World War II) | U. S. Government life (World War I) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | $0.20 | $0.64 | $0.64 |
| 19 | .21 | .65 | .64 |
| 20 | .21 | .65 | .65 |
| 21 | .22 | .65 | .65 |
| 22 | .23 | .66 | .66 |
| 23 | .24 | .66 | .66 |
| 24 | .25 | .67 | .67 |
| 25 | .26 | .67 | .67 |
| 26 | .27 | .68 | .68 |
| 27 | .28 | .69 | .68 |
| 28 | .29 | .69 | .69 |
| 29 | .31 | .70 | .70 |
| 30 | .32 | .71 | .71 |
| 31 | .34 | .72 | .72 |
| 32 | .36 | .73 | .73 |
| 33 | .38 | .74 | .74 |
| 34 | .40 | .75 | .75 |
| 35 | .43 | .76 | .76 |
| 36 | .45 | .77 | .77 |
| 37 | .48 | .79 | .79 |
| 38 | .51 | .81 | .80 |

*Monthly premium rate per $1,000 based on Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table at 2¼ percent, listing national service life insurance, and U. S. Government life insurance*—Continued

| Age at issue | Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table | National service life insurance (World War II) | U. S. Government life (World War I) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 39 | $0.54 | $0.83 | $0.82 |
| 40 | .58 | .85 | .84 |
| 41 | .62 | .87 | .87 |
| 42 | .67 | .89 | .89 |
| 43 | .71 | .92 | .92 |
| 44 | .76 | .95 | .95 |
| 45 | .82 | .99 | .99 |
| 46 | .88 | 1.03 | 1.03 |
| 47 | .95 | 1.08 | 1.08 |
| 48 | 1.02 | 1.14 | 1.14 |
| 49 | 1.10 | 1.20 | 1.20 |
| 50 | 1.19 | 1.27 | 1.27 |
| 51 | 1.28 | 1.35 | 1.35 |
| 52 | 1.38 | 1.44 | 1.43 |
| 53 | 1.49 | 1.54 | 1.53 |
| 54 | 1.61 | 1.65 | 1.64 |
| 55 | 1.75 | 1.77 | 1.76 |
| 56 | 1.89 | 1.90 | 1.89 |
| 57 | 2.04 | 2.05 | 2.04 |
| 58 | 2.21 | 2.21 | 2.21 |
| 59 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 2.39 |
| 60 | 2.60 | 2.60 | 2.59 |
| 61 | 2.82 | 2.82 | 2.81 |
| 62 | 3.05 | 3.07 | 3.06 |
| 63 | 3.31 | 3.34 | 3.33 |
| 64 | 3.59 | 3.64 | 3.63 |
| 65 | 3.90 | 3.97 | 3.96 |
| 66 | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.33 |
| 67 | 4.59 | 4.74 | 4.73 |
| 68 | 4.98 | 5.18 | 5.17 |
| 69 | 5.41 | 5.66 | 5.64 |
| 70 | 5.87 | 6.18 | 6.16 |

Section 11 incorporates the amendment offered by Senator Aiken of Vermont on the floor of the Senate which provides coverage for a limited group of World War II cases not eligible for benefits under section 602 (m) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, because of the forfeiture provisions contained in section 612 of said act, where the serviceman had authorized in writing a deduction from his pay for national service life insurance, and was subsequently court-martialed, thus forfeiting his rights to insurance. In certain cases, persons who deserted were later restored to active duty and killed in action believing that their insurance was in force. It is believed that restoration to active service should include restoration of rights to insurance. This provision is in line with section 8 of H. R. 1 and the managers are convinced that this is an equitable provision and therefore agreed to include it.

Section 12 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to cancel or restrict in any way any rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of its enactment. The committee has been advised that in the absence of this specific provision the language of the bill would not preclude renewal of term insurance if otherwise authorized, or future reinstatement or conversion of policies which have lapsed before or after the enactment of the bill. Should the question arise as a result of improper interpretation by any Government agency, it is the opinion of the committee that the courts would sustain the position that contract rights cannot be affected by subsequent legislation. In any event, section 11 will remove any doubt as to such matters.

Section 13 states that part II may be cited as the "Insurance Act of 1951."

J. E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
CARL ELLIOTT,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Engle | Moulder |
| Armstrong | Gillette | Murdock |
| Bolling | Goodwin | Murray, Wis. |
| Boykin | Hart | O'Konski |
| Brehm | Havenner | Ostertag |
| Brooks | Hébert | Patman |
| Buchanan | Holifield | Rivers |
| Celler | Jones, Hamilton C. | Scott, Hardie |
| Crosser | King | Sieminski |
| Dawson | Miller, N. Y. | Tollefson |
| Dingell | | Woodruff |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 398 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNITED STATES v. E. A. RUMELY

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on April 13, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against E. A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* E. A. RUMELY, No. 1789–50

To Representative JOSEPH O'HARA, *House Office Building:*

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at District of Columbia in the city of Washington on the 13th day of April 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *Rumely.*

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By OSCAR ALTSHULER,
*Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 192) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 10 a. m. on the 13th day of April 1951 in the case of the *United States* v. *E. A. Rumely*, Criminal Docket No. 1789–50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *E. A. Rumely* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Are there any amendments to the Barden amendment?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 21, line 4, after the word "hereunder", strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the remaining language in the section.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make this statement for the information of the committee. I understand there are five or six very important amendments to the Barden substitute at the Clerk's desk. I hope after free debate we may be able to dispose of those amendments and dispose of the Barden bill today. If Members will remain in the Chamber, I feel confident that we can accomplish that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the information of the committee, I might add that after this bill is disposed of, there is no further legislative business for the rest of the week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if it is not to be taken out of the gentleman's time—in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, I am especially susceptible to that—I do not know what you would call it—I will not say it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just a friendly observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But listen, we had 4 days of debate last week on this bill, and most of this week. As I stated yesterday, there were at least some 375 of us here who wanted to say something about this.

I want to ask the majority leader and the chairman of the committee, are we going to adjourn and go home or go fishing and be deprived of an opportunity to speak?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will permit, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that there will be no disposition on the part of the committee to insist that anybody be denied an opportunity to freely express his views or to offer any amendment he wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say, those who want to stay here and talk will be given that privilege, and those who want to go home may do so?

Mr. VINSON. I am hoping we can always have a large attendance so that Members can have a good audience to address.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that much of my time has already been used, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I am proposing this amendment to the substitute as I had intended to offer it as an amendment to the original bill, on page 53, line 19. Briefly, my amendment would strike from the substitute the language on page 21, beginning with the proviso which would reinstate the policy of segregation in the Armed Forces. My remarks will, in substance, give to the House the policy of the armed services, the Defense Establishment, in regard to this measure.

I believe the majority of the Members of this House, in the interest of national security and of morale in the services, will support my amendment. At the beginning of my remarks I want to give the committee the position of the Defense Establishment on this matter.

The adoption of a provision giving men the right to choose whether they wish to serve in segregated units and making it mandatory on the Armed Forces to carry out that choice, except where military necessity forbids, would interfere substantially with the efficient fulfillment by the services of their military missions.

I would like the House to know that that is not only my personal opinion, but that it is the opinion of the leaders of the Defense Establishment.

The following aruments that I will use are also those proposed by the Defense Establishment.

There are no segregated units in the Navy or Air Force and it would necessitate a major reorganization of both of these services to provide opportunities for segregation in training or in subsequent service assignment. Both services would be severely limited in their freedom to assign personnel wher e they could be used most effectively if such a requirement were written into law.

In the Army there are no segregated training divisions to which men could be sent. Outside the training divisions, where segregated Army units do exist, the proposed amendment would take control over assignment away from the Army and give it to the individual.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the committee as to the method of writing this provision as it was submitted by the committee? How is it that you can determine what the word "race" means? There are five races. What puts a person into a particular race? Is it your grandfather, your great-grandfather, who is the controlling factor? How far back does it go? I believe the gentleman is correct in his position and I favor the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PRICE. That is one of the great difficulties involved in the language as it now exists in the bill and as it is also found in the substitute. That is one reason the services are disturbed, and others are also disturbed.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman on his points.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Commanding officers would not be able to assign men where they were needed most but would be compelled to send them to segregated units unless they could find some imperative military reason for doing otherwise. Every assignment made contrary to a man's expressed wish would open up the prospect of disaffection, increased racial tension, appeals to higher authority, and lawsuits.

Special difficulties would attend the assignment of men possessing critically needed skills. These assignments must be made on the basis of qualifications, rather than color. Failure to follow this practice would complicate the operating problems of military units.

Difficulties could also arise from the necessity for respecting the desire of men from relatively small racial groups to be in segregated units of their own. It would be hard to concentrate Malayans or Mongolians, for example, in special groups if they expressed a wish for such treatment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. The bill uses the broad term "race." Let us be perfectly frank with each other and with everybody here; is not this primarily aimed at the colored race?

Mr. PRICE. Of course it is; we all know that; certainly.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The language which the gentleman read or by which he seeks to amend the substitute offered by me is the exact language which the Members incorporated in the draft provisions of the Vinson bill, S. 1.

Mr. PRICE. That is absolutely correct. I had intended to offer my amendment to the Vinson bill, but the substitute is now before the House and just for protection I am also offering it to the substitute.

Mr. BARDEN. I am glad the gentleman from Illinois has such strong suspicion that my substitute is going to be adopted.

Mr. PRICE. Anything may happen when the Members have the right to vote as they choose in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the net effect of the proposed amendment would be to impair the flexibility of military assignment, with consequent great loss in the operating efficiency of the armed services.

The Armed Forces of the United States have in the past 5 years made progress away from racial segregation. No incidents of any kind have occurred to warrant a reversal of this trend. On the other hand, whenever the policy of nonsegregation in the different branches of service, the morale and efficiency of the troops have been improved.

We cannot afford such a backward step as the provision now in the bill would force the services to take. That is the reason for my amendment to strike these prosegregation features from the bill.

It was only a short time ago that we spent billions of dollars and sacrificed some of our finest citizens to destroy an arrogant dictatorship based on theories of racial superiority. Now we are fighting a new kind of war against an enemy whose chief stock in trade is a willingness to use all people, without regard to race or station, as long as they are willing to aid in establishing a world dictatorship.

The enemy we fight does not ignore the tremendous potential strength of Asia and Africa. We are not fighting in Korea for a strip of earth or a handful of trading rights. We are fighting there because we are determined that the people of the world shall be free from exploitation and all of the ugly forms of political oppression that go hand in hand with dictatorships.

Nowhere in the world is there another country that can produce more arms or braver soldiers than the United States. Our one weakness in Korea is the constant barrage of propaganda which points to the mistreatment of minority groups in the United States. This propaganda is not only used in Korea, but it is used by our enemies wherever they think it may stir up distrust and hate against us.

Therefore, from a very practical standpoint the language in the substitute and in the bill, which proposes that we continue and extend segregation of the races in the Armed Forces provides a terrible new weapon for our enemies. It is the kind of thing that forms the small core of truth for a tremendous and distorted lie.

But we in the United States have another reason for being against this amendment. Every war that we have fought has been based on our desire to win and hold democracy. In every war we have called on all of our citizens without regard to race. White men and black men have died in the uniform of our country whenever we have called our sons to battle. Now is the time to treat all of them alike. Now is the time to keep faith with the men who died in 1917. Now is the time to salute the white and black men who mingled their blood in the defense of Pearl Harbor. We must not write requirements of segregation into the law governing our Armed Forces.

The Air Force and the Navy have made good progress in eliminating racial segregation. During World War II there were many persons who were reluctant to use colored men as pilots. Now this attitude has changed and the Air Force has done an excellent job in making full use of all citizens on a democratic basis.

The Air Force Times of February 10, 1951, reports that 95 percent of all colored people serving in the Air Force are now working in mixed units. The colored members of the Air Force work with every type of outfit from squadrons on up. They constitute about 6 percent of the total Air Force strength. These men have acquitted themselves well in battle.

Not only have the colored men who are in the Air Force done well, but I call your attention to the front page of the Washington Post of March 31, 1951. That front page carried the pictures of three American heroes of the fighting in Korea. They were Lieutenant Hudner, Ensign Brown, and Corporal Red Cloud. Lieutenant Hudner is white. Ensign Brown was colored. Corporal Red Cloud was an Indian. Last Tuesday I inserted into the RECORD the story of the heroism of these men.

I mention, particularly, Ensign Brown and Corporal Red Cloud because, under the terms of the Winstead amendment, they could be forced into segregated units for colored people and Indians.

Ensign Brown came from Hattiesburg, Miss. He was the first of the Navy's colored aviators and the first of them to lose his life in combat. At the time of his death he was flying close support for Marines fighting near the Chaugjin Reservoir when his plane was hit by Chinese ack-ack fire and crashed.

Lieutenant Hudner, who was flying close support also, immediately maneuvered his plane to protect Ensign Brown from enemy troops. In other words, he risked his life to save the injured flier who was trapped alive in the burning wreckage. He also packed the fuselage with snow, using his bare hands to keep flames away from Ensign Brown, and struggled to free him. For this heroism, Lieutenant Hudner will justly receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. This is the American way in which our men should fight. We must not do anything that would substitute for this wonderful demonstration of democratic action a racist philosophy which denies men the right to be judged on the basis of ability rather than the color of skin.

Corp. Red Cloud was killed near Chongyon in North Korea while serving with the Twenty-fourth Division. He was badly hit by a burst of enemy fire but wrapped his arm around a tree to keep from falling and continued to fire an automatic rifle until he fell mortally wounded. This heroic act stopped the enemy from overrunning his company's position and gained time for reorganization and evacuation of the wounded.

Tuesday I inserted an article from the Pittsburgh Courier which tells of the heroism of Pfc Aaron Jones, a 21-year-old native of Memphis, Tenn. The story states that—

> The outstanding feature of Jones' action was the fact that he is a Browning automatic rifleman, but used unfamiliar weapons such as hand grenades, a captured rifle, and an abandoned machine gun to wreak havoc upon the enemy.
>
> The only Negro in his nine-man squad, Jones and his comrades were part of a force assigned to take a hill on which the Chinese Red troops were dug in. Just as the signal for the charge came, his gun jammed. Not wanting to be left out of the excitement, he grabbed up some hand grenades and closed in with the rest of the outfit. Halfway up the slope the hand grenades came in handy. A burp gun, firing from above, pinned down the American attackers. Jones, with complete disregard for his life, jumped to his feet and hurled a grenade up the hill. There was an explosion, then silence, and the attack again rolled forward.
>
> Reaching the top, the American troops locked in hand-to-hand struggle with the enemy, Jones grabbed up a rifle, a Japanese single-shot rifle, with no bullets and scurried around quickly to pick up some ammunition. When he had gotten some, he downed two of the enemy as they were running. The following day in another hill attack he spotted a Red force advancing up the other side of the slope. The regular machine gunners were eating at the time, so he took over one of the spray guns and downed 11 of the advancing enemy on the first burst.

I ask the Members to note, particularly, that Jones was the only colored man in a nine-man squad. If the Winstead amendment had been in effect, it is quite likely that Jones would not have been serving with that squad.

I wish to cite also from the Washington Star of January 25, 1951, a story concerning Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn, Jr., of Memphis, Tenn., who single-handedly wiped out a machine-gun crew threatening his unit. I quote some of the paragraphs from this story:

> In awarding him the Nation's second highest military award, Far East Command Headquarters said that Cleaborn's unit, Company A, Thirty-fourth Infantry Regiment, attacked a ridge where the enemy was occupying positions with excellent observation and fields of fire. Some of the enemy had infiltrated and flanking action had occurred and his platoon was pinned down almost immediately by machine-gun fire from the rear.
>
> Despiite the extreme hazard of interlacing machine-gun fire Cleaborn gained the ridge and killed the machine-gun crews to the front. From the continuous firing of his weapons' Cleaborn's hands were severely burned. Disregarding his burned hands, when his platoon began a withdrawal he remained on the ridge to cover withdrawal of his comrades and to permit evacuation of the wounded. He continued firing from this position, thus denying the enemy access to adjacent high ground.
>
> While furnishing protective fire, Private Cleaborn was mortally wounded. His heroic self-sacrifice permitted the withdrawal of his platoon to new positions.

Private Cleaborn was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for giving his life to save his platoon.

We cannot breathe life into the bodies of these men who are now dead, but we can keep alive the ideal for which they were fighting. That ideal is a democratic United States in which every citizen has the right to serve his country in time of need; in which every citizen has the right to serve his country as a man and not as a subhuman who must be segregated and set apart from his fellows.

The fine awards that have been made to these men will mean little if the Congress of the United States places beside these emblems of heroism a badge of inferiority on the breasts of colored troops.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is to strike out a provision of the bill which I offered as an amendment in the committee. I hope the House will listen to me on this question.

I regretted that it was necessary to offer such an amendment. We have fought all wars in the past with almost total segregation in the armed services. I think the military leaders should work this involved problem out according to the best interest of the service, which is exactly what my amendment does. It does not require that anyone even state a preference when he registers. It merely gives to each individual, regardless of who he is, a right to express himself when he registers as to whether or not he prefers segregation. It gives to the colored as well as the white, the Negro, or any other race of people, the same right and privilege. There is nothing demanding of the military that they carry out his wish if to do so would impair the operations of the service. We ask the military to give consideration to his desires and to use a little common sense in working out this very involved and complicated problem.

Let us see why an amendment such as this, or a provision like this, is absolutely necessary at the present time. I wonder how many Members of this Congress have read a book put out by the Committee for Equal Opportunity in the Armed Services, made public on May 22, 1950? As I said, during the last war there was hardly any integration in the armed services, and none of it forced. Today, in theory, there is no such thing as a segregated unit. In the Southern States our people, Negroes and whites, have lived together in peace and harmony and have made great progress in a peaceful way. I contend that the Negro is as much concerned about this as the whites.

Who would object to giving every American the right to express himself rather than have people, you, me, or anyone else, take the floor of this House year after year and tell the people what the Negro wants or what the white man wants? Let them speak for themselves. I think that is a fair proposition.

The President's Committee takes pride in overseeing every branch of the Armed Services and using the power of the draft backed up by the President's directive to force social changes which many do not want. It even has quotations and testimony from General Omar Bradley, from Secretary Royall, and from General Eisenhower and others. I would like to call your attention to what General Omar Bradley said.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that is the President's Committee and that the President himself has issued a directive eliminating segregation and so has the Secretary of Defense? How can the gentleman say that the Committee has contravened what is the policy of the armed services?

Mr. WINSTEAD. The President appointed this Committee and it might not be best to bring that up, for in my opinion the best interest of the service was not the motivating force behind the Committee's action and the resulting directive. I want to say to you that this racial problem has been played with in the North, South, East, and West until it is time to stop it. I am trying to take it out from under the President's Committee and put it in the hands of the military leaders where it belongs, who will be fair. May I say that I for one want to see the Negroes have equal opportunity. What did General Bradley and General Eisenhower say about their opportunity for equal treatment?

May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that this same Committee admits the Negro has not had the educational and training opportunity and that they cannot have equal opportunity for promotion if they are in mixed groups. Why not permit them to express a preference? Then let the military work out this problem, using common sense, and take it from these political committees that have done nothing but stir up racial hatred and racial prejudice in this country.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his fairness

and say that of all the Members of the House that I know from the south taking his position, that he is most sincere and fair in his statement, although I differ with him. May I ask this question? Where does the segregation of the unit end? Is it in the lowest ranks or does it go on up through the generals? Can a general or a colonel ask that he be segregated?

Mr. WINSTEAD. We will leave it to the individual to express himself. Of course in this bill we are dealing with draftees, which does not include officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. There is nothing compulsory on the part of the military. We are trying to give them an opportunity to use common sense and judgment to solve this involved and complicated problem. After they broke down segregation in the Military, the Navy, and the Air Force and Marine Corps, recruited largely through volunteer system, have only a small percentage of Negroes. They only took a handful of them. You could take probably 8 or 10 Negroes with 90 whites and work it out on a common sense basis. The Army had to resort to the draft and take a great majority of the Negroes, which gave a high percentage of Negroes in the Infantry. The Army raised the mental standards, not as a reflection on the Negro race, but with this political pressure stamped upon the necks of the military leaders, they were forced to break it down. They knew that around 30 to 40 percent of the Infantry in the Army would be composed of Negroes. They knew, furthermore, if they put them in the Infantry, 40 percent Negro and 60 percent white and forced them together under all conditions, that they would have race riots as they have had. The trouble has not yet been exposed; it is only in its infancy; yet there have been many serious difficulties which have been kept out of the press. I say if you put in the provision of lowering the mental standards to the 1945 level, you must put this provision in there to give the Military the right to use some common sense and judgment in connection with this problem. The Air Force served notice on the institutions of this country that they could not participate in any kind of a military-training program where they practiced segregation. Since this committee reported this provision, 21 to 12, a few weeks ago, they have rescinded that act. The fact that I got the committee to adopt my amendment has already had this beneficial result, and, if retained, it will result in permitting the armed services to exercise common sense with regard to other matters.

I am pleading with this House. I am not reflecting upon the Negro race. I say to you that I get along with them.

I say to you that unless you leave the provision in this bill that gives the military not these political powers, but the right to use common sense and judgment in this thing, 6 or 12 months from now may be too late to correct some things about it, you may legislate in a way to further create hatred where hatred does not exist today. Certainly we will not have all segregated units; we will have only a few under this provision, and over a period of time, with common sense and judgment, the military will solve this problem in a better manner than can these political committees. It is indeed an involved and a complicated and a serious problem that we might just as well face now as any other time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This merely gives the military the right to do what they have been doing in all the wars we have gone through; is that not correct?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes. And I say this is American; it is democratic. Do you want special favors or do you want equal opportunity? The Negro boy has the same right as the white boy. What else do you want? I ask you in all fairness, is it special consideration or is it equal opportunity, and that is what my provision offers, equal opportunity to all races.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman started to read a minute ago a statement by General Eisenhower and a statement by General Bradley. I hope he will not use all his time before he has an opportunity to read those.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The purpose of this amendment to the universal military training proposal has as its foundation a sincere belief that hereby a greater measure of consideration for the rights of the men inducted into military service might be accorded to all. It envisages a higher level of morale and efficiency, especially among those men who are not wholly pleased with the results of the present trends toward complete integration of all the units of the Armed Forces, regardless of race, color, and other classifications. Many persons are firmly convinced that the programs reputedly designed to grant equality to and to eliminate discrimination against various minority groups are, in reality, only political expedients and are not sincere.

The records of the committees that are appointed to study the problem of segregation in the military, educational, and other phases of our Nation's life have numerous statements by top leaders who do not favor the integration of all groups of our population at this time. They believe the present system of separating people according to differences in race and cultural background serves the best interests of all concerned and furthers the progress of each group. But the committee reports would have the American people believe that everyone supports the notion that segregation should be eliminated now. One such committee is the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces which reported to the President last year.

At the time the Executive order was issued establishing this committee, Gen. Omar Bradley, who was then Army Chief of Staff, told newsmen in a conference at Fort Knox that he "favored segregation of white and Negro units in the lower level of the Army." When General Bradley was called to testify before the committee he stated:

I would assume that your committee is not only interested in the welfare of our Negro minority but that you are primarily concerned with the need for full utilization of the skills, talents, and competence of all our men in order that the Army might be an efficient and representative protector of our Nation. * * *

Any system of handling manpower and any principles of organization must be based upon what will obtain best results in carrying out our mission, i. e., winning battles in case of war. We must not do anything that will jeopardize national security. * * *

There are several advantages to the Negro soldier in this arrangement. In the first place he is competing with men who have in general had the same opportunities as to education and development of leadership. * * * It is especially necessary that we give every gradient of our population which is transposed from civilian to Army life, an opportunity to accept responsibility, and learn the basic tenants (sic).

General Bradley continued:

Among the principal disadvantages, complete integration might very seriously affect voluntary enlistments, both Negro and white. Any system of selection within an organization based upon anything but free competition would be contrary to our American system. * * * In addition, such a system might seriously affect morale and thus affect battle efficiency. I consider that a unit has high morale when the men have confidence in themselves, confidence in their fellow-members of their unit, and confidence in their leaders. If we try to force integration on the Army before the country is ready to accept these customs, we may have difficulty attaining high morale along lines I have mentioned.

Major General Dahlquist, on the General Staff of the Army and who is from Minnesota, stated before this same committee that—

So long as we have separate units the competition for noncommissioned officer grades is restricted to that unit. Therefore, the very separation of these people into units has been the thing that has given the Negro far greater opportunity than I think any business or any profession in the United States can point to.

Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr. was commander of the Third Army and chairman of a board which had prepared a report in 1946 on the subject of utilization of Negro manpower in the postwar Army. Lieutenant General Gillem made a statement before this committee which was a summary of the findings of the Army board relative to composite groups on an unsegregated basis. He states that Negroes would have an adverse obstacle under those conditions, that they would have a better advantage in units composed of their own people.

Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, the Secretary of the Army at that time, stated that:

> Another factor to be considered * * * perhaps the most important, is the morale of the troops as a whole—their satisfaction with Army life, and the spirit with which they perform Army tasks. In war, when the chips are down, this morale factor may well be the difference between victory and defeat.
>
> We must remember that soldiers are not mere bodies that can be moved and handled as trucks and guns. They are individuals who came from civilian life and often return thereto. They are subject to all the emotions, prejudices, ideals, ambitions, and inhibitions that encumber our civil population throughout the country. * * * We must remember that in close personal relationships such as exist in an Army unit, that in civilian life voluntary segregation is the normal thing. And this is true even in those localities where no type of segregation is required by law.

Within these statements by top military leaders lies the crux of our proposal. The high morale, efficiency, and spirit of cooperation would materially be furthered if the men placed in the military service under this law would at least have the right to choose the unit with which they would serve.

In conclusion, I wish to say that national defense is too serious a matter to be used by social reformers in any way. They are entitled to their opinion. They have succeeded through the President's Commission in forcing through nonsegregation. They have behind them the force of the Federal Government. I do not believe it is right to force this upon those boys drafted into military service who do not wish such segregation, and yet my amendment would yield to military necessity—I do not wish to interfere with national defense but I believe it unwise to permit the other side to jeopardize national defense to forward their aims. I trust you will vote against the Price amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the fact that these are very serious hours for our Nation and the entire world, but we should all do our very best to keep our feet on the ground and our heads cool. I think we might be able to do that.

I believe we all agree that there is a necessity of extending the draft. I think we are all in full agreement on that. The only disagreement is as to whether the minimum age should be 18½ or 19 years. I definitely favor the 19-year-old limit instead of the 18½-year-old provision.

I am very strongly in favor of the Barden substitute. I want to address myself to just one point in regard to that, because my time is so limited that I cannot go into a number of other arguments I should like to use in favor of the Barden substitute.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], one of the proponents of the bill, in the course of his argument said in substance that basic training may change tomorrow, and he is eminently correct about that. Yes; it may change tomorrow. We are living in a great scientific age, as we all know. Consequently, if basic training may change tomorrow, and it not only may change tomorrow but it all probability it will change tomorrow, how much real good is going to be accomplished by training these men today as Reserves?

The purpose of the universal military-training feature of this bill is to establish a reserve of trained men; but if the basic training changes from day to day and the scientific developments change from day to day, how much real good will be accomplished by it?

We all recognize the fact that we must have a draft in an emergency; and that is the only thing we need, in my judgment. It would be at least somewhat useless and baseless to put this upon us since there could be no real accomplishment. The price we will be paying for UMT will be billions of dollars, over a period of years, and a departure from the traditions of this great Nation. That is the price we will pay. What will we get for that price? That is the question I ask. It seems to me the best reserves in the world we can possibly have are citizens, first, imbued with the principles of Christianity, democracy, and patriotism, second, sound and healthy in mind and body, and third, educated in the normal way. That is the reserve we need and that is the reserve we should always keep. Under our present program and as long as emergencies occur, of course we can take care of those emergencies by a draft. I point that out to you for your thinking and you can give such consideration to it as you may think it is worth.

Talking about present stirring events, I agree 100 percent with President Truman in the action he took relative to General MacArthur. I believe that the President by such action has very probably prevented an all-out war with Red China, as well as a third world war. For that and other reasons I agree with him 100 percent on that. But I disagree with him as to his right to send troops anywhere he may choose. I think such action is definitely up to the Congress. I will tell you why. In section 8 of article I of the Constitution it is provided that Congress shall have certain powers. One of those powers is to declare war and, if you will note this carefully, Mr. Chairman, in the same section of the same article, is this provision:

> Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense.

Now, how can the Congress provide for the common defense unless it has the right and full power to use the Armed Forces?

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] deplored the fact that politicians were attempting to run the war. Most of us agree with him that the politicians should have no part in the question of how the war should be fought. Many of us, however, believe that so-called politicians—some refer to them as statesmen, I refer to them as representatives of the people—should have something to say as to when and where a war is to be fought. Going along with the gentleman from Georgia, I agree that Secretary Acheson should not tell us when a war is to be fought, where it is to be fought, nor how long we are to continue in that war, nor should he name the objectives for which world war III or any war is to be fought. His sympathy for Britain, his concern over her interests, his friendship for and association with known Communists makes him an improper agent to act for America.

Time and again from the well of the House, I have asked someone here to tell me what it is that our men are fighting for, what is it that when they have obtained their objectives, the war will be over, we will have peace and they can come home and live their own lives in the American way.

So far, even though we have had almost 2 weeks of debate on this bill, I have not even a semblance of an answer to that question. I would like to have that answer. The men who are fighting are entitled to an answer, and so are their wives and mothers. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], the politicians have declared war, they are in control of this war, and they are not even American politicans, they are greedy, power-mad politicians of other countries.

Yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I wish someone would notify him, he is out in the hall, and I did not anticipate so early a recognition, made a short but remarkable speech [1] which you may read in foot-

---

[1] Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] during his remarks said that the people put more confidence in the Congress than in the President.

During the Civil War, reading the current history of those days, there were very few people who had confidence in President Lincoln. I remember history saying that General McClellan challenged the civil government and the President of the United States at that time. I remember history showing that President Lincoln visited the home of General McClellan in Washington. General McClellan was out attending a wedding, and the President and the Secretary of War waited for General McClellan to return to his residence. Some time later General McClellan did return, and his servant told him that President Lincoln and the Secretary of War were waiting to talk to him; and General McClellan went upstairs, passed the room in which Lincoln was seated; that a half hour later President Lincoln asked the servant if General McClellan was going to see him, and the servant told him that General McClellan had retired for the night; that Lincoln then left and went back to the White House.

I remember history telling that very few Members of Congress supported Lincoln in those days. Lincoln was crucified in those days, but Lincoln's Memorial now stands as a shrine, and properly so, to which hundreds of thousands of people make a pilgrimage each year, because Lincoln now is identified as the savior of the Union.

note 1. Among other statements he said:

I am going to vote on the side of strength for my country, for I am satisfied there is only one thing that the Communists respect and that is what they fear. And the only thing they fear is a strength and power greater than they possess.

Permit me to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts in his assumption as to the characteristics of the Communists' idea of fear. But what I do not understand, and which I would like to have him explain is how we can contribute to the Communists' fear of strength by giving them Formosa and by refusing to permit the four hundred-odd thousand Nationalist Chinese on Formosa to leave that island and fight the Communists on the mainland. Do we show fear or strength by that policy—which, according to last night's press is to be our policy. Are we not offering appeasement—which the gentleman has so often condemned? The gentleman's talk and the administration's policy which he supports do not seem to be consistent.

Another thing he said, "Three years ago I made a speech calling attention to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union operating on the ideology of communism, taking over country after country through internal subversion, the ultimate objective being the United States of America." A little less than 10 months ago Mr. Truman, not General MacArthur, at the request of UN, took us into this war. Then he tied the hands of the general who was directing the war. Last night he told us he wanted to confine that war to Korea. But today he is not only determined to send an additional 200,000 men to Europe. He is demanding that we conscript men who are under 19 years of age, who are denied the right to vote, to fight on foreign soil wherever United Nations may direct. I want none of it.

Again I ask, "How you do reconcile the views the gentleman from Massachusetts expressed against appeasement with the views of the United Nations, under whom we are fighting," when they announce that they are ready to call for peace; ready to give Formosa to Russia? I cannot see the consistency of those two positions.

Another thing the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said, and I quote: "We can have peace in the world very easily if we want to. There is nothing in the world to stop us from having peace. We do not have to appropriate 1 penny. We do not have to take one young man from his home. All we have to do is to get down on our knees to Stalin. The UN, Great Britain and France now propose just that. What the three are saying is this: "Quit fighting in Korea so British can keep Hongkong, give Formosa to the Reds, abandon Korea, take the Chinese Communists into the UN where they can by their vote support Russia. A silly futile course which would add strength to Stalin, and send an American Army to Europe in support of Socialist England.

"Get down on our knees to Stalin"—permit a repetition: We went into this war on the orders of President Truman at the request of the Security Council of the United Nations. That was the President's message. Some 9,000 of our men have died. To what purpose? Today they tell us that the United Nations is about to ask that we sue for peace; surrender to Stalin; let them have Formosa; keep the Nationalist Chinese from fighting the Communists. Take them into UN, get ready for a war in Europe and Northern Africa.

It has been said that this war is fought to contain communism. Do you believe it? Do you believe it when you have the record of our Secretary of State, who is the politician who has been determining our policy and who is sympathetic to the Communist views? Who has, whatever his intention, consistently followed a policy which has helped the Communists, not only in China, but here at home. You cannot have forgotten his friendship for—his help to Hiss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in view of the established custom, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make that request, Mr. Chairman, because this is a matter that is near my heart and has been on my mind for many months and because I feel I have a duty to my people. One point I want to enlarge on a little which I tried to express before—the thought that we are fighting to contain communism. We know better. The record of the State Department is to the contrary. Again if we are fighting the Communists would we not clean house here in Washington first. As J. Edgar Hoover said the other day, there are some 210 Communists right here in Washington. Why not start where we can get our hands on them? Why send men across the seas to clean up on the Communists when here in the Nation's capital they smell to high heaven. Let us at least try to be consistent. Those here in the State Department and in the administration when they are not corruptly chasing the dollar have been just playing palsy with the "commies."

They say we are fighting for the free nations. Where is there a free nation in this world. Britain, France, and the Netherlands still have their colonies, their exploited peoples. Even here in America are we free? We are being told, and more and more we will be told as the days go on, that we cannot buy this or we cannot buy that. We come under more and more regimentation all the time and that by incompetent or corrupt administrators. And what is the purpose of this bill?

The bill now pending before the House calls for the conscription into the armed services of the United States for a period of 26 months of every physically and mentally fit young American man—except those not otherwise deferred—as he reaches the age of 18 years and 6 months.

Another purpose of the bill is to require those so conscripted to remain in either the active or reserve service for an overall period of 6 years. After the expiration of the first 26 months in active service, either as trainees or combat troops, the surviving conscripted men would be returned to their homes, subject, however, to recall to active service, not as individuals but with their organizational units.

The testimony of Anna Rosenberg and General Marshall before the Armed Services Committee of the House in support of their original plan indicated their purpose was to draft the youth of America for a period of 26 months and to retain them, either in the active or reserve service, for an additional period of 6 years, or an over-all period of 8 years. The House Armed Services Committee refused to accept that program. The present bill is far less drastic.

The present bill rests upon the assumption, first, that war is inevitable and, second, that the welfare of our people, the security of the Republic, is dependent upon our entry into some form of a "one world" organization in which practically all economically powerful nations would be members.

Such an organization, known as United Nations, the announced desirable purpose of which is to establish and maintain peace throughout the world, and in which 59 nations are members, is now in existence.

The difficulty of either establishing or maintaining universal peace through the activities of United Nations is apparent

---

So I think a little reference to history pointedly answers the observation made by my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, in that respect. We see history made today of 435 Americans, each of us elected by the people of our congressional districts, with a direct responsibility imposed upon us in these trying days to do those things as Americans that will be for the best interest of our country, not only today but tomorrow. It is not what we like to do but what we should do. We should face the problems with courage. We should face the issues of the day with confidence and with courage, and we should do those things and cast those votes for issues that will be for the best interests of the United States of America without fear or without regard to personal consequences politically. I have to live with my conscience, and you have to live with yours, and all I can say is that so far as JOHN McCORMACK'S conscience is concerned, I am going to vote on the side of strength for my country. For I am satisfied that there is only one thing that the Communists respect, and that is what they fear, and the only thing they fear is a strength and power greater than they possess.

Three years ago I made a speech calling attention to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union operating under the ideology of international communism, taking over country after country through internal subversion, the ultimate objective being the United States of America. We can have peace in the world very easily if we want to; there is nothing in the world to stop us from having peace. We do not have to appropriate one penny, and we do not have to take one young man from his home. My two brothers and I left our home in World War I and enlisted as privates. We do not have to make any sacrifices. All we have to do is get down on our knees to Stalin. But what a life afterward? We can live if we want to become slaves, but we have to do those things that our judgment tells us we must do if we want to remain free men and free women.

when we realize that the United States of America and several other nations—in a very minor way—are now fighting a war, the purpose of which we have said is to contain communism, preserve free nations, and that in that war in the Far East, the Communists, led by Russia, are our opponents while they still sit in the United Nations.

The war in Korea is being fought under the flag and command of United Nations and in that organization sit the representatives of the United States and the representatives of Russia.

On the battlefields of Korea 90 percent of the fighting is by American forces—90 percent of the casualties are American men. One hundred percent of the men opposed to our forces are Communists, inspired to fight by Russia.

The real purpose of this bill is to conscript the young men of America; for the first time in the history of our country, for the first time in the history of any nation since the days of the feudal lords, men are being conscripted to fight—under the Stars and Stripes? Oh, no. Under the flag of an organization made up of individuals who are not Americans. Sometimes seeing, one can make himself understood. But first, what is this flag? It is the stars—48 of them—and the stripes—13 of them—the Star-Spangled Banner it has been named—and the pledge:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

And what are we doing? Denying surrendering our allegiance to that flag. Conscripting men to fight, not under the Stars and Stripes? But under a "rag"—the banner of as quarrelsome and impotent a group as a roof ever sheltered.

Let me show you another "rag" that I picked up in 1942, that they tried to get us into war under. The flag of the one-worlders, the United States of America, the Federated Union Streit; Owen J. Roberts, Ickes, and how many more with high ideals but not too much good sense.

See this flag. Stars? Yes. Stripes? Yes, but superimposed the symbol of Britain and of Russia. One world; that was Davis' so-called organization.

What is the one under which today your men are fighting? Here is the rag; this spider web on a field of pale blue and these men that you conscript, they sail from America's shores under the Stars and Stripes, but when they get on the high seas and when they land abroad in Asia or in Europe they fight not under the Stars and Stripes, oh, no, but under the flag of the United Nations, which flies over the CO post—over the combat forces in the place of the Stars and Stripes.

Now, I ask you, how can you conscript, how can you vote to conscript the young men of America to fight under another flag, under another commander, not an American, under one who takes his orders not from the Congress, not from the President; but from an organization on which sits at least one, perhaps six, of our enemies, one a representative of Red Russia? Some of the others at all times willing to sacrifice our interests, the lives of our men if their interests be served.

The Marshall plan distributed our dollars all over the world. Be that good or bad, that is something that we cannot now change, though to our sorrow we know it has made, is continuing to make Russia, Stalin and the Communists powerful, better able to fight us. This conscription plan is another Marshall plan. It distributes all over the world at the direction of UN not dollars, not dollars, but your own flesh and blood. The youth of America to aid a socialist England, to protect and advance the commercial interests of Britain, to assist a France more than a third Communist, to help those and some other nations exploit, gain profit from people they hold by force of arms. To what end? And for what purpose? Oh, you remember the boast of the British Empire, do you not? Even though you may have forgotten the myth that only the British Navy protected us from destruction. Remember that boast? That the sun never sets on the British flag? Now, if we as a nation keep on in the course upon which we are embarked, soon Stalin and the British can boast that the sun never goes down on the cross which marks the grave of an American soldier. That the morning sun as it comes up over the horizan never failes to cast the shadow of a cross on the grave of some mother's boy who gave his life, not for home or country, but in a futile war waged to advance the fortune of some ambitious power mad politician.

Follow the course now charted for us by an Acheson and his crew and Stalin, trapping us into exhausting our resources, wasting and dispersing our strength all over the world, will have won—will have destroyed the Republic.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 25 minutes.

Mr. POTTER. I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withhold his request for a while.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my colleague and friend from Mississippi on the calm manner in which he approached this problem. I hope that everyone who speaks here today will bear in mind that that is really the only way to discuss this question. I believe that the purpose of the Members of this House, regardless of what their views may be, is that we should now present a united front against the common enemy and that anything or any method by which we can promote harmony and good will among all of the members of the Armed Forces is the thing that we all desire to do.

As the gentleman from Mississippi stated, the purpose of the provisions of this bill is to do that, and it is to leave to the military authorities themselves the question of handling this proposition without having to yield to the recommendations or the views of anyone or any committee.

Now, there is not any question but what this problem has been met over a long period of years by the military without any recommendations from any committee or anyone else satisfactorily and if they are left alone they will continue to do that. Long after this committee that the gentleman from Mississippi had reference to was appointed back in 1948, long after they had met with and discussed the problem with all of the armed services and made informal recommendations and before they made their final recommendation, the armed services were slow in yielding ground as to what they should do, and while they have yielded, if they are permitted to run the thing according to the way they think it should be run, and that is what this provision will say to them, I believe we will have a more united front than we will have in any other way.

Secretary Gray while he was Secretary of the Army testified before our committee last January and at that time the gentleman from Mississippi who has just spoken asked this question with reference to the provision which at that time was being considered in the draft bill:

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Secretary, would you have any objections to providing in this bill that each individual when he registers shall have the right to express himself on three questions: Do you prefer to serve in a segregated unit, or do you prefer not to serve in an integrated unit, or do you have any choice? It would give us a chance to let the individuals speak instead of the politicians and the Secretary of Defense.

Secretary GRAY. Mr. WINSTEAD, I wouldn't have an objection to an individual expressing himself. If that is what you mean, as you stated it, I would have no objection to their expressing themselves. I don't know that we could agree that that would be binding.

We do not provide that it is binding. We provide in there that it shall be done as far as military necessity will permit, which gives them a broad latitude as to whether they consider it practical or not to the best interests of the armed services. Later on and while Secretary Gray was before the committee, I asked him about the present policy in the Army. This was still in January 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, he stated in reply to my question, and I am still referring to Secretary Gray:

Secretary GRAY. There is no policy of elimination of segregation in the Army at

the present time. In order to answer your question, let me tell you what this recent directive amounted to that we sent out to the field, which was published in the press recently. It is provided that in a critical band of specialties which are published periodically by the Army, that is specialties where we do not have people available to fill them—there are some 35 or 40—in this critical band of specialties if there is a Negro specialist who meets the qualifications, and who is available, and if there is a vacancy in the Army command, they must assign him to a unit regardless of race or color. That is in a group of clearly defined areas of activity; radar operators, for example, various kinds of mechanics and other specialties.

In addition, major commanders are now given the power to assign Negroes with special skills and qualifications to units in MOS's or military occupation specialties, other than the critical list which we publish here in the Department at Washington. But as the press has indicated, this policy does not contemplate the elimination of the Negro units in being. It does not mean integration at this time in the Army. My own frank opinion is that some day in the future we will come to integration. I think that day is some time in the future.

A fair conclusion from what the Secretary says there is that he thinks the Army should travel along with the country. He does not think the country is yet ready for that policy to be adopted. Since he made the statement, of course, when we talked with him about it, they are following policies that do involve segregation in the Army, but I am concerned that they have just about done away with their former policy, and I fear that it is due to the pressure that has been brought to bear upon them from time to time by pressure groups and by this committee that was appointed, and in deference to some Executive order which was issued, rather than carrying out their own good judgment.

It was said here a moment ago that we have not had any incidents up to this time which indicated that nonsegregation was unwise.

There was an incident down in Camp Rucker in the month of March of this year. I am reading from the Dothan Eagle of Friday afternoon, March 9, 1951. It states as follows:

Soldiers from "all over" in Rucker row PIO says.

Camp Rucker Public Information Office said today that soldiers from practically all sections of the United States were involved in a fight between Negroes and whites at a post exchange earlier this week.

At the same time the PIO announced that the Army Inspector General, Maj. Gen. Louis A. Craig, had arrived at the post but his visit has no bearing on the incident.

It goes on to say:

Home States specifically mentioned in the PIO statement were Georgia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, but a spokesman said if a complete check was made, it probably would reveal that soldiers from practically every State in the Nation were involved.

Six men were injured in the affray, which Rucker officials said started with an argument over the use of a juke box in the post exchange.

Military police broke up the fight in short order, reportedly using tear gas to rout the rioters. Unofficial military sources in Dothan said approximately 60 men were involved in the fight, which left the exchange nearly wrecked.

Well, that was an unfortunate incident that occurred, and we may have further unfortunate incidents of that kind. What we want now in this country is an opportunity to present a united and harmonious front to fight the enemy in Korea or elsewhere should the necessity arise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. deGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. It is on that point that I wanted to bring out the significance of this particular provision. Actually the provision as written goes only to registration in the future and it does not affect segregation in the Army or the Armed Forces as it now exist. So, if this amendment is adopted, how can you say you will have unity when you will have the new registrants segregated on their original registration, while you have 3,500,000 men now in the service in unsegregated units?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. According to the Army, they are not now altogether in unsegregated units, from what they tell me. What we do in this amendment is to leave that problem for the military to work out in the best method that they can.

In reply to another question that the gentleman asked the gentleman from Mississippi about whether a general could express his preference or not, as I understand the provision in this bill it only applies to inductees under the draft, and there would not be any officers inducted under the draft.

Mr. FULTON. Yes, but does it not nevertheless follow them all through their service on any military assignment, so if any of these boys got up to be a captain or a colonel or a general he then would have this segregation right following him?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. It says he has the right to express himself at the time of induction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, I should like to ask the gentleman as a member of the committee two questions as to how this provision will operate: On the basis of the gentleman's statement concerning what happened at Camp Rucker, would the gentleman then not argue in accordance with what I believe his thesis to be that no colored troops of any type, whether from the Northern States or not, should be sent into the South, whether they are in segregated units or not, because of the possibility of such incidents occurring?

The second question I should like to ask is, what happens under the provision for which the gentleman is speaking in the event there is a particular technician that is needed by a segregated group? I am thinking of such scientists as George Washington Carver and Dr. Percy Julian, who have peculiar skills and knowledges. Suppose there were a Negro who had skills which were needed in a segregated unit; what would happen under those circumstances?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. The gentleman has two questions combined there, but in answer to the first question I will say that from what I have read you, this report, it was merely incidental that this matter occurred in the South because the ones involved were, according to the report, from practically every State in the Union. I think we have to look at this thing as a country-at-large proposition.

In regard to the gentleman's second question, as far as the specialties are concerned, I do not believe this would interfere with that at all. I think it would leave it in the discretion of the military to exercise their judgment in regard to it.

Mr. YATES. But would not individual soldiers have the right in declaring for segregation to refuse to serve with such a specialist?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I do not believe they would.

Mr. YATES. They would not have the right?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I do not believe they would. I believe they have a right to express themselves, but then I believe the military under this provision is given the right to exercise their judgment as to whether that expression should be granted. They will grant it unless military necessity would prevent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Am I right that the Winstead amendment provides for segregation where in the judgment of the Army it is practicable? If that is stricken out, would it not follow that under the present operation the Army would be forced to have nonsegregation under the Presidential directive and under the recommendations of this committee even though nonsegregation be impracticable.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. That is my interpretation of it. There might be

various interpretations. Some Members might say that military necessity does not mean the same as practicable, but I think that is the construction the military authorities would put on the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Under the Winstead provision the determination of when it is permitted and when it is not lies with the military?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. In answer to the question posed a moment ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], is it not true that when you are drafted or when you enlist in the service, that is, when you are an enlisted man, before you are an officer, you are discharged at the convenience of the Government, before you can accept a commission?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that I cannot answer that question. I expect the gentleman from Georgia is really better informed about that than I am. May I ask the committee chairman about that?

Mr. VINSON. The statement of the gentleman from Georgia is correct.

Mr. FULTON. May we have the question answered by the chairman?

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman address his remarks to the gentleman from Alabama? I will take the floor in my time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. As I understood the chairman, he said he preferred not to answer questions on my time, and therefore I must decline to yield.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of first congratulating the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Mississippi for the very high level on which they have pitched their remarks. It is very encouraging in this body after these many years to find that at last we can speak about subjects which we view with a great deal of passion with the dignity befitting the House of Representatives of this Nation. Light rather than heat will always provide more guidance.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak, although I did address the House last week for some time on this subject, because this amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] was originally mine. I so informed the Members of the House by mail during the early part of this week that I would offer it. However, after consultation, I thought it would be better if a member of the Committee on Armed Services offered it.

I would like to just state a few facts so that we can see the entire picture correctly. In the first place this provision authored by the gentleman from Mississippi was never in the original bill. It was not in the original bill which was sent from the Pentagon. It was not in the original bill which was rewritten by our eminent chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and his colleagues. It was not in the original Senate bill and it is not in the Senate bill as now passed by that body. This, then, is an amendment which was adopted by a vote of the committee—not a unanimous vote, but a closely divided vote, and I think the House should know, by a vote which would not have been possible if a great many people from the Republican side of the aisle had not voted with those on this side. I want you to know there have been certain statements made which are not correct. I do not impugn the motives of those who have made the statement, nor their desire for accuracy, but I do want to present you with the real facts.

In the first place, we have not fought wars on the basis of total segregation as has been stated. The United States Navy was not segregated until recent years. We never had an Air Force until recently. That Air Force has developed into our finest striking arm. Today our Air Force is unsegregated and our Navy is unsegregated. But truth of the matter is that there is still segregation in the Army. As the Secretary of the Army said a year and a half ago, some day integration would come, and they would work toward it. They are working toward it now, and I hope the chairman of our Committee on Armed Services will tell you that progress has been made. But nevertheless, there is still segregation in the Army. Therefore, you cannot prove that integration is not good by citing instances which are happening now in a segregated army. This the gentleman from Alabama tried to do. I would like you to know that morale in Korea has greatly increased where there is no segregation. In all of Korea, only two whites have been sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war. In all of Korea not a single Negro has been sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war, except in the one segregated regiment now left in our whole Armed Forces, the Twenty-fifth, and in that one regiment 32 men were sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war.

I would like for you to know how integration works even further. In all of the 4 years of World War II, with hundreds of thousands of Negro troops, only four Distinguished Service Crosses were won by Negroes. In 6 months in Korea, with comparatively a handful of Negro troops, nine Distinguished Service Crosses were won, and they were won by Negroes fighting in nonsegregated units.

I would like to go further and say that the Winstead clause is impractical. Leaving aside the racial question it cannot be operated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has pointed that out. Under the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, you will draft men and then give them the power to select where they want to serve. That is not a draft.

The language of the Winstead amendment is very ambiguous. It does not point out where the draftee can serve. It says he can select whatever "unit" he wants. What does unit mean—a platoon? Does it mean a battalion; does it mean a regiment; does it mean an Army corps, does it mean a cruiser, does it mean a destroyer, does it mean a submarine? What does it mean—"unit"? This is impractical and cannot be operated.

Maybe a year and a half ago the Secretary of War was not in favor of integration then, but I defy any member of the Armed Services Committee to tell me a single person of importance in the Pentagon, on the Joint Staff, who has told them that they are in favor of the Winstead amendment. I await your reply now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. I ask you on the Armed Services Committee to inform this House of a single top-ranking member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from the Pentagon, who is in favor of the Winstead amendment in this day of our Lord, April 12, 1951. The truth is, and if I am wrong, correct me—the Pentagon does not want this amendment. If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected and I now await your reply.

It has been stated that Negro people want segregation. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not true by any stretch of the imagination. For the past 4 days this hill has had Representatives from every State in the Union, including the States of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED], coming to see you, my colleagues in your offices, telling you that they are not in favor of the Winstead amendment. There is not a single Negro organization in this country that is in favor of segregation. Oh, of course you can pick out individuals here and there, there have always been such in all the pages of history, that would be in favor of anything; but I mean sensible, forward-looking people. They are not in favor of segregation. By the power of the living God we are going to purge it from the American scene.

Finally, perhaps we have fought some wars in the past on the basis of a segregated army. This is not a war of the past. This is a new war. This is a war of freedom. This is an earth-shaking war. This is not a war to protect our country. This is a war to carry the torch of freedom to portions of the earth where freedom has never been known, to portions of the world that are now enslaved. You cannot do this with men shackled by the chains of segregation. If we are to appeal to this world that we are the torch bearers of this new liberty of mankind, that we are the vanguard of those

who are going to make this not just "the land of the free and the home of the brave" but a world of the free and a world of the brave, how can we do it by saying, "We have black men here, white men there, yellow men over there, separated, divided, with no equality"? You are asking on a world basis 1,000,000,000 colored people to be the allies of a nation that practices the color bar. This will be the end of our Nation. It will give Communists almost certain victory.

I know the problems of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED]. But look beyond these narrow problems. Look at the whole picture of our Nation, 48 States of many, many races, going forth to do battle as a modern Sir Galahad: "One nation, indivisible." Let us not go forth half slave and half free. Let us not go forth half integrated and half segregated. If we do we will lose.

I ask you to support this amendment that our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has offered, and put this draft bill back in the form in which it was originally, back in the form in which it is now in the Senate.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to hear the gentleman say what he did about the spirit in which our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] has offered his amendment. I would like to say something that I am sure will be endorsed by many who differ with the gentleman from New York as to the amendment, and that is that he himself has added to the good will and tolerance which characterizes the debate. The gentleman from New York earlier in the year helped to clear the atmosphere and thus advanced the spirit of unity when it was desperately needed.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question, however: If he is not willing to concede, in case his view prevails and the Winstead amendment goes out, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] has raised some pertinent points and that the armed services would not have a mandate by that negative action to create an integrated army overnight; that it would not mean disregarding individual attitudes of inductees? If the gentleman gets my point, is he willing to agree that no such mandate would exist?

Mr. POWELL. I am not sure that I know just what the gentleman means.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I mean, here is a young inductee who is not accustomed to the kind of integrated army for which the gentleman pleads—and I am not quarreling with him about that—should not the inductee's wishes, under proper circumstances, at least, be regarded and respected and an effort be made by the armed services to consider individual desires while evolving policies that achieve the goals favored by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman has raised a point; but when are you going to make a start toward progress? That is the question I asked you. Secondly, when a man is drafted, his wishes are left home. If you give him a choice, you defeat the draft.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. May I add, Mr. Chairman, that in the final analysis it is the responsibility of the armed services to work out a proper policy on this point. I have projected this idea into the discussion only because I believe whatever happens to the amendment, weight should be given to the individual attitudes of inductees. And that applies with equal force to those preferring nonsegregated units as well as others.

It is a serious matter under any conditions to take men from their normal ways into military life. Since many are not conditioned by training and backgrounds for all of the innovations mentioned here, I see no justification for holding that defeat of the Winstead amendment would carry implications that the armed services must be indifferent to individual backgrounds.

I recognize the basis for the gentleman's opposition to segregation and I am sure he understands that I would not seek, even by indirection, to extend my own region's social patterns by Federal law.

I am arguing only that we stick to the idea of gradually working out a desirable relationship for the races as they serve in uniform. An Executive order that pursues the goal of nonsegregation too rigidly will not only damage morale, it will tend to defeat its own purposes.

The case cited by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is an illustration. No matter how one feels about segregated college groups, the armed services worked an injustice in forbidding training units on such campuses. Incidentally, many colleges in the South have already begun to alter segregation policies and real progress is being made.

My own views on this difficult question have been previously stated to the House. I believe that these comments are consistent with them.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach some agreement as to a limit on debate on the Price amendment? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, and that the committee shall have the last 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto close within 30 minutes, and that the committee have the last 5.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point against the motion on the ground that it is out of order.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the last statement reserving 5 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. YORTY, Mr. DOLLINGER, and Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and were given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. YORTY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has made a learned, dispassionate and compelling statement, which makes any remarks I might make at this point seem unnecessary and superfluous. I want to join with my other colleagues who have complimented the gentleman by adding my compliments to theirs. This is the type of question that is apt to arouse our emotions, and it is well that it is being debated calmly because, as I view the problem, cold logic as well as justice is on the side of those supporting the amendment by Mr. PRICE, which would delete from the bill the Winstead amendment designed to compel the creation of segregated units in our Armed Forces.

Segregation at this time would be a backward step, and would wipe out the admirable progress that has been made toward integration of our Armed Forces. When it comes to the defense of our country, how can even the most prejudiced person contend that there should be a distinction between Americans based upon race. To me, such a distinction is contrary to the religious faith which we profess, and contrary to the law of inherent, fundamental human rights.

At this time, when our Nation is attempting to lead the free men of all colors, races, and creeds in the defense of the great ideals of human liberty and justice, it seems particularly inopportune that we should, in the halls of this great Congress where all Americans are represented, allow ourselves to be misled into compelling, by our acts, the continuance of discrimination between our citizens.

I fully realize that some of the men from some sections of the country will need to adjust themselves, and to ameliorate their attitudes, in order to make the program of integration effective, but their doing so will be in the interest of national welfare, and I am sure that our patriotic young men will not hesitate to wholeheartedly respond to the national and international need for an end to discrimination based upon race, creed, or color. America cannot hold high the torch of human liberty with a firm hand, unless it is willing to practice what it preaches.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, in January of 1949 and January of 1951, I introduced bills to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States. In my opinion, such segregation is a shameful and flagrant violation of the very principles of democracy which our men are now being called upon to defend. It must be ended if we are to convince the enemies of democracy that we are sincere in our proclamation that "all men are created equal" and that in this Nation, there shall be "liberty and justice for all."

According to reports, race segregation has been eliminated in the Navy and Air Force. As a result, morale has been raised, and the services have been strengthened — not weakened. The Army has been making strides in the right direction. The Winstead amendment which has been proposed would be a terrible blow—first to the brave men discriminated against, and second to the right-thinking citizens who prefer that we practice what we preach. It would undo all the efforts which have been put forth to remove this blot of discrimination, and the results accomplished thus far. It would make our servicemen wonder if the cause they are dying for is indeed a worthy one. Certainly, it would give great comfort to our enemies, as well as ammunition in their propaganda against us.

Death-dealing missiles reach all men indiscriminately and all suffer the same mortal pain, regardless of their color. In drafting our youth, they should be made to feel that they are fighting for a just cause; that this means that the defenders of our beloved country must be willing to fight side by side to preserve the liberty of all. How utterly stupid it would be for us to inject feelings of racial hatreds into our Armed Forces, when it is so important to maintain high standards of morale and a feeling of responsibility toward one another, among our servicemen. These make for efficient and victorious soldiers—racial discrimination causes ill feelings and disintegration.

For these reasons, the Winstead amendment must be defeated. We cannot afford to tolerate, much less foster, discrimination in our Armed Forces. Every effort should be made to wipe it out. Our servicemen must have the example of sincerity on our part if they are to be called upon to sacrifice their lives so that democracy may survive. Victory and survival depend upon the concerted efforts and cooperation of all. To discriminate against any segment of our population in these perilous days, either at home or on the battlefront, is to court disaster.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, I join my friend from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] in opposition to the Winstead amendment to this bill and shall wholeheartedly support the amendment that has been offered by him.

The proposal to allow any registrant to demand to serve in a segregated unit is unfair and unwise from every standpoint. Segregation and discrimination are difficult to wipe out, in the Army as elsewhere, but the task of eliminating them has progressed so far that we must be on guard against attempts to backtrack. The Army has moved cautiously in carrying out the integration program, but considerable progress has been made since the President's policy statement in January, ordering equality of treatment. To turn back the clock by enforcing harsh and wasteful segregation and discrimination would undermine the training of servicemen and reduce the efficiency of the fighting forces. How can anyone be asked to fight to preserve democracy when the very Nation he is asked to fight for discriminates so shamefully? Our country is committed to the defense of the basic American principles of liberty, justice, and equality. Yet, the supporters of the Winstead amendment believe that those who consider themselves too good to serve, fight, and die alongside of members of other races should be privileged to demand an organization of units segregated as to race. It is a contradiction of the democratic principle of selective service whereby all young men, regardless of their circumstances, are called upon to defend their country.

Aside from the blow to our ideals that the Winstead amendment proposes, those who put their prejudices above the best interests of our country are playing Stalin's game, whether they know it or not. This is the most effective way to provide grist for the Russian propaganda mill, and to weaken our position of leadership among the nations representing all races of mankind.

The Winstead amendment would dangerously cripple the objective of this legislation which is to strengthen our Armed Forces and thereby add to our national security. I earnestly hope that the House will reject the Winstead amendment and will adopt the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been made clear that the Winstead proposal is already in the bill, that if Members vote for the Price amendment they get it out of the bill. This Price amendment would strike the Winstead proposal out of the bill.

I think it is a fair statement to say that the burden of the argument of the proponents of segregation in the armed services has always been to leave it to the armed services themselves and they would work it out. Well, the armed services have made their decision, the question is whether it is being carried out. There is no segregation in the Navy; there is no segregation in the Air Force. The Secretary of Defense has ordered it to be eliminated. They have everything they wanted. The Armed Forces are handling it and the Armed Forces say segregation should go.

Finally, I want to say that the gentleman from New Jersey and I inspected the situation at Fort Dix. Segregation was ordered out there in February of this year among the units on that post. Segregation had existed there among the units in training and it was ordered replaced by integration. We found the moral of the Negro troops, as a result, had risen about 100 percent. We found that the integrated units were going forward in training just as fast as ever. We found very importantly, too, and the commanding officer said that integration enabled them to use facilities to the full which theretofore had remained completely idle, facilities for training, barracks, and messing because there were not enough Negro troops in training on the post often to occupy them as they were segregated facilities.

If we want unity, if we are going to do the job that has got to be done to defend freedom in our Nation and the world, you cannot make second-class citizens out of some Americans and differentiate one American because of color or because he is from some other minority from another. This provision sought to be stricken from the bill establishes enforced segregation in the armed services—among men and women sworn together to serve their country even unto life itself—and I think this provision ought to come out of this bill if we mean what we say about unity.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRIEST). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price amendment. The bill which we are debating, in proposing to create for the first time in the history of our country a system of universal military training, will inevitably bring with it, if it is adopted, the most profound changes in the social structure of this country. Life with the military must necessarily become an inherent part of our society for many, many years to come. We must give recognition to the fact that many changes in our mores and customs will occur, for it is a new way of life—a new part in our democratic processes which we are creating.

That is why I oppose the Winstead provision of the bill. It attempts to freeze our social structure as it exists today, rather than seizing this opportunity to take advantage of the possibility of eliminating some of our current social abuses. I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Mississippi for the very objective and dispassionate manner in which they pleaded their side of what is necessarily a subject which arouses extreme emotion and passion. They are both able and conscientious legislators, and while they have presented their argument with all the force at their command, it seems to me that their viewpoint is unrealistic and would place the dying and, in many instances, the dead hand of the past upon the stormy present and the dynamic future. They propose to impose and crystallize upon and into the military service a decadent caste system which would seriously cripple, if not destroy, every social advance that has been made for better understanding between the peoples of various races.

They argue that we cannot change our present social standards—that for the sake of unity we must maintain the status quo. Why must we maintain a status quo which even they recognize is bad, and for which they plead for time's remedy as a cure? I think the best answer to their argument is given in the parable of the discussion between Glaucon and Socrates wherein Glaucon said to Socrates:

Socrates, I do not believe that there is such a city of God anywhere on earth.

Socrates replied:

Whether such a city exists in heaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will

live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order.

I believe their argument that Negroes prefer the present system is equally untenable. Let me cite to them the statement of one Negro, a man who, like Dr. George Washington Carver, broke through the almost insuperable obstacles which today throttle members of his race to reach the pinnacle of scientific achievement. I refer to Dr. Percy L. Julian of my home city of Chicago, who is world famous as the discoverer of numerous life-giving drugs, such as cortisone, the hormone compound which is used in the treatment of arthritis; physostigmine, used in the cure of the eye disease, glaucoma; prostigmine, used in the treatment of paralysis, and synthetic male and female hormones credited with saving the lives of countless unborn babies by protecting expectant mothers from miscarriage. Dr. Julian has discovered too, aero-foam, the fire extinguisher which saved so many lives aboard our ships during the last war.

In his speech before the Decalogue Society of Lawyers in Chicago on March 3, 1951, when he received the annual award for merit bestowed by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers to an outstanding person in the community, Dr. Julian said:

I would be faithless to my strongest convictions as an American citizen did I not tell you that the image of our national character is severely blurred for the rest of the civilized world by the miserable eighteenth and nineteenth-century Europeanlike ghettos which choke the honor and human decency out of nearly every major metropolis in this Nation. It is symptomatic of our smugness that we expect to weld Americans together in a unity of purpose, while we subject the spirits of 15,000,000 of Americans to the horrors of a Dachau and Buchenwald psychology. We cannot hold the garment of God in our right hand and raise it to our lips while a left hand behind our back is clasped firmly in the grip of Satan, and expect a world of people to discern a coveted image of our national character. I warn my fellow citizens that no true patriotism can emanate from the American ghettos. It has only served to create a house bitterly divided against itself, and though the house may stand, its strength and fiber are vitiated. Someday, someone will write a dramatic story for the rest of the civilized world of the detailed horrors of the American ghetto and the peculiar helplessness of its innocent victims. I say unto you now that the forces which have fought to maintain American Negro ghettos must be destroyed. * * * We certainly cannot weld together a Nation of one people by reminding 15,000,000 Americans constantly of white neighborhoods any more than by asking them to die for a white country.

Dr. Julian's statement is particularly appropriate in its application to the Winstead provision, for that part of the bill is specifically intended to create within the Military Establishment Negro compounds or isolation wards, if you prefer, exactly like those in which Negroes are compelled to live in cities today. The Army is not a social fraternity; it is not a tea party; it is not an Army of a few States of this Nation, but of the United States of America. The customs of a civil society which restrict and relegate to American citizens inferior citizenship has no place in a military system. The blood of Negro Americans which may be shed upon the battlefield should be as precious and dear to our thinking as that of all other classes of American citizens.

What about the members of other races? The Winstead provision may very well affect them as well. Members of the House from Texas will remember, I am sure, the honorary citizenship bestowed by their great State upon the Nissei Japanese of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team who rescued the lost battalion of Texas in Italy at a cost in lives to themselves greater than the number of men whom they rescued. Can you say now that the boys entering service from Texas or any other part of the country should be given the privilege of not serving with American-born Japanese, as the Winstead provision proposes?

Much progress in civil life is being made in connection with interracial problems. For example, the Christian Science Monitor for Friday, April 6, states that—

A Negro youth growing up in Chicago today can see doors of employment opportunity opening to him which not long ago were closed tight to members of his race.

Conservative business is largely responsible. Executives of corporations and their staffs are working at this business of breaking down old habits based on race prejudice, and are succeeding. Persons in service organizations say that the openings, although still few numerically, are of significance far out of proportion to their numbers.

This makes sense. This shows that at long last we are moving in the right direction and I think it important to point out that with respect to the progress being made in Chicago, as cited in the article, the steps that are being taken toward better racial understanding, are being pushed by some of the most conservative business firms in the city, such as the International Harvester Co., the Illinois Bell Telephone Co., and Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co.

Our Military Establishment has been making progress, too, with its interracial problems. The Air Force is well advanced and has a very high morale under a policy of integration. The Navy has taken great strides, too, and the Army is moving in the same direction, slowly but surely. Directly contrary to what the gentlemen from Mississippi and Alabama have said that the Winstead proposal gives the Army a free hand to deal with the problem, its effect will be to tie the hands of the military and prevent their dealing with interracial groups upon a realistic and sympathetic basis.

I strongly urge the Members of the House to vote the Price amendment.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, when we go back into the House I am going to ask permission to insert in the RECORD some material which I have here.

Here is a news item:

Twenty-four men in Korea win awards for gallantry from 15 different States.

They are all Negroes. I also have here a list of Negroes who have been given the Distinguished Service Cross for gallantry in action. I want to read just one little line from a citation:

Heedless of his personal safety, he shielded the two wounded men with his own body in an effort to protect them from further wounds. While in this exposed position he was mortally wounded.

Corp. Levi Jackson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, gave his life for two men who were wounded. He was a medical corpsman in Korea.

We talk about democracy in this country, we talk about it throughout the world. I am told that people from 124 different nationalities and races are in our armed services. We have got to prove to the people throughout the world that we believe in the thing that we preach, because we are going to have to depend upon the people of all races to fight this fight of freedom. We cannot depend on only the white race, there are too few of us; we are going to have to admit sooner or later that we are going to have to have help from the colored races throughout the world.

I beg of you to support the Price amendment to strike this particular principle from the bill. You will be doing a thing that is honorable, you will be making your contribution today for the real forces of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I shall get permission in the House to insert five citations to Negroes of our highest military award for bravery in action, the Distinguished Service Cross:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS AWARDS

Second Lt. William M. Benefield, Jr., (posthumous), Corps of Engineers, United States Army, a member of the Seventy-seventh Engineer Combat Company, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division, distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy on July 29, 1950, near Sangju, Korea. On July 29, 1950, during daylight hours, the Seventy-seventh Engineer Combat Company received orders to advance against the enemy's position. Information was received on the location of an enemy mine field in the path of the company's advance. Realizing the danger to personnel of the company, Lieutenant Benefield with complete disregard for his personnel safety, went forward alone. Although the area was swept by intense

small-arms fire, he advanced to within 200 yards of the enemy position and attempted to remove the mine field. During this action Lieutenant Benefield was killed. The extraordinary heroism displayed by Lieutenant Benefield reflects the highest credit on himself and the military service.

Master Sgt. Curtis D. Pugh, Infantry, United States Army. Sergeant Pugh, a member of Company L, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division, distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism in action against a numerically superior enemy near Haman, Korea, on September 15, 1950. Sergeant Pugh, as a volunteer member of a rear guard, held his position on a narrow mountain ridge and fought off a series of fanatical enemy assaults at ranges as close as 10 yards. He personally stopped one attack by rising from behind his rock barricade with utter disregard for his own safety and firing his automatic rifle in an arc before him. When his battalion commander was engaged in a hand to hand combat with enemy soldiers, Sergeant Pugh came to his rescue and saved the life of the battalion commander by shooting the enemy soldiers who had succeeded in wounding him. Sergeant Pugh then maintained a base of fire until the wounded officer was able to escape. The extraordinary heroism displayed by Sergeant Pugh reflects great credit on himself and is in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service. Entered the military service from Georgia.

Sgt. First Class Arthur C. Dudley, Infantry, United States Army, a member of Company B. Nineteenth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fourth Infantry Division distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism against an armed enemy near Ch'angnyong, Korea, during the period August 2 to 7, 1950. Sergenat Dudley's company which was occupying a defensive position near the Naktong River, had suffered severe casualties and was at half strength from the result of continuous fighting over a period of weeks. Men were exhausted and were subjected to harassing fire particularly from snipers and automatic weapons. Sergeant Dudley, an expert rifleman, continually exposed himself by moving from one position to another, in order to locate and fire on the enemy and his unerring accuracy with the M1 rifle, often at unbelievable ranges, soon became the pride of his organization. Although often observed and fired upon by both automatic weapons and snipers, Sergeant Dudley calmly continued to expose himself and during a period of approximately 5 days, destroyed over 50 enemy riflemen and machinegunners. On August 7, 1950, Sergeant Dudley left his fox hole under fire, in order to clear a jammed machinegun, which was proving difficult for the gunner. Later that day he was wounded, but before being evacuated expressed concern that he be permitted to return as soon as possible, in order to continue his deadly destruction of the enemy. The extraordinary heroism displayed by Sergeant Dudley on this occasion reflects the highest credit on himself and the military service. Entered the military service from Florida.

Sergeant Dudley won his DSC while assigned to the Nineteenth Infantry Regiment, a white unit.

Corp. Levi Jackson, Jr. (missing in action), Army Medical Service, United States Army a member of Medical Company, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division is cited for extraordinary heroism in action against the enemy near Haman, Korea on August 13, 1950. On this date Corporal Jackson was serving as medical aid man with Company G when two men were seriously wounded. Moving across the exposed terrain through the withering enemy small arms and automatic weapons fire, Corporal Jackson reached the men and was administering first aid when the enemy laid a devastating barrage on the area. Heedless of his personal safety, he shielded the two wounded men with his own body in an effort to protect them from further wounds. While in this exposed position he was mortally wounded. Corporal Jackson performed his duties as medical corpsman in a heroic manner. His primary concern at all times was the welfare and prompt treatment of the many wounded. On numerous occasions he evacuated men under the most adverse conditions over treacherous terrain while subjected to constant hostile fire. The outstanding bravery, conspicuous devotion to his comrades, and grim determination displayed by Corporal Jackson exemplify the highest traditions of the American soldier and provide a lasting tribute to himself and to the Army Medical Service. Entered the military service from Pennsylvania.

Second Lt. Levy V. Hollis (then master sergeant), Infantry, United States Army. Lieutenant Hollis, a member of Headquarters, Third Battalion, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division, displayed extraordinary heroism and leadership ability in action against an armed enemy near Haman, Korea, during the period August 21 to August 24, 1950. Lieutenant Hollis' battalion was engaged in a fierce fire fight with the enemy for the strategically important high ground near Haman, Korea, known as Battle Mountain or Bald Hill. Despite the fact that his job as battalion operations sergeant would ordinarily confine him to the battalion command post, he constantly moved under heavy enemy machine-gun, mortar, and small-arms fire from one end of the sector to the other coordinating the fire and attack of assault elements and providing invaluable assistance to the battalion commander. Throughout this period he was active in organizing stragglers from the assault units of the battalion. He accompanied the battalion commander to front-line positions on numerous occasions and on August 22, 1950, moved through intense enemy fire to carry ammunition to a strategically placed machine-gun position. On August 24, 1950, battalion front-line troops withdrew after being heavily attacked by a numerically superior enemy force. Lieutenant Hollis, after rounding up stragglers, reorganized them as they came off the hill. Issuing weapons to those who had lost them in the attack or whose weapon was not functioning properly, he personally led them in a counterattack. His courage and initiative inspired the men to perform prodigious feats of arms and pushed the enemy off the position. At all times during this period he voluntarily led and directed carrying parties with vital supplies of water and ammunition to assault elements in the thick of the fight. The extraordinary heroism of Lieutenant Hollis reflects great credit on himself and the military service. Entered the military service from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, among my constituents in my congressional district in Los Angeles, there is a highly respected and responsible group whose primary objective is to assist their fellow citizens of Mexican and Spanish descent to become integrated into every phase of our community life. This group once wrote to me protesting an Army policy which classified them as Mexicans instead of Caucasians.

The letter gave an account of a specific incident of a citizen of Spanish descent being interviewed in an Army recruiting office. The interviewer, according to Army policy, scratched out the word white on the enlistment form and inserted Mexican. I would like to quote a paragraph of this letter which comments on the incident:

> This practice will unquestionably do considerable damage to the recruiting program in the entire Southwest. In this general area persons of Mexican ancestry total well over 3,000,000 individuals and represent the largest single minority group. Since the great majority of them are attempting to become a part of the life-stream of the community and the Nation, any attempt to forestall this ambition by treating them as a group apart is extremely repellent to them and give rise to demoralization and hostility. The fostering of such attitudes is not only destructive of the democratic processes, but is scarcely conducive to the creation of a receptive state of mind on the part of political recruitees.

Under present practices in the Army, citizens of Latin ancestry are no longer set apart because we were able to obtain a revision of the policy. The Winstead amendment is an invitation to scrap that change and return to the old system. Even now, the Army follows certain racial classifications that would be covered by the Winstead amendment.

We do not want an Army of colored people or a Navy of Chinese or an Air Force of white people. We want our armed services to use all Americans for whatever duties they are capable of performing.

The policy of segregation and discrimination based on race must be abolished from the armed services.

We must not permit segregation to be written into this universal military training legislation. We must, instead, take active measures to stamp it out and expressly provide that all men who serve in our Armed Forces receive equal treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price amendment. I think we ought to look at the provision itself and see if it means anything the way it is written. From the questions that have been asked it appears that there is segregation only for enlisted men it has been stated because they are discharged as such when they apply for officer status.

Secondly, on the comments that have been made on the floor here so far, "military necessity," on line 3, page 54 of the bill, as well as under this amendment, would not mean "military necessity," but would mean only "where practicable."

Third, on the definition of the word "race," there are five races in the world, and so far the debate has only been between the white and the brown and the black race. As a matter of fact, there are Congressmen here that are part Indian, and I wonder whether they would be in segregated units under this provision.

Lastly, in defining "race" how far back do you go? What is the definition as to a man's antecedents? Does the man have to have either great grandparent colored or Indian, or any other race, Chinese of Hawaiian for example, and then is he entitled to choose his race

on registration? Well, there is no such definition given.

Gentlemen, I think the amendment is unworkable because it will divide the Armed Forces into the present nonsegregated units as the present units are now, and then will segregate for all time, the future draftees. I do not think this provision can be administratively worked out, because it has to work not only for the man for 1 year, one particular group or unit, but to follow him anywhere in any future assignment both in the military and training service. Where will the red tape end?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DAWSON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, after those very fine words of our distinguished colleague from Illinois, perhaps some of the rest of us should not say too much, but I want to point out that I think if the words of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] are left in the bill, it will be unwise and a backward step.

I think all of you realize that the Department of the Army has been slower than the Air Force and the Navy in implementing the policy of nonsegregation and integration of all troops. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has explained, we together made an official visit recently to Fort Dix, which is in my congressional district. There they have found, as he suggested, that it was not practical even to segregate the troops in the training regiments they have at that post. Previously they had segregated them there, and then tried to integrate them after they were trained, but they found that even that was not practical. We found that there at Fort Dix this policy is working very well. There is no complaint as to how this integration was working from any source. There is a great improvement in the morale of the Negro troops. Training is going on. Men from all sections of the country and of all colors and creeds are living together in the barracks. They are having their recreation together and their training together. All in all, it is working very, very well. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois would not require the armed services to do anything beyond what they are now doing under official policy. Why upset a policy which I am convinced is making progress, and which is, to a large extent, contributing to a fuller utilization of our manpower? Let us give it a further trial.

(Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, while the so-called manpower bill, formally designated as S. 1, is not perfect, it is, in my judgment, the best that can be developed under present circumstances. I am pleased with the provisions of the bill as they relate to lowering the age for induction. It is hoped that the calling of these young men 18½ years of age will make it possible to curtail the calling of and permit the release of combat veterans of World War II. To be sure, we do not like to call young men into service, but all of us must make sacrifices it seems; and the provisions of this measure, in part at least, tend to divide the burden.

Through the years, I of course have been an advocate of universal military training and intend to vote against the Barden bill which would separate extension of the Selective Service Act from the universal military feature. All in all, the bill as presented by the Armed Services Committee seems to be fair and the best that can be agreed upon at this time. I am therefore giving it my full support.

Of course, I intend to offer an amendment to the committee bill in an effort to throw at least some safeguards around younger men, who will be leaving home for the first time, with reference to temptations such as intoxicating beverages and houses of ill fame.

It seems to me that the so-called Abernethy provision in the bill is entirely proper. Many of us in the South still adhere to the belief that we should continue to have complete segregation of the races. There is a gradual change in the viewpoint of a lot of our people and, no doubt, eventually this seemingly impossible problem will solve itself. In his inaugural address, our new governor speaking for our people this past January, indicated his and the willingness of all of us to make additional sacrifices so as to provide better educational opportunities to members of the Negro race.

As we call these fine young men into the service, some of them will be leaving home for the first time. Recalling my own early days in the service, I remember the drastic changes in my accustomed way of living which, of necessity, had to be adopted. There are changes which are not so necessary. The idea of a sudden and complete integration and/or amalgamation of the races comes as a terrific shock to a lot of us from the South. The invoking of this ironclad rule has done and will continue to do more to create friction and reduce efficiency and harmony in the service than anything I can think of. Early in my life I discovered these lines from the pen of the poet, Sir Thomas Moore, who said:

Shall I ask the brave soldier who fights by my side in the cause of mankind if our creeds agree? Shall I forget the true friend so valued and tried if he kneel not before the same altar with me?

I have no religious or racial prejudice. I have never consciously discriminated against or committed a wrong against any person. My views now, I believe, are consistent with my stated philosophy of life as I advocate the retention of the Abernethy provision in the bill. What harm could come if this permission is given to young service people to elect for themselves whether they will serve in a segregated or nonsegregated company? It might be that there are some Negroes who would prefer rather to serve in a complete Negro unit than to serve in a white unit where they will always be decidedly in the minority. I believe there can be little dispute that the average white person is more alert in his mental capacity than the average Negro. This being so, a Negro will have a hard time winning any rank in a company in which the majority of his fellows are white. I sincerely hope that the Price amendment will be defeated and that the committee bill will be enacted into law without further delay.

(Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

SEGREGATION A RELIC OF THE PAST

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we should face the future freed of anachronisms like segregation. We weaken our Armed Forces with deliberate separations between whites and blacks. We must strengthen rather than weaken our armed might in the cold war against communism. Segregation can only afford aid and comfort to Communist propaganda. It is grist to the Russian mill.

The administration and Department of Defense are all opposed to this unfortunate practice. They realize the baneful implications of transforming our Armed Forces into organizations of units divided as to race.

How tragic it is that at this day and age men must fight and die with tags on marked "first-class citizen" and "second-class citizen." Bullets find their mark and victim regardless of race or color. The hand of death knows no color. The grim reaper strikes in all directions. He does not say, "For blacks only" or "for whites only."

What leadership can we assert in the United Nations, whose forces fight together in Korea, if we insist upon segregation? UN is representative of all mankind, not whites only.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, of course, I am favoring the Price amendment. It is paradoxical to consider legislation enabling us to prepare for the struggle

for democratic principles, and at the same time to have the most undemocratic Whitten provision in this bill, and I am voting to strike it out.

The first speech I ever made in the House was a plea for the eradication of second-class citizenship and I shall continue to work and vote accordingly.

I must compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] for his exceptionally moving plea in this connection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the excellent presentation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in support of the Price motion to strike the Winstead amendment from the universal military training bill, thereby aiming to eliminate segregation in our Armed Forces. My distinguished colleague from New York rightfully stated that what we need is not segregation but integration of men in the services, and he pointed to the example being set in Korea and the magnificent combat record already attained by Negro soldiers—something which all of us recognize and of which we are all proud.

I was very much impressed by the statement of my good friend, Representative POWELL, when he said that no one in the Pentagon today favors segregation in the armed services. When he asked for those who know of anyone in the Pentagon favoring segregation to speak up, not a single voice was raised. I want to take this opportunity to commend Representative POWELL for the very forceful statement he made here today.

Although it is difficult to add any more potent reasons for the elimination of segregation than those already mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], I should like to express a few thoughts on the subject.

The time is long overdue for us to eliminate all remains of racialism in the military forces and thereby help to keep clear the good name of the United States. Liberty-loving people throughout the world recognize our country as the leader in the cause of democracy and human rights. We have always been in the forefront of the struggle to establish and maintain the unique right of every man to be respected. In the same manner, it is our sacred duty to see that all citizens of the United States should be afforded the privilege and the opportunity to serve their country with dignity and pride.

A little over a year ago—on February 16, 1950—I brought this situation to the attention of this House and on that occasion I stated as follows:

> The Negro, though in our history he has been subjected to second-hand citizenship or to no citizenship at all, has played a very large and very honorable part in all the wars of the United States. * * * We have always asked the Negro to shed his blood for the United States, and he has done so, in spite of frequent shabby treatment. Such loyalty is one of our greatest national assets.

The heroism and participation of the Negro in the American wars, beginning with the Revolutionary War and through the present conflict in Korea, is a matter of record. We are now faced with a situation all over the world, especially among the millions of people in Asia who are closely following our treatment of minorities, where Communist propaganda exploits this situation and points out to the nonwhite peoples of the world this gap between our principles of democracy and our performance of these principles.

Segregation is not only undemocratic, but it is wasteful when practiced in the armed services and intolerable at a time when we should apply utmost efficiency and coordination in our defense efforts for the welfare of the Nation. I support the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and urge its adoption.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the antisegregation amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

If the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD], is adopted, it would serve notice on our critics across the sea that we in America do not practice the free democracy of which we so enthusiastically boast.

The fighting men of our Armed Forces, in the thick of battle, whether it is in no-man's land, in the air, or on the sea, never stop to ask the skin color of their comrades fighting by their side. This so-called amendment, although the words are not expressed, nevertheless implies that we not only have second-class citizens in civilian life, but second-class servicemen in our Armed Forces. It is indeed a sad commentary if this Congress sinks to the error of recognizing racism in our Military Establishments.

Americans are constantly orating about their great heritage of freedom and equality. We must be practical and eliminate racial hatreds and group intolerances whether it is in the military or in civilian life. Intolerance in the military helps to defeat the very thing that we are spending billions of dollars and sacrificing thousands of American lives combating. The opposition to a segregated military is not confined to Negro groups by any means. Great national organizations, industrial, labor, civic, and otherwise have protested against segregation in our Armed Forces. In the last war, the bravery and fighting ability of the Negro soldiers were lauded by the British, the Australians, General Eisenhower, and others, too numerous to mention.

The Negro women served with great distinction in the Army Nurse Corps and enlisted in the WAVES, WAC, and SPARS. After these great demonstrations of patriotism, bravery, and valor, why should we say to these Americans, "You must live in barracks on the other side of the camp. You also must eat your meals there."

Our Nation is made up of a cosmopolitan representation of peoples from all races, nationalities, and creeds. Great progress has been made in the last 20 years toward eliminating intolerance and bigotry. We must not relax now. This segregation amendment would not only hamper the operation of our Armed Forces and promote inefficiency, but would lower the morale of our fighting men, regardless of race.

I am confident that this Congress will adopt the so-called Price amendment and prohibit segregation in our Armed Forces.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the Winstead amendment is the most sensible approach that has been made to the question of segregation in the armed services. I believe that any fair minded person will concede that it is nothing but right and fair to permit the registrants to express their choice of serving in either a segregated or nonsegregated unit. This is democratic. It is fair. It eliminates the difficulties which have come from the President's order striking down segregation in the armed services and which forces all of the men to serve in nonsegregated units regardless of their wishes or the effect which it has upon their morale.

Leaders of our Armed Forces will tell you that the President's nonsegregation order has been nothing but a trouble-maker. It has not been a morale builder. On the contrary it has lowered the morale of thousands of young men, white and black, in the services.

Nonsegregation is something which most of the politicians preach but do not practice except occasionally during their political campaigns. They do not believe in it, they do not live it and they do not teach it. They use it entirely as a lure to secure the votes of minority groups and I do not know of any who have been more successful in that regard than some of the members on the Democratic side of the aisle.

It is my firm conviction that if you strike out the Winstead amendment you may jeopardize the entire bill. Certainly you should consider the question from this angle.

I urge you not to adopt the Price amendment. I am sure that the military will administer the Winstead provision in a democratic manner. I am sure they will permit anyone who wishes to serve in nonsegregated units to do so and I believe they will make an effort to permit those who wish to serve in nonsegregated units so to do. What could be more democratic?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this point simply for the purpose of pointing out to the committee and to the Members of the House, how much more effective the type of debate in which we are presently indulging, than the type which many of you Members may recall we have had in the past. I, too, commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED] on their approach to this problem which I appreciate as well as they do, is a difficult one and which cannot be solved overnight, and which also cannot be solved by demagogues either on the floor of the House or elsewhere. I think it is refreshing indeed, like a breath of fresh air, to take up a question dealing with segregation on such a high plane to note how much more effective this debate is, than the rantings and ravings

on this question that have been indulged in here in this House and elsewhere on previous occasions. I hope this is symptomatic of what may occur in the future, whether we discuss segregation in the armed services, or in schools or residences, or on any of the vexing questions affecting minority groups in this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I join the gentleman in that statement. I think the debate has been splendid and at a very high level. It is indeed very inspiring.

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, appreciate the way in which this problem has been discussed on this floor, and the fair way my distinguished colleague [Mr. WINSTEAD] has handled this entire problem. I would like to call attention to the fact that up until after this World War II was over, the military did handle this most difficult problem. I have always thought that this country came to glorious victory in all past wars when this question was in the hands of the military, but we have in this country—and they are entitled to their opinion—certain social reformers who want to change the segregation policies which exist in certain sections. I differ with them but that is their privilege. Progress is being made by them, who, like all reformers, want to wrap around that which they believe in the force and power of the Federal Government to carry out their wishes regardless of the feelings of others or the results. I think that is a mistake in any case but to tie up such law with national defense is tragic indeed. At any rate from the arguments you have heard from people in northern areas, they do not care for segregation. If the Winstead amendment were the law, they seem to say here today that the people who would desire segregated companies would be the southern white people. I doubt that, but if that be true, why not give them that privilege? Even there the Army would still determine in each case where segregation was practical. Do you not realize that in the South you have had the greatest percentage of volunteers that you have had at any place in the country? The Winstead amendment simply gives back to the Army the right to run the Army as they did run it before segregation was abolished by Presidential directive, which was issued under political pressure.

In the Winstead amendment you provide for segregation where it is desired and feasible. Strike it out and you provide for nonsegregation in all instances regardless even though it be impractical, not desired, and may, in some cases, bring about serious consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, the formation of an army by selective service is a most difficult and most serious task. It is not a vehicle for social reform or social experiment.

Our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] made a very touching speech a moment ago. But do not forget, he has been honored as every other Representative in this body for many years. He has been made chairman of a great committee, and he has been treated with great respect and affection by all Members of this body, including those from the South. What is wrong with a system that gives such opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that circumstances make it necessary to bring young men out of homes and regiment them into an army for the purpose of destroying the enemy. It would be far more unfortunate to use that force for social reform and social experiment. The Whitten amendment is fair, democratic, and in keeping with our best traditions.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. As I understand you, you are making the point that you cannot understand just why it is that we want to make these boys who are drafted into our Army unwilling guinea pigs for social experiments that are not being conducted and not being practiced by any other group in the United States.

Mr. LYLE. That is exactly right. We will have a stronger Army if the Price amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time this afternoon to say a few words to my colleagues on the Republican side. This is not a speech for home consumption. All of you are familiar, I am sure, with the founding of the Republican Party and the high principles which gave it life. Our great party was born to set men free. Whenever and wherever the Republican Party has flourished the rights of human beings are advanced and living conditions improved. The Republican Party has always been in the forefront of every great fight for human rights. Today on the floor of the House, we are charged with pulling somebody's chestnuts out of the fire, and the same representations are made by Democratic orators at meetings of our colored citizens in northern cities.

I am sure the vote on the Price amendment this afternoon will demonstrate that with few exceptions the Republicans here today will vote in support of the Price amendment. The planks in the Republican platform, not only of 1950, but from the time of its origin, were not intended to be fishhooks to catch suckers with. Republicans today will recognize the vote for the Price amendment as a further opportunity to demonstrate that deeds are more important than words.

I hope my Republican colleagues will not emulate so many of the orators on the other side of the aisle. The Democratic Party's constant profession of love for all people is constantly being mocked by the activities of those areas where it derives its greatest political strength. Time after time, despite the vast outpouring of speeches dealing with every phase of civil rights, nondiscrimination, and brotherhood, the words have been completely denied in practice. When the Democratic Party starts practicing what it preaches, there will be a new era of advancement and growth for the Southland. Until then, the mockery of human brotherhood which characterizes the Democratic lip service remains a blight upon the party and a lesson for all Americans in a world where discrimination and segregation are no longer merely local issues, but are part and parcel of the world clash between east and west. The vote on this amendment will be taken in a very few minutes, and all Members and the press will have an opportunity to observe on which side of the House we will find the greatest support for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, for 60 long days from 10 o'clock until oftentimes 4 and 5 o'clock in the afternoon the Armed Services Committee conducted hearings on what is probably the most important bill that will come before the House during this session. We heard over a hundred witnesses either by word of mouth or statements inserted in the RECORD. For over a week we sat in executive session writting the various provisions of this bill. The committee by a vote of 32 to 3 reported the present bill.

I am supporting the bill as submitted to the House in every line and sentence. There has not been a single amendment offered that in my judgment has improved the committee bill. The committee concluded to write in what is known as the Winstead amendment; the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. PRICE], is moving to knock it out. As chairman of the committee I do not feel that I can support any amendment of substance which would be at variance with the committee's actions. Therefore, I am voting against the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRICE) there were—ayes 131, noes 106.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. PRICE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 178, noes 126.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENNY to the Barden substitute: on page 8, strike out lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

"(k) Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(k) (1) Each person who, subsequent to the date of the enactment of this subsection, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to attaining the twentieth anniversary of his birth, shall receive his initial military training (while simultaneously receiving academic training) at a school or college selected by the Secretary of Defense.

"'(2) Any person designated by the Secretary of Defense who, subsequent to the date of the enactment of this subsection, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces on or after attaining the twentieth anniversary of his birth, may receive his initial military training (while simultaneously receiving academic training) at a school or college selected by the Secretary of Defense.

"'(3) The Secretary of Defense shall enter into contracts or other arrangements with the schools and colleges selected by him for the establishment of initial military training units under this subsection. Each such contract or arrangement shall appropriately provide, on a reimbursable basis, for the utilization by the school or college concerned of its existing personnel, buildings, plant, and facilities in furnishing academic training, meals, lodging, and related services to persons assigned to such school or college to receive initial military training under this subsection. In the administration of this subsection, no officer or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of such school or college, except that the contract or arrangement entered into under this paragraph may establish the nature and extent of the academic training to be provided at such school or college under this subsection.

"'(4) Whenever an initial military training unit shall have been established under this subsection at any school or college, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as may be appropriate, shall issue such arms and equipment, and shall detail for duty as instructors or as administrative or other personnel such officers and enlisted men, as may be necessary to insure that the initial military training provided in such unit will be adequate and effective. The commanding officer of each initial military training unit shall have complete supervision over the military training and over the discipline of the persons serving therein.

"'(5) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe such regulations and standards as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.'"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I am taking into consideration the fact that the next few days are going to be good fishing days, and also, something that has not been noted, Monday is baseball day, and we all want to get through before then.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment which I have offered and my argument will be clear, precise, and indubitable. I have made it just as short as I possibly can. I think it is very brief and very readily understood. I hope for that reason that a great many of you will vote for it.

My amendment makes it mandatory for all young men under the age of 20 to continue their education at a school or college selected by the Secretary of Defense simultaneously with and at the same place as they are undergoing basic or initial training in the military forces whether it be for a period of 4 or 8 months.

This plan arose because of my experience in the Air Force in the last war. Up to 1944 the basic training of the pilots who came into the Air Force, and there was a tremendous backlog then, as I believe there is going to be a tremendous backlog of trainees again, was given to them at Miami and Nashville and in four or five different places before they could get any real learning on pilot training. This continual basic training, basic training, basic training, is a very, very bad thing for these young men. They had nothing of interest to do, nothing to keep their minds busy, nothing that they enjoyed working with. It was a drudge at best, and many of them got into mischief. Continual hardening of muscles and no book learning was bad. I believe these young men can continue their education and get something constructive out of their basic training while they are getting the training.

I want it thoroughly understood I am not one who believes in being gentle with soldiers. I believe that they should be made tough. I believe they should be made hardy. I think they should be given complete athletic programs. In the last war the training was given in this manner and it was successful. It worked out splendidly when they were given their college training and were able to continue school or college at the same time that they were getting their basic training. I inspected about 50 of these schools and the morale of the boys after this school system started was just tremendously better than it was before. My own son went through it and I saw it in operation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment is to make it mandatory on the Secretary of Defense to utilize the schools in giving basic training to those who are inducted for service and for training; is that correct?

Mr. DENNY. That is for those under 20 years of age.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. But that is the effect of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DENNY. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. And it applies to a man who is inducted for service as well as the man who enlists and the man who is drafted or appointed? The Secretary must give the contracts to the schools or universities to give him the basic military training at some particular school?

Mr. DENNY. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. In other words, I have stated correctly, then, what the gentleman's amendment does?

Mr. DENNY. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, the short course of college that these boys had in the Air Force during the last war resulted in thousands of them coming back after their military service was over. They went back to college because they had a taste of it. It was the greatest thing for those boys that I think ever happened during the last war. Their school course will be entirely under school authorities during this period of basic military training. Their military training course will be entirely under the military during the period. The military will be the only ones who will have charge of them. They will use the parade grounds and the athletic fields and they will live in the college dormitories and use the messhall in the college to which they are assigned. That will materially reduce the cost of this induction program for these young people. Instead of building new cantonments for them, and constructing new places where they have to build mess halls and living facilities and everything else, they will be put into places which are already constructed, with mess halls, all of the necessary buildings in existence, and so forth. The comfort, housing, feeding, and care of the young man will be immeasurably better.

I believe that the cost is a very material thing here.

The fourth point is, and this is more or less incidental, that it will help the colleges tremendously as it did in the last war. They will lose thousands and thousands of boys under this program, but by this method they will be getting more boys.

I have intentionally left out many details of training that might be more fully discussed, for the reason that they would encumber the record and the military prefers to establish such details for themselves and in their own manner. The infantry soldier becomes a specialist after his first period of basic training. This is also true of the Air Force and Navy candidates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, reading the amendment, it is difficult to understand just where it is supposed to go in the bill. Quite evidently there is some confusion or error, because it seeks to strike out a portion of a section of the bill which authorizes the President to reduce or cancel out training, and it simply does not hook up. It does not become germane at the point mentioned.

But, addressing myself to the substance of the amendment, the gentleman has made it clear that the amendment is intended to make it mandatory upon the Secretary of Defense to assign all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed, who are under 20 years of age, to educational institutions, to pursue military training along with academic training. It is mandatory that they shall be assigned to educational institutions where the initial period of train-

ing will go with academic education. Of course, it would be nice if you could raise an army and train it and leave the men at home to pursue their normal course of life and follow their normal activities and live with their families. Unfortunately you cannot raise and train an army that way. Of course, we will utilize educational institutions. I am in favor of utilizing educational institutions for those portions of the training which can be used for that purpose and at the same time train the soldiers. There is no doubt but that the colleges and educational institutions could be utilized for technical subjects, such as electronics, and things like that, but you cannot raise a foot-soldier army and let them stay in a university until they are 20 years of age and pursue their academic education. You are going to have to uproot them, unfortunate as it may be.

Mr. SHORT. How would you give them training in tanks, and such things?

Mr. KILDAY. Use the football field, I suppose.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. DENNY. I think my amendment clearly sets out that this is only during the period of their basic training. Their preliminary training. As for tanks and special kinds of guns, that comes in the second type of basic training. You do not call it exactly basic training. My whole purpose in this is that when they come out of the Army they will come out better soldiers and better citizens of the Nation.

Mr. KILDAY. Unfortunately, we cannot reach the state of efficiency and numbers in the Army that we have to have and pursue business as usual. It is going to be necessary, unfortunate as it may be—and I know of no one who approaches this legislation with any degree of enthusiasm whatever—but if you are going to have military training you are going to have to have military training with all the hardening and everything else that goes with it.

The amendment, of course, would greatly handicap—well, it would throw the whole program into a state of confusion.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY].

The amendment was rejected.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 19, lines 13 and 14, strike out "Any member of the inactive or volunteer Reserve" and insert the following: "Any member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces"; and before the period in line 25, insert the following: "; and any person so released from active duty shall at the time of such release be permitted to resign from the Reserve component of which he is a member."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complex about this amendment. The first provision simply takes in the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

The second provision of my amendment permits these veteran reserves only, you understand, who have been released after 12 months of service to resign. The bill provides that the veteran reserves may be released after 12 months' service, but neither the committee bill nor the Barden amendment——

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. So the Committee can understand, the Committee's provision applies to the inactive or volunteer reserves. The gentleman's amendment includes all reservists which would include the National Guard; and, therefore, the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that over some four or five hundred thousand would be immediately subject to fall within the purview of the gentleman's amendment and be relieved from duty within 1 year. Is not that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment would practically destroy the Army that is in the field today, because it orders by statute that at least four or five hundred thousand would have to immediately come out, and you would find yourself in this kind of position—

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me how many are going to be released under the provisions of his bill?

Mr. VINSON. Under the provisions of the House bill, 233,000; and we confine it only to the inactive and volunteer reserves. The gentleman goes one step further and makes it applicable to the National Guard and organized reserves; in other words, his amendment would emasculate the calling of the reserves into the service.

Mr. GROSS. No; my amendment does not do anything of the kind. You release these men; you say "release;" I say "resign" because you do not go ahead and amend the basic law by which the President within 24 hours could call back these veteran reserves into the service. If you say what you mean and if you mean what you say you will permit these veteran reserves to resign so the President cannot reach out and grab them within 24 hours, a week, or a month after you have released them from service. I am going to try to keep any promise made here with these reservists. You say they have been punished; you say thay have been the victims of injustice. Then why do you not permit them to resign? I am not forgetting that a whole lot has happened in the last few hours. The President has snuffed out the military career of General MacArthur. And unless the provisions of my amendment are enacted, the President could, in a few hours, snuff out the civilian careers of veteran reservists who had been released after 12 months' of active duty by recalling them again.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman raised a question the other day in debate, and a very pertinent one, that after he had been relieved he could be called back. I grant the gentleman that is correct. So when we get back to the committee bill there will be offered an amendment in line with what the gentleman has already said; but the gentleman in this amendment is going entirely too far because he is making it applicable to the entire Reserve organization of the Army.

Mr. GROSS. If the Reserves and the National Guard have been in active service for 12 months why should they be discriminated against?

Mr. VINSON. They belonged to an organized unit and have been paid. Those who serve in inactive units are not paid.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I must confess I am not quite sure I understand the effect of the gentleman's amendment. If the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has within his knowledge information of the type of amendment that should be attached to the bill I would think the proper and fair thing would be to offer it to this substitute because there is a very strong possibility the gentleman will not get back to his bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is just building up useless hopes.

Mr. BARDEN. Maybe I am, but I honestly and frankly ask the gentleman, he being in possession of the type of information he thinks should go into this bill, if he will not offer it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman has a workable and necessary amendment to the Barden amendment, then in all fairness to the House it should be offered at this time and the House given an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. VINSON. May I say that the gentleman from Iowa the other day raised a very pertinent question in regard to the Reserves. He said a reservist could be relieved after 12 months and could be called back immediately. Technically speaking, that is absolutely accurate and the gentleman was correct. The proposal that I shall offer will fix it so that cannot be done within 30 days after he leaves the service, or for more than 30 days.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. He cannot be recalled for more than a period of 30 days, except in case of war or national emergency.

Mr. GROSS. He is released only for 30 days?

Mr. VINSON. No, no. He cannot be called back in excess of 30 days except in case of war or national emergency.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. If the hearings before the committee have justified that proposal and it is acceptable to the committee and the gentleman will accept that as a substitute for his amendment, then insofar as I am capable of doing, I will approve the gentleman's acceptance of this and will follow along that channel.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to accept it if it will be offered as an amendment to the Barden amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman can accept this and offer it as a substitute for his amendment.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will restrict his other part of the amendment, then I will be glad for the gentleman to offer this to the Barden bill or to the committee bill, which does the right and proper thing. After a reservist has been relieved, after 12 months, he cannot be called back for a longer period than 30 days except in case of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. The gentleman is in error when he goes as far as his amendment does because it completely destroys the Organized Reserves and the National Guard.

Mr. GROSS. I will accept that amendment, although I do not agree that my original amendment would destroy the Reserves or National Guard. They could serve for 12 months on active duty.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman would not want to go as far as his amendment goes for the reason some of these reservists perhaps are looking toward retirement, for instance. Under Public Law 810 after 20 years of service he is entitled to some sort of retirement. Some may want to go through on that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman's amendment might go so far as to preclude a reservist who is anxious to stay in until he is eligible for retirement under Public Law 810 in order to accomplish the benefits that he has been looking forward to for a long, long time.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that nothing in my amendment precludes them from continuing in the Reserves if they want to. It is not mandatory that they resign. I say again that my original amendment, and the substitute which I am now prepared to offer, is designed simply to prevent President Truman or any other President from yanking veteran reserves, with 12 months of active duty, back into the service for light and transient reasons. No one can deny that reservists, during past months, have been the victims of shameful and intolerable treatment. It is to help put an end to this that I have taken the floor this afternoon.

I appreciate the fairness and cooperation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in connection with the amendment which I trust will now be adopted.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say further that the amendment which the chairman proposes is an amendment which will accomplish the results that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 19, line 25, after the word "duty", strike out the period and add the following: "and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter to be declared by the Congress."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned and as far as the Members sitting at the table are concerned, we accept the amendment, because the amendment is right and proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the Barden amendments.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, those Members of Congress who yesterday predicted that there would be great rejoicing among the Communists and those persons who follow the Communist line, did not have to wait long for confirmation of those comments.

I hold in my hand a copy of today's edition of the Daily Worker. I shall quote two or three paragraphs from this front-page editorial which bear out the fact that those Members who made such predictions knew what they were talking about.

Under this 72-point heading "Now end the war," this editorial from this Communist Party periodical reads:

A tremendous feeling of gratification will be felt all over the Nation today that the war-hungry General MacArthur who called openly for world war III has been fired by the Government. With the firing of this arrogant militarist, the peace camp of the world has won an important gain which opens up very great opportunities to advance the cause of peace. MacArthur is out. Now the war in Korea must be ditched as well.

Then further on in the editorial there appears this paragraph:

All Americans who rejoice today that the war-incendiary MacArthur is out owe it to themselves to put enormous public pressure on the Government to negotiate for peace in Asia with China, and for peace in Europe with the Soviet Union.

Further on in the editorial it says:

Common sense and the national interest demand that President Truman return Formosa to its rightful owner, China; that a cease fire in Korea be immediately established with negotiations for the rapid withdrawal of all non-Korean forces leaving the Korean people to decide their own destiny. China must be admitted to the UN.

Then on page 3 there is a comment by William Z. Foster, general chairman of the Communist Party. Under the heading "Good riddance to MacArthur," Foster says:

The forced retirement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his position as mikado and general imperialist dictator in the Far East will be welcomed with a sense of relief over the world. MacArthur's whole course, especially since the outbreak of the war in Korea, has been to spread the war in Asia and thus precipitate a third world war. His steps in this direction have been bold, brazen, and unmistakable.

Then in conclusion Foster writes:

Good riddance to MacArthur. All peace-loving people may well rejoice at his being fired. But if his displacement is to be made into a real step toward peace, this can be done only by sailing into the Hoovers, Tafts, McCarthys, and Knowlands, who are backing him, and especially by defeating the militaristic plans of the even larger menace of war represented by the Truman administration itself.

Now I recall that Mr. Truman, in his radio address to the Nation last night, expressed the hope and belief that a peaceful settlement of the Korean War may still be possible with the Communists. There is every indication, Mr. Chairman, that we are heading for that kind of a settlement in an effort to extract Mr. Truman from the very difficult situation in which he finds himself and the Nation today as the result of his war in Korea. I fear the peaceful settlement he hopes for will have to be made on the terms laid down by the Communists in their Daily Worker today. It appears to me that the Communist peace offensive is likely to succeed.

While listening to President Truman last night I wondered if we have not already lost the war by the discharge of General MacArthur; that the lives of some 9,000 or 10,000 American boys, not to speak of 50,000 other American casualties, have not been lost in vain.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman left out one line in the editorial, and that

is that the peace terms would be dictated by the Kremlin.

Mr. SHAFER. I did not read that.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is it not true, as the gentleman has so eloquently pointed out, that this is in line with the phony and infamous peace offensive of Russia, and also with the recent recommendations of the British Foreign Office that we turn Formosa over to the Chinese Reds and take the Reds into the United Nations?

Mr. SHAFER. That is true. It was not over 3 weeks ago they made those recommendations.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman highly on bringing this to the attention of the House at this time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE to the Barden amendment: On page 3, strike out all of lines 17 through 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Within the limits of the over-all military manpower needs of the United States and not withstanding any other provision of law any person whether a citizen of the United States or of any friendly nation and any national of Western Germany or Japan who meets all the other qualifications for service in the Armed Forces of the United States and who is determined by the Armed Forces of the United States to be attached to the principles of freedom and democracy shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"The terms of service and grade, commissioned or enlisted, for persons not citizens of the United States and accepted for enlistment under this section shall be in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the President: *Provided, however,* That no such person not a citizen of the United States shall be given a grade higher than that of captain or its equivalent.

"*Provided further,* That no veterans' benefits as now or as may be hereafter provided by the laws of the United States shall accrue to any enlistee or officer not a citizen of the United States and accepted under the provisions of this section; nor shall any such enlistee or officer acquire any special rights or preference in connection with the attainment of United States citizenship by reason of the service authorized herein."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we are faced today with the responsibility of securing for the Armed Forces of the United States a substantial amount of manpower. Traditionally we have sought that manpower from among the young men of the Nation whose welfare they defended. We must continue to rely upon the young men of America as the backbone of our national defense, although today our Armed Forces are committed to the defenses not only of the United States but of the entire free world. It seems to me that it would be a tragic and an unfair thing indeed if we were to close our eyes to the fact that there are other and very substantial sources of manpower within the free world outside of the United States. These men of other lands are well able to contribute to the defense of freedom throughout the world. They should be given the opportunity to do so. In fact, it seems to me that they owe the same obligation that our boys owe.

I cannot find it in my heart to say that we must confine all of the sacrifice to American boys. American boys are going to do their part as they always have, but we should not call upon American boys to make all of the sacrifices. We can compel our own boys to serve in the defense of world peace. We are, in fact, doing so by this very bill. It is true that we cannot compel a boy in Western Germany, or in Japan to join in the defense of the same freedom for which we draft Americans, but his country, his freedom, is involved no less than that of the American boy we draft.

We cannot draft this foreign boy, but we can offer him a job. We can say to him that if he wants to join with our own boys in the defense of his home as well as ours, that we will pay him well. Any time it is possible to spend American dollars to save American lives, I feel that we should spend the dollars. If we fail to take advantage of the opportunity to share the sacrifices required by this bill with other beneficiaries of American protection, then may it not be that the blood of American boys will be upon us.

I think that here this afternoon we have the opportunity to save American lives. How many, I do not know. But if it is but the life of one American boy, we should make the effort to save that life. We have the opportunity to secure enlistments in many parts of the world. Certainly, those of you who have visited Germany know there are no better jobs in that war ravaged country than in the American Army. Those of you who have visited Japan know that the Japanese cannot expect to receive any kind of job which would give them anywhere near the income or the opportunity which service in the American Armed Forces would give him. I anticipate if we make this offer we can secure, if we so desire, probably a million men in Europe and another million men in Asia to serve in the American Army under American officers to carry out an American program. When we do that we avoid the problem of leadership at the hands of leaders of questionable ability or purpose. We then have American control over those men. Certainly we may not be able to displace a million American boys by using a million foreigners. I do not think we can. But if we can displace one American boy by using three foreigners, would it not be a good investment?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman have in mind, for example, the Nationalists in Formosa?

Mr. POAGE. I think we could probably enlist a large part of the present Nationalist army under the American flag, under American command. The only question which has been raised with respect to these troops is as to their leadership. Certainly nobody questions that there are hard, tough fighters in Formosa. But let us put them under American leadership. Let us put them where they can do the job for America without any question of some leader selling out. This bill provides that we will not give any higher rating than a captaincy to any of these foreign nationals. It also makes it absolutely clear that no one will ever receive American citizenship as a result of such service. I do not propose to bribe anybody by offering them American citizenship. But I do propose simply to say if they want to draw the pay of an American soldier, they should enlist in the American Army, and if they do the job, they will get the pay. And, incidentally, it is going to cost far less to maintain a division of Germans in Germany, or a division of Japanese in Japan than it costs to maintain a division of Americans in either country, or at home in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I anticipate that the opponents of your amendment will charge that this is a radical departure from the American tradition. At the same time, they propose that we depart very definitely from that tradition by the imposition of universal military training as written by the Pentagon. I can see no objection whatsoever to your amendment.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I think everyone who is interested in saving the lives of American boys by the use of American dollars will be willing to put up the dollars to pay for foreign troops and use them under American command in the American Army. This amendment does just that.

Are we really interested in building a strong, effective, military force for use in all parts of the world, just as quickly and as cheaply as we can, or are we more interested in imposing some system of military control over our own people? Unless the opponents of this amendment can show that it would not supply the needed troops, or that its cost would be out of line, I submit that they have no right to object to it on one hand, and insist on drafting American boys to protect the homes of foreigners, on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. If you do what the gentleman's amendment proposes, you will do something that in all probability will put the Army in very poor shape. It will get the Army so confused and so saturated with thousands upon thousands of people who would be in there only for the purpose of getting $90 a month, food, and clothing, and not with a real patriotic spirit.

This same question was propounded to General Eisenhower when he was before our committee. The general said while he was a great believer in the French Foreign Legion, he did not want anything like this in the American Army.

You will make one the worst mistakes that the Congress could possibly make if you open up the enlistment of all nationals in the world to the American Army.

In order to put the amendment into operation, you would have to establish induction centers all over the world, because it provides that thousands of allied nationals would "be provided an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service."

The Congress is a pretty levelheaded body. It is very realistic. When we reach the day in the history of this great Republic of ours that Americans will not fight and serve in the Army, then the doom of the Republic is sealed. Let us have an American Army, imbued with the American spirit. What do you want? Do you want an Army of potential DP's? That is what this amendment does.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. No. I will not yield. I will not trespass on the time of the House any more to talk about building an army for the defense of our liberties upon such a broken reed as would be presented by the enlistment of thousands upon thousands of future DP's in America.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Following line 11, page 21, insert a new subsection as follows:

"SEC. 5. No person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the confines of or within a reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training, or mobilization place which is being used at the time for military purposes; but the Secretary of Defense may make regulations permitting the sale and use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I am just not quite sure of my position on the matter at this time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a simple one, but it is one that is extremely important. The amendment provides that no intoxicating liquor shall be sold in and around military training camps and that the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to carry out the provisions of the act. One provision not far different was included during World War I; so it is not absolutely new. That measure was declared to apply only to the Army.

This applies to all of the Armed Forces. This amendment is for the protection of the men in the Armed Forces, not only for them as individuals but to protect them in their physical and mental abilities, if you will, to make them better men, better trained and qualified men in the Armed Forces of our country.

This amendment is very similar to a proposal by the universal military training and service group appointed by the President, including such men as Joseph E. Davies, Truman K. Gibson, Daniel A. Polling, Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, Charles E. Wilson, and Carl T. Compton, chairman of that committee.

I call your attention to a statement that General Marshall made some 2 years ago with respect to the proposal we have before us, and I quote from him as Secretary of State when he said, discussing this very problem here:

We have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army, not to mention the responsibility of the War Department to develop an army of the highest quality. This situation must be brought under control, because it is growing serious.

General Marshall has been quoted many times with respect to various provisions of this legislation presently under consideration. That is what he said with respect to this problem when the question of the sale of intoxicating liquor was under consideration back in 1948 when a similar problem was under consideration on the floor of the House.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman for introducing this amendment and to say that I think it will do more to strengthen the Armed Forces of America than anything we can do.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and especially his interest in this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this committee.

Mr. VINSON. Is it not true that the only place on a military reservation where anyone can get a drink—that is, beer, ale, whisky—is in the officers' clubs or noncommissioned officers' clubs? That is what the gentleman is driving at, but you cannot accomplish it under this amendment because this amendment would not reach that at all.

I grant you that when we get down to the question of writing the plan for the inductees for training, it will be highly proper and important that there be safeguards thrown around the inductees who are brought in for training; and, of course, Congress will see that that is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then I may say to the distinguished chairman, if this or similar legislation ought to be approved for inductees, and I hope at the proper time it will be done, the same principle should certainly apply to those under the training act he proposes, then it ought to apply to all members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment in actual application would be that a boy would have to leave camp to get his liquor. That cannot be dealt with by the gentleman's amendment. The only place in the camp where liquor is available is in the officers' and noncommissioned officers' clubs and that liquor they buy and keep there themselves. Most of the enlisted men will not have the privilege of participating in the noncommissioned officers' club, so you are going to send them downtown.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The intent of this amendment is to at least prevent the use and sale of intoxicating liquors in and within a reasonable distance of training camps. Of course, if the serviceman is away on leave, the amendment does not protect him against the use of liquor, but it would, if enforced, keep it away from him within the camps and at a reasonable distance therefrom.

Mr. Chairman, the last thing we want is for these boys to be confronted with a temptation that will dull the edges of sensation. Most boys going into the Armed Forces are not drinkers. No one has contended or suggested that liquor will be helpful to them in any respect. I believe, further, anyone who has used alcohol excessively, will tell you it is an enemy that steals away a man's brains. Certainly, the Armed Forces is not the place for men who become addicted to excessive use of alcoholic beverages.

Very unfortunately, we have a few people in this country who, for selfish interests and profits, would, as Dr. Hammaker has well said:

Shut their eyes to the desolation and ruin that may come to many a soldier boy in 21 or 27 months.

It is our job and our responsibility to defend these boys against that sort of thing insofar as we can do so. Let us see to it that men in uniform will find it difficult rather than easy to take on a thing that is bound to do them harm and at the same time make them less valuable as members of the Armed Forces.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

(Mr. BARDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would not at this time attempt to say how far the gentleman's amendment goes. I do say that to throw it into the hopper now when the armed services and the camps I have attended are handling the situation much better than the civilian authorities away from the camp handle it, and they have a way of handling the men in the camp. I have

never seen anything administered any better than this situation administered in certain of the camps, the marine camps and so forth. I do not know how far overseas this would reach. I do not know how it would fit into the military set-up. I understand that the Canteen Act of 1901 is still in effect which regulates that and is Federal law. I hope we will not not do anything here that will throw confusion into the present administration of the Army camps. They are progressing very well. I am not going to come down here and argue for the sale of liquor for nothing good can be said about it or for debauchery of the men, but I do feel it is very unwise to try to tinker with the internal workings of a military camp for which the commanding officer is responsible. If the internal workings of a camp, and if the personnel are not handled correctly, the proper thing to do is to change the commanding officer. I know this has some public appeal. As to the question of working on it, when we get to the so-called Universal Military Training Act, which I think will be some time next year instead of 6 months and 45 days from now, it will be wise for us to call up and get some advice from those who have been on the line and who have handled the situation. I think likewise the Committee on Education should be given a job to do with reference to working with and coordinating in the preparation of the so-called universal military training bill. I am reluctant to throw any more confusion into the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have enough confusion in America today. It is time for this House now to make up its mind to adopt the substitute I have offered, which is a straight outright draft bill, adopt it unanimously and let it go out to the people of America that at least the United States House of Representatives is in harmony and wants to promote harmony and is in accord on this very vital and immediately necessary piece of national defense legislation. I do hope that the gentleman will not prevail in this amendment. I understand it has been discussed before the Committee on Armed Services. I understand that the military men have seen some difficulties with this very problem, and so far as I am concerned I do not think we should on the spur of the moment take any ill-advised or on the spur-of-the-moment action on an apparently harmless looking amendment that might do us some harm. Let us see if we cannot keep this out. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's very high objectives. The gentleman is prompted by the highest motives, and so am I, but I am not so sure that this is not one of those things that looks so nice on the outside but may have a very disturbing and a bad effect in the handling and the administration of the camps.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman calls attention that this might add to confusion. I agree with him that we have too much confusion in this country already, but it seems to me that this is one place where we can avoid a lot of confusion by just laying the thing on the line and then saying to the Secretary of Defense, "Now, you are the one who is to carry out these proposals."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say this. I do not think the gentleman is in possession of anything indicative of the fact that this provision is greatly needed. I have not been aware of any demand for this kind of legislation, and for that reason I do think that we had better settle down a little bit. I think to drag in this and to drag in the so-called universal military training that you are reaching ahead for trouble to bring in and wrestle with for the next year or two. Let us deal with the problems we now have confronting us. Let us let the American people at least settle back in their seats for a moment. I tell you they are worried, because they love their country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. With respect to the law of 1901, the difficulty with that is that we had a decision with regard to the Tax Act. They mixed the thing up with respect to what was intoxicating liquor.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know what was on the books.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This will straighten that out.

Mr. BARDEN. I will pay my compliments to the commanding officers of the camps. They are doing a better job than we are doing as civilians on the outside, and they have the discipline, and they have the respect of the men in the camps. I am very reluctant to advocate that we attempt to reach inside of the gates of their camps and begin to go into the detailed management of the camps when no justification has been brought forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to the Barden amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that we are going to settle today or for many days to come the question of whether President Truman should fire General MacArthur or whether General MacArthur should fire President Truman. But we are going to settle today or tomorrow the question of this draft bill, and I rise in support of the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, had the vote on this bill been taken last November or December or even in January, when American forces in Korea were in dire peril, when there was fear that we would be thrown out of Korea with a loss of untold American lives, when we knew not where trouble would strike next, there would have been no question about the outcome of the vote on this bill. But today America is confident. The threat of a general war, America thinks, is over, at least for the moment, and when America is confident, America is complacent.

Now, what are the grounds for complacency? Are there grounds, Mr. Chairman, for complacency in Korea? At best we are only approaching a stalemate in Korea. We are not out of danger in Korea. At a cost of 58,000 casualties, we have driven the Reds out of South Korea, but they are still poised above the thirty-eighth parallel, possibly in greater strength than they have ever amassed before. That is all we have done in Korea.

Are there grounds for complacency in Western Europe? We have an alliance in Western Europe for our protection and their protection, but it is a paper alliance, an alliance in name only. We are but little stronger in fact at this moment in Western Europe than we were last June when the Reds struck in Korea.

Communism is a continuing effort, and for how long it will threaten no man cay say. We have no agreement with Russia or China on peace. We do not even have an agreement that the foreign ministers can meet to talk of peace.

Then where are the grounds for complacency which would make it possible safely to water down this bill? Pass this bill and we may have some slight grounds for complacency, because we will be providing additional machinery for strength, and strength, Mr. Chairman, is the only thing that is heeded in world politics in this day.

I do not make idle talk. We have never before had half the world allied against us, and never before have we been so completely dependent upon our own strength for our security.

Mr. Chairman, approval of this bill, with what, of course, is an unprecented proposal, a proposal for universal military training, may save, certainly it is is going to help to save, many times 58,000 casualties in the years to come. I hope the committee will approve the bill as it now is before us.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I oppose the amendment offered by my own chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

There has been much effort of late by many people in and out of Congress to ridicule our military leaders. It has been an open season on the so-called brass. You see articles in Look magazine and in the Saturday Evening Post and other national magazines, endeavoring to tell the American people that the American soldier is an inferior soldier and that our military organization is not sufficient for national defense. There is a great deal of concern, as I have noted in the debate on this manpower bill, by many Members of the House that by the pas-

sage of this legislation we will become a militaristic country, and that allowing military leaders to make military decisions, would eventually lead to a dictatorship. To be candid with you, I am not afraid one iota of this country becoming a military dictatorship. As a matter of fact, I do not agree with the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] that if we pass this bill and had a five-star general in the White House, we should hang on to our hats. The events in recent hours have led me to believe that we would be much better off if we did have a five-star general in the White House. History has dramatically pointed out to us that it is not our military leaders who have fostered war upon us, but rather it is the people in the field of diplomacy who commit us to war without knowing the military significance of their actions. We can look at Korea as an example. We were committed to war in Korea not by our military leaders making a military decision, but we were committed to war in Korea because of a diplomatic decision reached by our so-called diplomats who had no comprehension of the military situation that they were getting us into. Yes, the diplomats put us into war in Korea without our being prepared for a military operation of that kind. The Secretary of State previously had stated Korea was out of our defense perimeter. The same Secretary of State prevailed upon the President and committed us to a military operation and then immediately threw the handcuffs and straitjacket on our military leaders so that they could not win the war which they were committed to fight.

So I say to you I am not fearful of our military leaders making military decisions, but I am fearful of military decisions being made by our State Department following the lead of the British Government.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Would the gentleman agree with the statement made by Harold Ickes that "Wars are the result of stupid statesmanship"? I notice that Mr. Ickes did not say anything about stupid generalship. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. POTTER. I agree with that statement. I certainly do.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much concern over the so-called universal military training features of this bill. I personally am sorry and regret that the committee did not bring us a universal military training bill. But I am going to support the committee's position, hoping that the committee will take the recommendations of this commission and then work its will within the committee and then allow the Congress to work its will to write a military training bill.

I am just old-fashioned enough to sincerely believe that citizenship requires, as one of its responsibilities, the duty to be ready to defend our country when we are needed. That duty to defend your country does not apply to just a few of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, that does not mean that a few people, or a certain portion of our citizenship should be left out to take lucrative positions and then allow the poor boy and allow the boy without influence to do the fighting and assume the responsibility of the defense of his country for the entire group. Military training is a responsibility inherent upon each individual citizen. Because we are equal in citizenship it is the duty and responsibility of each individual to be trained in order to be in a position to defend his country when that defense is needed.

There are many things I would like to see carried out in our military program. If we adopt a program of universal military training, I am hopeful that if world conditions do not worsen we will be able to cut down our standing army. I am disappointed that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] did not prevail. We cannot cut down the size of our standing army if we continue to send troops to every corner of the earth. It does no good to have troops for the Organized Reserves if you are going to have large forces of troops in being. So I hope that we will do everything possible to try to build up a large, strong reserve which will be the backbone of our military program, and which will allow us to keep our standing force at the very, very minimum. If that is not accomplished, then all this talk about a UMT program is of no avail.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he just stated it was his judgment that he would not hesitate to leave very grave and perplexing questions of diplomacy to military men. I understood him correctly?

Mr. POTTER. I said military questions.

Mr. JONAS. How does he reconcile that situation with the present dismissal of General MacArthur?

Mr. POTTER. I think it is one of the most tragic things that has happened to America. It is not General MacArthur whom I am concerned about, but it is the men who are fighting in Korea who have been stabbed in the back. Let me tell you why they were stabbed in the back. General MacArthur was relieved because he could not condone a military operation that had no declared objective—a policy to kill and be killed, with no declared objective. That is the present policy in Korea. General MacArthur in an effort to carry out his military job of winning the war was dismissed. The men fighting in Korea are left with little hope that they will ever know for what they are fighting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has expired.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one or two words in support of the committee bill now pending. First of all, I would like to make it quite clear that I do not like a peacetime draft for UMT any more than some of the other Members. However, I feel that we have no choice, in view of world conditions. I might say that I was not in favor of the bill as originally offered, but I believe that the present bill, as amended, contains ample safeguards.

It has been suggested by some that should we adopt a policy of universal military training, such a step would lead toward war. It has been argued that universal military training in countries abroad did not prevent war. I think it might also be argued that the lack of universal military training did not prevent war.

Another objection to universal military training is that it would build up a military clique in this country which would be extremely damaging. Unfortunately, I cannot concur in that belief. Such might be possible if we had an extremely large Regular Establishment, but this particular bill is designed to make it possible to reduce our standing Army.

It has been suggested that with such forces under the control of the military that they, the military, would be anxious to employ them. I think such suggestions are entirely unwarranted, and I believe that any man, whether he be a professional soldier or not, who has seen the horrors of war, would do everything possible to prevent its recurrence. One fact that I think has been overlooked is that the Regulars also have sons who are subject to call. It is regrettable that world conditions are such that make this step necessary, but we must face the facts as they exist today. Let us have no wishful thinking or play upon intentions as far as Russia is concerned. As long as she is capable through her armed might of committing aggressive acts, we, in turn, must be capable of defending ourselves.

In conclusion, I might make my position clear. Should a bill eventually be presented which, in my judgment, is not sound, I will oppose it. To enact an unsound program of military training would give us a sense of false security.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Do I understand the gentleman from Maryland to say that he is for the bill known as S. 1?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And against the Barden amendment?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is quite correct.

(Mr. DENNY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are five amendments at the Clerk's desk. I am wondering if we can reach an agreement as to limitation of debate. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close and that we have a vote at 4:30 o'clock. This would give ample time to dispose of all amendments that are on the desk and allow free debate on the Barden substitute. That would be an hour and 35 minutes from now that we would have a vote on the Barden substitute.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that is just the Barden substitute and the amendments to the substitute?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state the request. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close not later than 4:30 p. m.

Is there objection?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will those who wish to be heard stand in order that we may know how much time is needed?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask that debate close at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close not later than 5 o'clock p. m.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the large number of Members standing can the Chair advise us how much time will be allotted to each?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can see how many Members are standing and he knows when 5 o'clock is.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

(Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the pending bill and I intend to vote for universal military training, whether we vote on it separately or whether it is voted on in conjunction with the selective-service extension.

I am willing to stand up and be counted.

I have had some telegrams and letters—not many, just a handful—requesting that I support a separate vote on UMT. I have told these people I would support such a proposal because of my willingness to stand up and be counted on this particular issue. I may have to go back on my word to these correspondents, because I see the move to separate the two phases of this bill as a part of a move to defeat UMT. That, I believe, would be fatal.

Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have felt that universal military training was absolutely necessary for the security of our Nation. I believe that until all threat of aggression is removed from the world we must have universal military training.

I do not hold with the argument that it is a step toward military rule in the United States. I know of no groups more opposed to military rule than the veterans of World War I and World War II. I believe that under UMT the trainees returning to civilian status, having lived under military discipline, will cherish the freedoms of civilian rule to a greater extent than those who have never experienced military discipline.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my stand on this issue will not meet with the approval of a group whose support I have enjoyed through the years—the United Mine Workers of America. While I understand their position and their fear of military government, I believe, as I have already said, these fears to be unfounded.

I am pleased, however, to know that in supporting UMT, I shall be voicing the sentiments of the majority of voters in my congressional district. I am conducting a poll of public opinion. I have mailed questionnaires to every sixtieth name appearing on the voting lists in each of the seven counties comprising my district. My sampling hits the proper ratio of Republicans and Democrats in the district. When the questionnaires are all in, I shall make and present to the House a detailed tabulation of the results. But because of the pending legislation, I have had a running check made of answers to questions affecting military manpower.

Mr. Chairman, on the question "Do you favor universal military training," requiring a straight yes or no answer, as of this morning, with about three-fourths of the replies received, 81 percent of the voters in my district favor UMT.

That is an overwhelming percentage in favor. Only 13 percent have voted "no." Six percent either do not know or did not answer that particular question.

The preliminary, running tabulation, shows 74 percent of the voters favor an 18-year-old draft and 55 percent believe we require full mobilization.

Mr. Chairman, I believe these trends to be most significant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Members on both sides of the aisle, no matter what their views may be on the pending bill or any of the amendments thereto, for the very effective debate that has been engaged in to date, a debate that has been on the very highest level consistent with the great traditions of past Congresses.

Each and every one of us respects the views of other Members. The motives of no Member are impugned because, unlike legislative bodies of other countries where there is a powerful infiltration of Communists and Communist influence, each and every Member of the United States Congress, no matter how much they may disagree on this or that question, are over and above everything else loyal and true Americans. In our disagreement we disgrace as Americans. We have no individuals or groups having sinister thoughts, with responsibility to some foreign government the intent and purpose of which is to dominate the world and enslave all peoples if it can accomplish its objective.

The committee has worked hard under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia, one of our great Americans, not only of today but of his entire service in this body. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has brought here a bill that is the basis for consideration today. It has been a hard and a difficult task. The bill represents the best progress we can make at this time.

If I were to express any criticism, and I do not, I would say that the bill in relation to UMT, so far as I am concerned, does not go far enough. But that is no criticism. I am supporting the bill as reported by the committee and I shall support the bill as amended by the committee. The issue today will be the substitute offered by the very distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] to the committee bill as amended, the straight issue being whether or not we are going to have anything in the bill relating to UMT no matter how thin those provisions might be.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the sincerity of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] in offering his substitute, as I always do in any position he takes, though disagreeing with him in this instance. I hope his substitute will not be adopted.

To those Members who in theory are opposed to UMT, may I say that I recognize the thoughts that go through your minds, because the same thoughts have gone through my mind. I recognize the theoretical aspects and the theoretical considerations involved because I have had to give thought in my own mind for some years those influences and those considerations. To advocate the casting aside of those influences that exist in those Members' minds with just some sharp language would be unfair, because I am aware of those influences. I respectfully submit, having lived through the considerations that undoubtedly have entered your minds and which are in your minds now, yet retaining them in theory, you can justifiably vote to keep the UMT provisions in this bill, recognizing the practical situation that confronts us today. The law of self preservation is the first law of nature. It applies to nations the same as it applies to you and me as individual human beings. When sudden dangers confront us we have to respond to whatever it might be; not respond in the normal way, but in an abnormal way, and defense of our country is the primary duty of our Government.

I respectfully submit, my colleagues, viewing the world today and this question in the practical light that we should and must, and with all respect for my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BARDEN, and for his honesty in offering his amendment, that we should not take a chance today from a practical angle. We should reject his amendment and vote for the committee bill as amended, because that represents the strong side, psychologically important, in the world today.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin to the Barden amendment: Page 3, line 22, after subsection (d) of section 1 insert a new subsection, as follows:

Paragraph 3 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"No person shall be inducted for training and service under this title into any branch of the Armed Forces which restricts or limits the rights of its members to communicate directly with Members of Congress unless such communication is in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the Armed Forces."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reading of the amendment makes its purpose clear.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Is it the purpose to permit any man who is inducted to sit down and take a pencil and paper and write to his Congressman or Senator?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. Is there anything now in the law that prohibits him from doing that?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is. I was surprised to find out, and I was just going to say to the Members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that I never realized that there might be a need for such an amendment until just a couple of weeks ago. At that time a young sailor who was seeking a hardship discharge because of a situation which had arisen since his entry into the service had his family write to me in regard to the situation. In an attempt to investigate the facts I wrote back to the family and asked that they contact the son and have the son write me giving further details. They advised that he had been told by his commanding officer aboard ship that a direct communication with his Congressman was prohibited and it would make him subject to court-martial. I know that the regulation is not being enforced; I know that they overlook it many times, because you and I have received letters direct from members of the naval service. But the facts of the matter are that there should be no such prohibition; there should be no such regulation.

Mr. VINSON. The regulation that the gentleman has reference to is that no man in the armed services or in the Navy can write to a Congressman or a Senator with reference to legislation except through channels. It has no reference to writing anything about service. It is just to prohibit him from becoming a lobbyist, I might say, to influence Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I admire the chairman of this committee and I acknowledge him as a great authority on the subject. However, I think in this instance he is laboring under the same impression that I have always labored under until I inquired into the subject and received a letter from the Department of the Navy dated March 13, 1951. I now quote one paragraph of that letter. I will seek permission when we go into the House to insert the whole letter, together with another letter which I received from the Army and also a letter from the Air Corps.

In this letter from the Department of the Navy dated March 13 there is this paragraph:

Accordingly, in the light of the above-quoted articles 1248 and 1249 it appears that any letter from a member of the naval service to Congress or to a Congressman which affects the Naval Establishment should be sent through official channels.

You will note that the regulations relate not just to communications dealing with legislation which affects the naval establishment, it covers communications concerning anything related to the Navy, and it requires that they be sent through official channels.

I will admit, Mr. Chairman, that there is no restriction on their right to send communications through channels, but anybody knows that that certainly is a restriction in and of itself.

I want to make it perfectly clear while I have the floor that no such regulations exist as far as the Air Force and the Army are concerned. They take what I think is a very reasonable attitude. But the Navy at the present time is not taking a reasonable attitude, and I use this occasion to point it out in the hope that it will correct the situation.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman that there is no induction in the Navy. However, I think the gentleman's amendment is all right, and as far as I am personally concerned I have no objection to it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman and under the circumstances I will not argue the point further. I would like, however, to include the letters from the Army, Navy, and Air Corps at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, March 13, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BYRNES: This is in reply to your letter of February 26, 1951, requesting an interpretation of articles 1248 and 1249, Navy Regulations (1948).

In an opinion dated April 7, 1950, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with reference to articles 1248 and 1249, Navy Regulations (1948) stated in conclusion:

"The provisions of the above-quoted articles 1248 and 1249 would seem to be sufficiently broad to cover any communication intended or designed to influence Congress or a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriations affecting the Naval Establishment, whether pending, proposed, or suggested. Hence, in every case where a person in the naval service desires to send a communication to Congress, or a Member of Congress, the question to be answered by such person is whether his communication concerns legislation or appropriations relating to the Naval Establishment. Such a determination is made by the member of the naval forces at his own risk. If he has any doubt as to whether his proposed letter relates to the Naval Establishment, he should send it via the Secretary of the Navy.

"Accordingly, in the light of the above-quoted articles 1248 and 1249, it appears that any letter from a member of the naval service, to Congress or to a Congressman which affects the Naval Establishment, should be sent through official channels."

I consider this to be the correct interpretation of these articles. You will agree, I am sure, to the basic administrative policy on which these articles are based: That the Department of the Navy should at all times be advised as to all matters relating to the Naval Establishment. These articles are not intended to prohibit correspondence between naval personnel and their Congressmen. Whenever correspondence addressed to a Congressman is sent via the Secretary of the Navy, it is, as a matter of policy, forwarded promptly.

Your inquiry in this regard is appreciated and your letter is being further referred to the Chief of Naval Operations for study of your suggestion that the articles might be clarified.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS.

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,
*Washington 25, D. C., March 24, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. BYRNES: Reference is made to your letter to the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., wherein you ask if there are in existence any provisions which limit or restrict an officer or enlisted man from writing to Members of Congress or congressional committees. The Secretary of the Army has referred your letter to this office for appropriate action.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, there are no statutes by the Congress on such topic. The nearest approach thereto is contained in 50 United States Code 341, which, of course, is not directly in point.

The only Army regulation that has any relation to the subject inquired about appears to be Army regulations 600–10, paragraph 15, which, for your convenience, I quote, as follows:

"Legislative activities: Except as authorized by the Department of the Army, efforts by any person in the active military service of the United States or by any retired member of the Regular Army to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army Establishment or to procure personal favor through legislation, except to procure the enactment of private relief legislation, are forbidden. (Private relief legislation is legislation proposed or initiated by or on behalf of one individual for reimbursement or relief to himself or herself alone for damage or loss to his or her own person or property.)"

Arrangements have been made by the Army to provide ways and means of adjusting personal problems or grievances of individual soldiers. The company commander is required to be available for these purposes. The inspector general of every command will accept and look into complaints made by Army personnel. It is considered unnecessary for a man to feel he has to communicate with his Members of Congress in order to correct situations solely applicable to the military. However, as I have indicated, there are no regulations prohibiting such action, as it is felt it would be abridging the rights or privileges of a soldier as a citizen were he prevented from expressing his views to his elected Members of Congress.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. I trust the information I have furnished is responsive to your inquiry and unambiguous on the issues discussed.

Sincerely yours,
C. G. BLAKENEY,
*Colonel, GSC, Office; Chief of Legislative Liaison.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
*Washington, March 26, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. BYRNES: I refer to your letter of March 17, addressed to Secretary Finletter, regarding communications by servicemen with individuals outside the military service.

The Air Force has no policy or regulation prohibiting communication by its personnel with Members of Congress or other individuals not in the military service. In instances where a man is faced with a personal problem or some question concerning his military life, he is encouraged to seek the help and counsel of his commanding officer or others close at hand who can assist him, but his personal correspondence remains a matter entirely of his own choice.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. L. EATON,
*Brigadier General, USAF, Director, Legislation and Liaison.*

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCARTHY to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 19, line 25, strike out the quotation marks and insert after line 19 the following new paragraphs:

"The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from active duty (1) of members of the inactive and volunteer reserves whose occupation, employment, or other activity is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, and (2) of members of the inactive and volunteer reserves whose deferment is advisable by reason of the fact that other persons are dependent upon them for support. To the maximum extent practicable, deferments of such members shall be on the same basis as deferments under section 6 (h) of this title.

"The President is authorized to create and establish in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, one or more civilian reserve deferment appeal boards (not within the Selective Service System). Each such board shall consist of five citizens of the United States who are not members of the Armed Forces, and who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such boards shall function in the same manner and have the same powers, and the members of such boards shall receive the same compensation, as in the case of appeal boards within the Selective Service System.

"Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve may, if his claim for deferment is denied at the time he is ordered into the inactive military or naval service of the United States pursuant to the first paragraph of this section, appeal to the civilian reserve deferment appeal board for the area within which he resides, and such board shall hear and determine his claim for deferment in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the President, pursuant to the second paragraph of this section. The decisions of such boards shall be final, except that any such decision shall be subject to modification or change by the highest reviewing body of the service concerned having authority (on appeal or otherwise) to hear and determine questions or claims with respect to the deferment from active duty of members of the inactive and volunteer reserve components of such service."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, as is clear from the text, is to set up a civilian appeal board to which members of the inactive and volunteer reserves can appeal when they are called into service. Their first appeal, of course, is to the particular service which calls them. At the present time they have no appeal outside that special service, so it is a question of the Army or the Navy making a determination. This is simply to give them the same rights as draftees have, namely, to have their case reviewed by a civilian appeal board.

I think we all know that if any group was inequitably and unjustly treated in the last 6 months it was the members of the inactive and volunteer reserves. This is simply to set up an appeal board to whom they can go for a review of their case. In other words, we give them the same rights that draftees have at the present time.

I think they should have more careful consideration. This simply proposes to give them the same rights of appeal as are currently given to draftees. This is restricted to the inactive and volunteer reservists.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. In view of the fact that the boys who are drafted under this act will have to remain in the reserves for a number of years following their service, I think the gentleman's amendment is particularly in order and very apt under the circumstances.

Mr. McCARTHY. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I presume the gentleman, as I have and probably every Member of Congress, has come in contact with some of the most heartbreaking cases that we have had. Such cases are much greater in number than arose under the draft. I refer to the indiscriminate calling of the inactive reservists, both enlisted men and officers and the terrific hardships and dislocations which have resulted to those men by reason of their being called back into active service.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out that I have had exactly the same experience as my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota. I, too, have had cases of reservists who have been under the greatest pressure and who have had the greatest difficulty and their appeals have been based purely on a decision as to the military needs, without any cognizance being taken of their home or family situation. Their cases have been decided just the same as the draftees' cases have been decided.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to add that one of the chief naval personnel said, "We give consideration to these appeals." But they have no standards. They are given consideration. In other words, they may defer the man or they may not.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, it occurs to me, would have been very timely if it could have been on the statute books last summer when these situations began to arise.

I call the attention of the gentleman to a provision in the bill to require the military services to release these inactive people after 12 months of service. If that is eventually adopted, I am informally advised by one of the services that they will not call to active duty any of these inactive or volunteer reservists.

Mr. McCARTHY. I realize this comes late, but a great injustice has been done, and there is no assurance that the 12-month proposition will be enacted into law. I think this is necessary and I think it will help restore confidence in the reserve system which we need in this country.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows I have been very deeply interested in the proper handling of the reserve system. I have here a letter outlining a part of the program to be put into effect very shortly which I want to read into the RECORD when the gentleman has concluded addressing the committee.

I would like to ask him this question, however: This proposed amendment does not in fact turn over to the civilian board the matter of the release of reservists and give them full authority to work out a program of who should serve and who should not serve, does it?

Mr. McCARTHY. This commission would act only at the time the man was called up and under the same rules and regulations of the Selective Service Boards in the case of appeals of draftees. Once the man is in, this appeal board would have no authority over him.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it provides for the establishment of a board.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. May I call the attention of the gentleman, as well as the attention of the committee, to the fact that not long ago there were only 840 ad hoc boards in the Pentagon at one time. The gentleman now is seeking to make it 841 boards.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am seeking to create one in each State to take care of the problems of the inactive and volunteer reservists who have been treated unjustly, and those who may be treated unjustly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Georgia mentions that there were 840 ad hoc boards in the Pentagon. I should think the main ambition of the gentleman from Georgia would be to reduce that number so that more officers could be supplied for service.

Mr. VINSON. How can we do that when you adopt amendments and laws day after day to create more boards?

Mr. HINSHAW. The boards appointed at the Pentagon are appointed by the Military Establishment.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, but you have to have a law here which would create one more.

Mr. HINSHAW. No, these boards are appointed by the Military Establishment. This board would be appointed by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because I am unsympathetic to the problems which the gentleman has so ably presented to the committee.

I rise in opposition to it because I think he is moving at a late hour into a most complicated situation. I doubt whether it would be wise to set up, without careful consideration, boards and not know exactly what jurisdiction to give them. Such a board set-up would have the authority to decide what cases are to be deferrable and what are not deferrable. In effect, it would dispose of what is the policy of the Department of Defense, and what is the need of the Department of Defense, and all of those things.

So I rise at this time to read to you a letter. I think everybody will be interested in the letter, because it comes from the Department of Defense, setting up what this Department considers the present policy with reference to the recall of reservists. It is dated April 2, 1951.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Does that also contain a statement as to when some of these Reserves called up will be released from active duty?

Mr. BROOKS. Partially. That is covered partially in the letter.

This letter is addressed to me:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, D. C., April 2, 1951.*

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. BROOKS: In answer to your inquiry regarding the calling of inactive reserves by the various services, the following are present policies:

The Army and Air Force are no longer calling inactive enlisted Reserves to duty involuntarily and, unless there is a significant change in manpower requirements, no further recalls are contemplated. Nor are these services calling inactive officer Reserves involuntarily except in those cases of men possessing special skills not available in the pool of Organized Reserves.

Organized naval reservists ordinarily are being ordered to active service before inactive naval reservists. However, the Navy must maintain minimum key officer and enlisted personnel in organized divisions in order to continue the training and administration of its Reserve program. Inactive reservists are ordered to active service only when the organized divisions have reached the lowest practicable manning level or when the men possess critical skills not available in the Organized Reserve.

The Marine Corps has called all ground Organized Reserves. All air Organized Reserve personnel, with the exception of 10 squadrons, have been called. Current plans provide for no further call up of Organized Air Reserves. Basically all inactive Reserves, both ground and air, have been called to meet present plans. Only those few individuals whose specialties are required to fill specific billets will be called in the future.

The above policies do not affect orders already issued to inactive reservists.

In its presentation before your subcommittee, the Defense Department will cover:

1. Rotation plans of the services not already announced.

2. Phasing out programs and further recall policies respecting Reserves.

3. A long-range improved Defense Department Reserve program including the policy recommendations developed by the Civilian Components Policy Board.

As you can appreciate, the accomplishment and precise provisions of these plans and programs, and particularly of No. 3, will be dependent, to a large extent, upon the final form of the UMTS legislation and, naturally, at all times on the international situation.

As General Marshall has pointed out, our hopes and plans that we will not have to call back World War II veterans, and that we can reduce the size of the standing forces are dependent on the prompt adoption of long-range service and training legislation for the establishment of an enduring base of trained reserve manpower.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Outlined in that letter, Mr. Chairman, is the program which will be presented to the Subcommittee on Reserve Components when it begins its hearings in the very near future; and that will give you some idea, if you care to study it, as to what the Department is presently trying to do with reference to the reservists.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I am very much disappointed that the Army and Navy are seeing fit to quit calling inactive reservists and also to cut draft calls and yet not to have a more optimistic program about the release of inactive reservists who are in exactly the same category.

Mr. BROOKS. I think if the gentleman will read the letters he will find that the Defense Department said that it understood the problem of Congress in reference to inactive Reserves in service and that it wanted to proceed to release those inactive Reserves at the earliest possible moment. When we put the stipulation which we presently have in the bill, I raised the point as to whether or not that would require an inactive reservist who is a veteran to serve 12 months or whether he could be released under that stipulation before his 12-month period expired and found on studying the provision that the inactive reservist can be released, if he is a veteran, before the 12-month period is up if it is in the interest of national security to release him.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand the gentleman to say that if the provisions of the bill concerning the Reserve program as reported by the committee are adopted, within 12 months, by application an inactive reservist would be released from the service.

Mr. BROOKS. If he is a veteran, he has to come within the stipulation that he is a veteran.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true. I understand from the letter the gentleman has just read to the House that if this program as reported by the committee is adopted, according to the Defense Establishment itself and Mrs. Rosenberg's letter it will be the policy of the Department that they will not take in any more inactive reservists.

Mr. BROOKS. I would rather the gentleman read the letter himself. The gentleman has in fact read it.

Mr. HARRIS. I did read the letter, and I just ask the gentleman if I am correct in my understanding. The gentleman is a member of the committee and ought to be specific.

Mr. BROOKS. I am satisfied with that interpretation of it except in the Navy when the reservist has critical skills or when the organized division has reached the lowest practicable manning level.

May I say in conclusion that I am against the present amendment because I am not in sympathy with it, but because we are attempting to legislate too rapidly on a most complicated subject.

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will support the Barden substitute for S. 1. It is my opinion that the Barden substitute is the only bill that should be passed as it seeks only to amend the Selective Service Act and eliminates the provision in S. 1 which deals with universal military training.

I said on the floor of the House a few days ago that in view of the amendments to the universal military training bill that it was no longer a training bill as the veterans' organizations have conceived such a program for many years. It would appear therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we should legislate only on amendments to the Selective Service Act and I favor the Barden substitute as it provides for the induction of boys of 19 rather than 18½ years as contained in S. 1.

Mr. Chairman, we have now been debating this bill for more than a week. We have listened to a great deal of able argument for and against the pending measure. The views expressed have made for a solid understanding as to

just what is proposed in the measure before us. I have not as yet, however, heard any argument which would indicate that there is something more to the legislation than merely the amendment of a Selective Service Training Act or a program of universal military training.

Mr. Chairman, it should be clearly understood by all Members of this House that the military is merely an arm of foreign policy. Soldiers do not move unless in support of our foreign policies. Today that is the basic issue between General MacArthur and President Truman. The President has charged that the supreme commander in Tokyo has failed to support his foreign policies. So in considering the bill before us let it be understood that what we are actually doing is to support a bill which would induct untold millions of our American boys for purposes of combat to assist the Truman foreign policies which have been dismal and tragic failures. This legislation would impress young Americans into military service all over the world as it is doing today in Korea. Is that what Members of this House want? Is this what your constituents want? If you will think seriously on this point, I believe many of you will vote to support the Barden substitute rather than S. 1 which is sponsored by the Armed Services Committee of this House.

Mr. Chairman, last night Mr. Truman addressed the American people and he endeavored to explain his position regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur from his command in Tokio where he has done a marvelous job. He can never justify such action. Members of this House will recall that when the fighting in Korea broke out last June that Chiang Kai-shek offered to send a force of 35,000 trained fighting men to assist in holding the drive of the North Koreans. This offer was turned down by direction of President Truman and Secretary Acheson. Is it not strange that we would not accept the offer of Chiang Kai-shek to send his men? The administration saw fit to insist that American boys be sacrificed in this undeclared and terrible war in Korea and there are 70,000 casualties as of today; 9,000 of our boys have died in battle.

Mr. Chairman, there is one more point I want to stress, which is that it seems to me that our foreign policy is being dictated by the British Government. Was it not strange that on yesterday when the American people were aroused to a fighting pitch by the President's unthinkable action that the people in France and Britain were actually rejoicing and for what, I ask you? Foreign Minister Herbert Morrison had the gall to suggest when MacArthur's firing was know that the United Nations now invite the Chinese Communists to help write a peace treaty with Japan; that we now surrender Formosa to the Communists and that we negotiate peace immediately with the Chinese Communists in Korea. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] has just pointed out to the House in a news article and editorial today from the Communist Daily Worker which is parallel to the demands made by Mr. Morrison. This is nerve beyond description.

Mr. Chairman, so long as Dean Acheson is Secretary of State the British foreign office will write American foreign policy. The time has come and much too late for the President of the United States to demand his resignation in the interest of national unity.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I have a lot of boys in my district who enlisted a month or so ago. They are going to be called up in June. There is no room for these boys, yet they will not let these reservists out. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. No; I do not.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Like the gentleman from Minnesota, the sponsor of the amendment, I am very sympathetic to the cause of the reservist who is on active duty, and especially the inactive and volunteer reserve who has been called up. In considering the problem of a reservist who has been called to active duty it is well to keep in mind this point. When the reservist joined the Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps he signed his name to an application and in doing so he agreed to abide by certain rules and regulations that he understood before he affixed his signature.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point on that particular matter?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Not at the moment; I will yield later on.

The Armed Services Committee has considered this Reserve problem for many, many weeks, along with this UMT bill. We have written into this bill provisions that are designed to provide relied for the reservists. In addition to the relief provided in this bill, should it become a law, there is in existence special boards composed of officers, including reserves, created for the purpose of considering applications for deferment or for hardship discharge.

The membership of these boards include married officers with children thus giving them an insight to actual conditions in the average home. Therefore, it is proper to say that every application for a deferment or a hardship discharge is assured proper consideration. I have appeared before several of these boards in behalf of my constituents. I must say I have always been given a just hearing and where the evidence was of merit a favorable decision was rendered.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How does it come that the gentleman can appear as a Member of Congress before a board like that whereas other Members of Congress are denied the right to appear before such boards?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My statement is based on my own experience. I made a request to appear before such boards and have never been refused.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, and serving on one of the subcommittees headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], may I say that we are about to give consideration to the entire reserve program. One of the subjects to be considered is the future treatment of reserves. Knowing what I do about the report to be submitted by the Department of Defense I can say that many of the problems affecting the reserves of this country will be taken care of and we will recommend in the near future a reserve program that will tell the reserve far in advance of his date of call just what his classification is, when he will be called, whether he can be deferred and how long he will serve and so forth.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has referred to the reservist as one who signs his name and going into the Reserves. Has the gentleman recognized that in this bill he will involuntarily perhaps be in the Reserves for some 6 years after his 26 months of service?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct and that is one of the reasons why I am for the bill. It furnishes a reservoir of trained manpower for any emergency.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. One member of the committee says I am too late in offering my amendment. It seems now, from the gentleman's remark, that I am too early. May I suggest that this may be the right time to consider the problem.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hesitate to encourage the approval of the gentleman's amendment because I think the subject should be given a lot of consideration by the Brooks subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committtee in considering the entire reserve program for the future.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is a hard-working member of that subcommittee. He realizes that it is a very difficult problem and a complicated subject. Further, the gentleman has confidence in the subcommittee and realizes we are going to go into the matter and do our best to iron out inequities and injustices.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is exactly right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the McCarthy amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, it is quite possible that this is not the right time to consider the particular amendment that is pending and even if it were adopted as an amendment to the Barden bill and the Barden substitute not agreed to, it would not have any effect at all. However, may I say, particularly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he talks about the reservist who has signed his name and joined the Reserve and is a good American citizen as such, then he gets called in, that of course he knew what he promised when he signed his name, but years later when he finds himself in a difficult spot he cannot resign. Here we have a case where you are going to take about seven, eight, or nine hundred thousand men a year or every 6 months or whatever the time is and put them in the Reserves involuntarily for 6 years, under the UMT program. Now that is not what you might call voluntary service in the Reserves.

Furthermore, times change after men are released from training or service, and I feel very strongly as one Member of this Congress that the best people to decide upon deferment from call to active duty are those who are closest to the situation, just as we have those questions today brought before our local draft boards and local appeal boards. I think the situation is going to be different when we adopt the UMT program, for example, than it is now. It will be very different indeed, and I hope the gentleman will recognize that fact and not confine his thinking to the situation as it has existed heretofore.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Under the UMT program we are to be provided with a reservoir of trained men in time of an emergency.

Mr. HINSHAW. Partly trained.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They can do a pretty good job in 6 months. Now, why should we give a preference to this reservoir of trained men and not the man who volunteers for the Regular service?

Mr. HINSHAW. There is a difference between a volunteer and one not volunteering. If a man volunteers for the Regular service or to stay in the Reserve, and fills a niche, then that is his own personal voluntary action. This other action is not a voluntary action, and since it is not voluntary action, it should be considered differently. Many men enjoy military service as a career.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Am I not correct when I say that the responsibility of defending this country in time of war is a responsibility which belongs to everybody?

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, of course, nobody denies that. And, I could wave the flag myself when it comes down to that. I served in the Army of the United States just like a great many other Members of this Congress, and perhaps without the great distinction the gentleman from Pennsylvania achieved. Nevertheless, I served and I know fully what the situation is, and I understand too the situation of the people back home who are the relatives and dependents of these reservists and who suffer hardship on occasion because of some of these brass-hat boards that the gentleman can get in to see that the rest of us cannot get in to see and who refuse to listen to the pleas of these men for hardship deferment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think the greatest injustice that has been done to any group of people in this country has been done to the reservists. I believe something has to be done to rectify this situation now. I put that responsibility right on the Committee on Armed Services. They must do something about it; they should have done something about it month and months ago, and they cannot answer me as to why they have not.

I want to give you one example. A member of the inactive Reserve of the Health Department in the eastern part of West Virginia was called into the service and the Navy would not release him, the West Virginia Department of Health said it would take 6 months to train somebody to take his place and get acquainted with the territory. I appealed to the Navy Department to release him from active duty, becaus they have hundreds and hundreds of draftees that could be called, but they refused. Another instance, one boy who was also a member of the inactive Reserve was called back into the service and after 6 months, he wrote home and said all he had done during that time was answer muster in the morning. Day before yesterday a boy was in my office who was proceeding on orders to the Pacific. He is 38 years old with 2 children, and he also was in the inactive Reserves. He said a Navy commander came to his home to get him to sign up for the Reserves, and at that time told him the active Reserves would be called first in an emergency and that the draftees of the same age limit as he with the same number of dependents would be called next. These are the facts, and he is willing to make affidavit. Again, I say that this committee is the committee that should have straightened out the reservist material situation of this country. I think it is too late now. Furthermore, one boy told me that he was called into service as a reservist and that he was not given a physical examination. He is now in the Navy and has not yet been given a physical examination, yet he is on his way to the Pacific. In my hometown of all the reservists called to active duty not one has been in the active Reserve Corps.

If the gentlemen of the committee can explain away these facts I would like to see it done. Also, the fact of why they haven't proceeded to clear up this terrific injustice to the Reserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] to the Barden amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 19, line 25, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. All persons included within the scope of this act shall be entitled to vote regardless of age."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order to give me an opportunity to discuss it?

Mr. VINSON. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I assure the committee that I would not have pressed so hard for this amendment here today had not somebody blown down my neck a little while ago and said, "Withdraw your amendment. It is too tough an issue for this House to decide."

If it has come to the point where we cannot decide whether or not we ought to let the boys we are drafting under this bill vote, the boys of 18 years of age, and the boys regardless of age who are in the service, then I think we had better forget the whole business, because this issue goes hand in hand with the drafting of these boys. If they are old enough to fight they are old enough to vote.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. If a man is too old to fight he is too old to vote; is that right?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The answer to that is that a man is never too old to fight.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to the WAVES and WACS?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman heard my amendment being read, which I am sure he did, I believe it mentioned "persons," so I presume it would apply to both sexes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That would be the gentleman's congressional interpretation of his amendment?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That would certainly be my interpretation of it.

It does not seem to me as though it would take very much courage on the part of any one of us, since we are going to draft these boys into the armed services, to give them an opportunity to vote. In some States they vote at 18 and in other States they do not. However, I think we can at least make this concession to the young persons in the service.

and they should have an opportunity to vote regardless of age.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I cannot believe the gentleman would say here on the floor of this House that because he proposes an amendment that is not germane to the bill the Members of this House do not have the courage to vote on the issue regardless of what it is. Does the gentleman mean that?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know what the gentleman is trying to imply, but if he will follow what I am saying——

Mr. HARRIS. I am following what the gentleman is saying. The gentleman said the Members do not have the courage to vote on the issue.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I said nothing about my amendment's being ruled out of order and made no implication as to the chairman of the committee attempting to have my amendment ruled out of order because the House might be afraid to face this issue. What I referred to was the incident that occurred in the cloakroom, when, as I said a while ago, somebody blew down my neck and insinuated that they wanted me to withdraw this amendment because it was too tough an issue for them to face.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does not the gentleman realize that whatever is said in the cloakroom is privileged?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I simply want to set my good friend from Arkansas, a splendid gentleman, straight on the matter. I did not in any way imply that any member of the committee or any Member of the House in attempting to rule my amendment out of order was afraid to face the issue.

But I will say that the one who buttonholed me in the cloak room apparently was afraid to face the issue.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I am sure the gentleman who made that statement to the distinguished gentleman who is now addressing us was a stranger because we all know the gentleman from New York as a man of great courage.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman realize that many of his colleagues are just a little bit, maybe not too little, but are just envious and jealous of the position the gentleman from New York has attained in his own district among his constituents?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Time will tell. I appreciate the gentleman's generosity anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment ought to be adopted. I am sorry to see the gentleman from Georgia make a point of order against it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York deals with a subject matter which is not dealt with in the pending bill nor by the act which the pending bill seeks to amend. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York embraces a subject matter coming under the jurisdiction of another standing committee of the House and would seek to affect legislation which has been enacted, having been reported by another standing committee of the House and which does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services which has reported the pending bill.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment which the Chair has just ruled out of order, in the discussion with reference to it, a possible inference has been created involving the integrity of every Member of the House. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may pass upon the amendment irrespective of the fact that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not want to be included with the rest of the Members of the House. You just leave me out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 0, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] have the right to appeal from the decision of the Chair in this instance?

The CHAIRMAN. He would have had that right, but it may be a little late now.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to request to be advised how many amendments are now pending at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised there is one other amendment, proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. VINSON. May it be presented at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to offer his amendment at this time?

Mr. TEAGUE. I offer the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 20, after line 18, add a new section, as follows:

"That members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force entitled to receive basic pay shall in addition thereto be entitled to receive a special pay at the monthly rate of $100 per month for officers and $75 per month for enlisted persons for combat duty while actually engaged in combat, or in direct combat support of actual combat forces: *Provided*, That this special pay shall be included in the computation of any death gratuity or benefit payable as a result of the death of such member while entitled to such special pay.

"(b) Combat duty, for the purpose of this section, is duty for a period of at least 6 days in any calendar month in opposition to a hostile force, including guerrillas, performed under such circumstances as may be prescribed in regulations by the Secretaries concerned, subject to approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall be uniform as far as practicable: *Provided*, That if the member is killed or injured as a result of having been actually engaged in combat or in direct combat support of forces actually in combat, the requirement that he perform such duties for the period of at least 6 days shall not be applicable.

"(c) No person shall be eligible to receive the special pay provided by this section if authorized to receive any incentive or special pay pursuant to sections 203, 204, or 205 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 809).

"SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from and after June 27, 1950, and no pay provided herein shall accrue to any person for any prior periods."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, as it relates to combat pay, and there is nothing in this bill or the original Draft Act of 1948 dealing with the question of pay or combat pay at all.

I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman desires me to do so.

Mr. TEAGUE. If you will please.

Mr. VINSON. I reserve a point of order against the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. TEAGUE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TEAGUE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Georgia has made a point of order against the amendment

on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas covers a subject matter which is not covered in the pending bill or in the act which is sought to be amended by the pending bill.

The Chair is of the opinion therefore that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill and sustains the point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 7, line 26, after the period add a new paragraph (j) and the following:

"Said paragraph (1) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'No physician or dentist who is engaged in full-time employment as such at any hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the thirtieth anniversary of the date of his birth.'"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment, although I have not had an opportunity to study it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have proposed is refreshing in that it does not deal with a controversial section of this legislation that has torn the House during the past 3 days of debate. It is a humanitarian appeal to my colleagues to act now to handle a serious situation—an appalling situation—that has developed in the Veterans' hospitals of our Nation.

At the present time there are 146 hospitals in operation in the country. As of January 15, 1951, they were short 379 doctors, members of their medical staffs, to bring them up to the normal complement. Since the 15th of January there have been 6 additional veterans' hospitals completed requiring 55 doctors and only 4 of those hospitals have been able to open their doors because they have no medical staff.

Let me say, in addition, that there are 21 new hospitals to be completed prior to the 1st day of January 1952, which will require a total of 460 doctors on the medical staffs. There is not a doctor in sight for any of them.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we can justify this situation from an economic standpoint. The four that cannot go into operation plus the 21 to be completed before January 1, 1952, will cost about $317,000,000. I am wondering if we can justify their standing idle during the months we are waiting for doctors to fill the medical staffs and thousands of veterans are pleading for admission to the hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, that is not all. The armed services are raiding the medical staffs and the dental and nursing staffs of your veterans' hospitals. Of the 4,000 doctors employed in veterans' hospitals today, 2,040 are reservists; 418 of those reservists have been called to active service, including 136 specialists. They are caling now for an additional 270 doctors which they will separate in the matter of a few weeks or months at most. It is a desperate situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Veterans' Administration is begging for assistance. The situation is even worse than it was in World War II. They will accept almost anything to get doctors. I understand they are in favor of the gentleman's amendment or a provision that I put in and that other Members have offered.

Mr. BAILEY. I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I am sure if this amendment fails I shall join her in her effort to get some medical staffs for our veterans' hospitals.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this situation is really desperate. I could if time would permit read into the RECORD here in support of my amendment a statement from Maj. Gen. Carl Gray, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, pointing out the real seriousness of this situation. Let me appeal to you, if you are a veteran, please come to the rescue of the servicemen who need treatment in these hospitals. You may be the father or the mother of a veteran who needs treatment in these hospitals. Here is an opportunity, a simple approach to the situation.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that a certain number of the younger medical men who were trained at Government expense have an obligation they should carry out by serving in the armed services. We also have legislation on the statute books requiring the registration of doctors between the ages of 25 and 50 years. In between the ages of 30 and 50 we hope to get some medical men who will fill up the staffs of these veteran hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, all my amendment does is just this simple proposition, that we exempt from the terms of this legislation reservists who have reached their 31st birthday or other doctors subject to draft under public law passed by the Eighty-first Congress if they are above 30 years of age.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. As I understand it, there are now over 4,000 doctors with the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. BAILEY. Two thousand and forty to be correct.

Mr. CHELF. Two thousand and forty of the four thousand are in the reserves.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. CHELF. Four hundred thirteen have already been called?

Mr. BAILEY. Four hundred eighteen have been called and they are calling for nearly 300 more.

Mr. CHELF. I think I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Is it not a fact there are numerous veterans incarcerated in county jails by reason of the fact they cannot be admitted into veterans hospitals?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. I hope the members of the Armed Services Committee will not object to this amendment. I do not believe the point of germaneness should be raised and I do not believe it rests against this amendment. In any event, I sincerely hope no member of the committee will oppose it because it has a humanitarian objective, not political or military.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the gentleman's amendment, and I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Let me again plead with the Members to give this matter very serious consideration. Here is an opportunity to do a real service.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the committee is well aware of the difficulties that face not only the Veterans' Administration, but the civilian population and the services. Under the present Doctors Act which we passed some time ago the President, by Executive order, can do exactly what the gentleman's amendment will do; therefore, I hope the committee will oppose the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. That is not true according to the statement by General Gray. They take their chances just like any independent hospital in getting doctors at the present time.

Mr. DURHAM. A provision is written in there and he certainly can do it by Executive order.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say that I not only have the support of the Veterans' Administration, but I have the support of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They say it is a worthy project and there is no reason why this House should not act on it at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whether the President has the authority to act or not, he certainly has not acted. I remember in World War II they said the President had the authority to act to give them military status. He finally did act, but it was long after the need that he finally acted. We have lost men because we did not have enough doctors to take care of them. They were given military status.

We talk about giving the service men more pay while they are serving. Let

us take care of them when they are discharged. A good many veterans in hospitals who were discharged under the retirement act did not get retirement pay. To date the Armed Services Committee has done nothing to rectify that mistake. The least we can do is to give them medical attention in order that they can get well after they come out. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I do not believe any Member here will regret it, and I think it is a very necessary amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentlewoman please make it plain to the members of the committee that this amendment does not apply unless those men are full-time employees of the staff of a veterans' hospital.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, that is exactly what I have been told. I talked to the Veterans' Administration twice on the matter and they favor this and are very anxious for it; in fact, they have pleaded with me, which was not necessary, to try to secure more doctors for them. This amendment is one way to do it. Another way to do it is by giving them military status by legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the Barden amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and 5 minutes for the committee to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as a large number of Members have indicated they would like to speak on the Barden amendment, in order to give each of them an adequate amount of time, since I think this is the most far-reaching bill this Congress will consider this session, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended one-half hour.

Mr. TACKETT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

(Mr. LANTAFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. LANTAFF.)

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, universal military training is the base upon which a permanent national defense program in a democracy must be built today. We all know that total warfare of the modern type can descend on a nation overnight. That means, of course, we no longer have time to train massive military forces after the war begins or the emergency declares itself. The only answer, outside of a monstrous standing military force, is for citizen military training to become the duty of every male at some time in his life. In that way a large pool of men trained in the military ABC's is brought in being from which the Reserve forces may draw their strength; and then, in turn, the standing forces may turn to an adequate Reserve in time of emergency. In short, universal military training is a long-range program of military insurance for peace and security; and, I do not believe that such training, when properly conducted, breeds militarism or war any more than a life-insurance policy brings on sickness or death.

Yet, to admit the wisdom of universal military training is not enough. I believe that there are certain basic principles which any universal military training program must follow in order to succeed in the United States and still perform the job for which it is intended:

First, the program must be on a permanent, long-range basis. In order to satisfy this requirement, it must find a middle ground which takes into account these factors: (i) It must retain the approval of the Nation—particularly the parents—in times of peace as well as emergency; (ii) it must provide adequate training to bring the trainee up to the minimum level required by our Reserve forces; and, (iii) it must fit in as much as possible with the normal course of the individual trainee's life.

Secondly, the program must be democratic, that is, as universal as possible in its application.

Thirdly, the program must be predominantly a civilian effort, that is, the civilian must have a vital and controlling influence in its operation although the military provide the training. I believe that H. R. 3558, the bill which I have introduced on this subject, fully outlines a universal military training program which will satisfy these essentials.

Since George Washington's day, universal military training has been discussed in one form and another. Just in the last 10 years, there have been commissions appointed to study the subject; exhaustive hearings have been held in both the House and Senate; and numerous bills have been offered on both sides of Congress on universal military training. Just reading the material on this subject will keep any Member quite busy for several months. I believe that there is enough in this past discussion that we should be able to formulate a clear and definite universal military training program. For instance, the Compton Commission, after an exhaustive study of universal military training, submitted a report to the President in May 1947. Shortly thereafter—in July 1947—the Towe bill—H. R. 4278, Eightieth Congress—was introduced after hearings before the House Committee on Armed Services. The Towe bill was a concrete, detailed presentation of a universal military training program based substantially on the Compton Commission report and recommendations. The Towe bill evolved, ultimately, after further study—particularly by the American Legion—into the Russell bill which was introduced into the Senate as the first universal military training bill in 1951, and is the basis of the bill—H. R. 3558—which I have before the Congress. So, actually, the universal military training program which I am advocating is the end result of many, many people's thinking and several years of endeavor. If you wish to study the principles upon which it is based, read the Compton Commission report; if you want to study the background of the form it took, read the hearings on the Towe bill.

There are only two points of difference which could possibly be construed as major ones insofar as a comparison of my bill and the original Towe bill is concerned:

First, while both anticipate the equivalent of a year's military training through a combination of active and inactive duty training, the Towe bill specifies a 6-month active duty period and H. R. 3558, only 4 months.

Secondly, the Towe bill places control of the money for this program under the civilian commission by implication only; H. R. 3558 specifically names the civilian commission as being the agency to which funds are appropriated for carrying out the program.

The major features of H. R. 3558 are civilian control, integration of the program into normal activities and educational endeavor as much as possible, and effective training for the creation of a large, efficient Reserve force to supplement the Regulars as needed.

The average youngster will embark on this program in his eighteenth year, which, in general, coincides closely with graduation from high school. However, with the parent's consent, it is possible for training to be accomplished during the seventeenth year. Registration, examination, induction, records, and other administrative matters of that nature will be handled through the local selective-service boards. Exemptions or deferments are only allowable in case of extreme hardship, failure to meet military induction standards—though this does not preclude nonmilitary training in the interest of national security being required by the Civilian Commission—availability of training facilities, and previous military service.

The training program aims at the goal of the equivalent of 1 year's active duty through a combination of active- and inactive-duty training. The active-duty or basic-training portion is for the period of 4 months. This period was selected because, first, under an intensified military training program adequate basic training is possible in that period, and, second, the training may be taken during the summer, if desirable, without serious interference with the normal pattern of the youngster's life and education. Consistent with maintaining a

balanced military force, each youngster is to be allowed to train in the service of his choice. Immediately upon completion of the 4-month program the trainee must select and enter upon 1 of 10 alternate programs, among which are eight more months of active duty with the training corps, entry into the National Guard or some type of Organized Reserve unit, entry into one of the officer-training programs—including senior ROTC in college—enlistment in the Reserve and entrance into technical or specialist training program in college, or enlistment in the Volunteer Reserve for 6 years as a last alternative, wherein he is subject to 1 month's active-duty training each year. There is afforded in this plan as much freedom of choice and flexibility as possible so that the youngster may have at least one program available which will fit in with his particular plans for the future. If he does not pursue the alternate program satisfactorily, he is liable for recall by the Civilian Commission for a maximum of 8 months' active-duty training. A system of training credits is provided for so that it is possible for transfers from one alternate program to another to take place without losing credit for the time already served.

The active duty or basic training is conducted in a distinct training corps entitled the National Security Training Corps. While a member of this corps, the trainee operates under a special code of conduct, which is spelled out in the bill, insofar as military law and discipline is concerned. Pay during this period is $30 a month with additional allowances of $50 per month for one dependent, $65 for two or more.

This program is controlled by a National Security Training Commission consisting of five members appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. It is in this connection that I have found an inconsistency in my bill. Apparently, no member of the regular services of the Armed Forces, either active or retired, can serve on the Commission although a military member is mentioned later on in the bill. I am going to change this so that there will be one military member of the Commission. The Commission is appointed for 3 years on a full-time basis. To advise the Commission on moral, religious, recreational, and similar phases of the program, there is provision for a National Security Training Advisory Board of 10 to 25 members which will serve, as necessary, on a part-time basis. The Commission has full control of the program in all its essentials since: (i) It controls the funds by which the program operates and is required to report to Congress semiannually on all such expenditures—sections 343 and 344; (ii) it formulates the program and designates the training agencies to conduct the program—section 324 (a); (iii) it issues the policies, standard, and directives to govern training agencies in the conduct of the program—section 305 (a); and (iv) it ascertains that these policies, standards, and directives are being carried out through a system of civilian inspection—section 305 (b).

The time and rate of the implementation of the program has been left to the President based upon recommendations by the Secretary of Defense and the Commission. It has only been specified that it is the intent of Congress that the implementation of this program shall not interfere with the expansion of the Armed Forces to their authorized strengths. This flexibility has been necessary due to the many factors which cannot be estimated in this particular phase of the program, such as available training facilities, and so forth.

This universal military training program, outlined above, can be pursued irrespective of the operation of a selective service or draft; as a matter of fact, once in operation, it will simplify greatly their task. The average youngster will complete his basic training; enter one of the alternative programs which will normally be some assignment in the Reserve; and, if the draft takes him before he completes his alternate program, the required active service under the draft will cancel out any further obligations he has under the universal military training program. The principles and operation of the program remain the same regardless of the temper of the times: peace, emergency, draft, or otherwise.

Since 1940 there have been at least 10 universal military training bills of one type and another introduced into the Congress with the attendant hearings and various commission reports. Gentlemen, I believe that all the investigation necessary has been done on this matter and that we have sufficient information to formulate a good, concrete universal military training program. I believe that the Compton Commission Report is one of the finest pieces of work which has been done on the matter; I believe that the Towe bill, with few exceptions, embodied the principles of the Compton Commission Report is a good, workable legislative framework; and I believe that the Russell bill improved on the Towe bill. I do not, then, see the necessity of moving off on another tangent now. I will vote against the Barden substitute and support the committee bill and hope that, as a result of further study, a bill similar to H. R. 3558 will be reported by the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with marked interest to the debate which has taken place for the past week. Many arguments have been put forth on both sides of the aisle in connection with the advisability or inadvisability of including universal military training in the present bill, but I have failed to hear what I believe to be the most vital reason why we should have universal military training, and why we should have it now.

This vital reason to which I refer is that it is only through a system of universal military training that we will ever be able to build up an effective Organized Reserve and National Guard. I happen to be an Army Reserve officer and I have for many years served in the Florida National Guard. I know that there are a number of Members of this body who are also reservists at the present time, or who have in the past been members of the Guard or the Reserves. Any of these gentlemen will tell you that the weakness of any Reserve component program has always been the fact that basically trained enlisted men were not available for enlistment, plus the fact that the turn-over in enlisted men has been so great that it has been impossible to create truly effective units.

Testimony recently given to the House Armed Services Committee indicates that the turn-over in enlisted men in the National Guard runs as high as 30 percent per year. How can you expect to create an effective military organization with such a large yearly turn-over in personnel?

As General Marshall said:

MILITARY READINESS IMPROVING

We started in June from a state of bankruptcy as to available trained Reserves. Whatever Reserve organizations we had were only 40 or 50 percent of strength, and that strength only partially trained. We had no resources, no established system for the creation of trained manpower.

We know also that the time spent in recruiting consumes a tremendously heavy portion of the time of the men and officers of any unit, and as a result, time that should be spent on the training of the unit as such is not available.

Only under a system of universal military training will there be sufficient men in the National Guard and Organized Reserve units to maintain an effective second line of defense. These trainees will join the Reserve components after completing basic training, and thereafter a progressive mobilization training program can be carried out so as to maintain the unit in a constant state of combat readiness.

Under today's world conditions, where it appears necessary to maintain a high security level, it is vital that we do something to assure that the reserves and the guard become an effective combat force without delay, and it is only through universal military training that this can be accomplished.

Adoption of the substitute will mean a vote for the continuance of an inadequate, undermanned Reserve force not capable of the immediate accomplishment of its assigned mission. Not only is the interest of economy, but to establish an effective second line of defense, I urge the Members of this body to vote against the amendment under consideration.

(Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to place myself on record as favoring universal military training to be put into practice earlier than the committee bill provides. Therefore, I favor the Barden amendment so that the question of universal military training may be considered separately.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

(Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, April 3, I endeavored to advance some thinking in regard to the bill on draft extension and UMT which is now before us. It was not too well received by the Members who were then on the floor of the House and certainly it was not well received by the members of the Committee on Armed Services who were in attendance.

The latter is understandable because I suggested that the subject of universal military training had not been properly or fully considered by the committee of this Congress because no thought at all had been given to the question of what military training was, is, or will be. I suggested that the UMT part of this bill be referred back to the committee for further study.

I still feel that way. In the first place, the present bill as written is merely a capitulation by Congress of its rights and responsibilities as respect universal military training. All we are doing, gentlemen, by this bill is establishing a Commission which will study and propose a UMT program to the Congress. I do not care whether the Congress has to fail to negate the plan in 60 calendar days, or has to affirmatively approve it, or as it now has been amended has to consider it within a specified number of days, the net result is that the Committee on Armed Forces is declining to do its job and is creating a Commission to do it for them. There is a serious constitutional question, aside from the propriety of the action, involved in Congress creating executive commissions to do its legislative work. The constitutional question was raised in the debates on passage of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Expediency disposed of these arguments. We now do not even have the argument of expediency to fall back upon in the present instance. I suggest the danger of this trend. Those who fear a possible dictatorship in this country must realize that this procedure opens the door that much wider. The next push could well be the executive branch writing all legislation referring same to Congress and conducting a strong propaganda campaign and using other pressures on the Congress for its adoption. This would then create a completely subservient Congress. History tells us that the fall of every Republic has come from the attack upon, and the collapse of, the independent legislative branch. It is tragic that the fatal attacks have come from the members of the legislative branch itself. I urge the members of the Armed Services Committee to consider what they are doing in urging the creation of a commission, failing to perform the duty that I, and I presume other Members of the House, thought they had been performing these past 3 months. That duty is no more than to present to this House a complete, well-thought-out manpower training program to meet the emergencies and wars this country might face.

I favor the Barden substitute, and at the same time I urge the Armed Services Committee, for which I have great respect, to immediately go to work and present to this House a real bill that we can consider and vote upon—and with the committee's experience, I believe the committee can do this in 3 months, not 6 months and 45 days.

I want to suggest again some of the basic thinking I believe this Congress must do in approaching a decision on the question of universal military training.

First of all, we must get the glamour of military uniform out of our eyes and do a job analysis of our Armed Forces. As I stated Tuesday, we have had four basic categories of work activity when this country has been in emergency or war:

First. Those working in defense industry, including farming.

Second. Those working in civil service as employees of the Armed Forces bureaus.

Third. Those working as technicians under military law as part of the Armed Forces.

Fourth. Those engaged in combat work for the Armed Forces.

Now one question is, What group of workers should be in uniform? I suggest that only those in category four need be in uniform. Certainly, there has been no real job analysis made, or attempted, to determine what jobs are benefited by having the performer in uniform.

A corollary to that question is, What physical standards are necessary, based upon a job analysis? Certainly it is stupid to apply combat standards to any but combatants. Solving this problem will go a long way in solving our IV–F problem, which will help our manpower problems.

Another question is, What group of workers need, or are entitled to, veteran benefits? Coupled with this question is, What group needs the incentive of medals, ribbons, and glamour for the performance of their assigned tasks—this is aside from the question of what group is entitled to ribbons, medals, honors, and glamour. I suggest that only those in category four are so entitled. If my thinking is right, or even close to right, we will solve the great problem of administering to our veterans by doing this job analysis.

Another question, and the basic question for Congress to decide, as I argue it, and not some committee appointed by the executive branch of the Government is what organization or organizations should train the workers to fill their jobs in emergency.

Well there seems to be no question about categories one and two. They are traditionally trained by civilian enterprise. However, there is no well-defined line of what jobs are performed under military law and what jobs performed under civilian law. There needs to be, based upon a study of what would be best.

In category 3, and I remind you that approximately 90 percent of those who were in uniform during World War II were in category 3—the noncombatants in uniform—the technicians—who should do their training? I suggest that civilian enterprise is not only best set up to train the personnel, but I even suggest that most of the job performance would be best done under civilian control, rather than military control.

In category 4 are the combatants, and they amount to only 10 percent roughly of our uniformed men, based upon the jobs done in the last war. They should be trained by the military with little or no interference from the civilians.

I might state in regard to this important question, that the present bill before us, by failing to do, or even consider, a job analysis, is placing not only the 90 percent under the civilian commission, but is also placing the 10-percent combatant group under this civilian commission. The result will be poorer combatant training as well as poorer civilian training.

The congressional committee, and not an executive committee, should further consider the basic question which emerges from these other questions, of whether the assembling of technicians in uniform, if they are to be kept in uniform, should follow the system the Armed Forces want or the system followed in setting up the Seabees.

I quote General Hershey, page 195 of the House hearings, on what the military wants:

> I would say that in the Armed Forces and in the Navy, as I have observed them, no matter how much they talk about skill, what they want is a young, smart boy because they can teach him much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have: (a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have. If there is anything else to be done, they want somebody else to do it. I believe that you just about got to build armies and build navies and build air forces by taking people who have capacity and teaching them what you want them to know, because unfortunately, by and large in our civilian life the type of man we need, and that is the fighter, is only there as an avocation and not as a vocation.

Now, right here, gentlemen, is the philosophy this Congress should resolve and not pass the buck on to an executive commission. Do you agree with General Hershey's statement and philosophy? I personally do not and I am satisfied that any real job analysis of the Armed Forces would knock into a cocked hat this type of thinking. In General Hershey's statement itself, you see the type of deliberate misleading thinking I am talking about. He starts off talking about technical skills and then at the end cinches his argument by talking about fighting or combat skills, on which very few would disagree with him.

In fact, I will state that the main trouble with the Armed Forces in the last war was their failure to do a job analysis of

the skills they needed and a concomitant failure to scan the civilian skills existing to put the two together.

The procurement of Seabee personnel in World War II was based upon a philosophy diametrically opposed to that advanced by General Hershey and the Armed Forces. Incidentally, it was put into effect over the great opposition of the Regular Naval Establishment primarily because Secretary Forrestal and Admiral Ben Moreell, a graduate of Washington University Engineering School in St. Louis, not the Academy at Annapolis, had clear eyes.

I believe the success of the Seabees is directly the result of this procurement program. It is a living demonstration of the need for the philosophy I advocate and the elimination of the present philosophy of the armed services and General Hershey.

I want to quote Dr. Karl Compton, who was advancing the argument for the utilization of IV–F's more fully, but in doing so suggests the philosophy I advocate. His statement may be found on page 7 of Calendar No. 116, report of the Committee on Armed Services to accompany S. 1:

> Within the group which is not eligible for military service on present standards, there are many who are as well qualified to perform certain essential military duties as are those of higher standards of fitness. * * * The Seabees did a remarkable job but were generally outside the selective service standards. * * * I feel that a decided improvement in manpower utilization is * * * one of the directions in which a major increase in the strength of our Armed Forces might be achieved.

Now, the Seabees were outside the selective service standards not only in a physical way, but also in a procuring way. The Seabees were procured on a basis of matching rates and commissions with technical skills already acquired in civilian endeavors. They were not procured by taking them all in as apprentice seamen and letting the Military Establishment train them. If the military system had been followed, the Seabees would have been members of the naval construction battalions, lost in the shuffle, and not a word on everyone's lips in admiration of the miracles they performed.

My thesis is simple. Congress has a job to do. It is to review the basic system of mobilization in light of our experience. The thinking to date is that of putting new wine into old bottles. If this country is to survive and to remain a republic, and I believe it can with less trouble than might be imagined, we must take off our coats and do some basic work and study. It is our duty and we cannot pass the buck to a civilian commission appointed by the executive branch. I regret to state that, in my opinion, the reason we are not ready today to vote upon a concrete program of peacetime preparation for mobilization or war is because our Armed Services Committee has not done its job. I state again I have confidence in the committee and its chairman. I think we should vote for the Barden bill and refer the matter of peacetime preparation for mobilization or war back to the committee for their prompt consideration and preparation of a bill that will answer the problems that face us which I have tried to suggest in my present remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

(Mr. PROUTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, we certainly would like to demobilize our Armed Forces, our weapons of war and the arsenals which produce them and through shear power of moral persuasion point the road to peace. But we know very definitely that such an approach would be suicidal at this time. So long as the rulers in the Kremlin retain their almost pathological zeal for world domination or until they have become convinced that the free nations of the world have power superior to that of Soviet Russia and her satellites, we must realize that we are confronted with very serious and momentous questions. Even if the Korean War should end tomorrow, could we ignore the fact that the most powerful and revolutionary force in history poses a constant threat to our security as a Nation?

In supporting S. 1 as amended by the Committee on Armed Services I am perfectly aware that I am not voting for universal military training. I am merely giving expression to the belief that the enactment of a sound and well conceived program should be given serious consideration by the Congress.

The very concept of universal military training is repugnant to most Americans. It is contrary to national precedent and foreign to our traditions. But we must remember that we are living in unprecedented times, and that our minds should be alerted to the needs of the present and to the contingencies of the future insofar as it is possible for us to determine these.

All of us would prefer to demobilize our Armed Forces, destroy our weapons of war and the arsenals which produce them and through the power of moral persuasion point out the road to peace. But, Mr. Chairman, we realize that such an approach would be suicidal at this time, for so long as the rulers in the Kremlin retain their almost pathological zeal for world domination or until they have become convinced that the free nations of the world possess power superior to that of Russia and her satellites, we will be confronted with momentous questions. Even if the Korean War should end tomorrow, could we ignore the fact that the most powerful revolutionary force in history poses a constant threat to our security as a Nation?

If we are going to be realistic I think we must recognize that the present emergency is not likely to be of short duration. It is almost certain to be with us for years, and only pure folly will persuade us to meet this challenge on a day-to-day basis. We must have a consistent, long-range program which will not be abandoned until it is certain that the danger no longer exists.

Universal military training might well be an essential of such a program. It would constitute one of the best possible means of averting major war because nothing is more discouraging to a potential aggressor than large reserves of manpower and equipment in the hands of his contemplated victim.

So, in a very real sense, UMT represents a strategy for peace, but we should never labor under the illusion that armed force represents the ultimate solution to international problems. At best this can serve only as a necessary deterrent to war while we seek ways and means to ameliorate the basic causes of such disasters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, never have we in the Congress faced a decision with more soul searching.

As a former member of the United States Naval Reserve, as a former school teacher who recognizes full well the impact on our youth of the present program, I have tried to face each of the problems presented today with one thought uppermost: What is best for my country?

I have dedicated myself to—

First. Strengthening the United States militarily, morally, and spiritually.

Second. Mobilizing all of the resources of this Nation to meet fully and swiftly the requirements of the emergency and to see to it that this burden falls as equitably as can be upon all our people.

Third. Opposing any secret commitments to any other nation. The recent exchanges between Washington and Tokyo and between the Foreign Office in London and our State Department indicate the new importance of my attitude.

If this national emergency is to continue for a long time—and the present indications are that it is—we must decide on a sound system of universal military training under civilian control.

I believe we must have a better utilization of existing manpower priorities if we are to provide effective help in solving our problems. The American people very properly are demanding that the Pentagon itself set a proper example in this respect.

We must develop immediately a much fairer system for our National Guard and Reserve units.

I personally consider the draft bill and the universal military training program as part and parcel of the same problem. Each must be considered in the light of the other. Unless we provide for a proper system of universal military training now, we shall be forced to keep a large standing army of draftees and Reservists in active duty status for a long time.

All of us must ask ourselves this question: "Shall I stand up and dedicate my thinking, my action, and my prayers to the protection of my country?"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized.

(Mr. GROSS, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. AUGUST H.

ANDRESEN asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. O'HARA.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, now we come to that time in the debate where there is that hush before the solemn hour when we as Members of Congress have to make our decision of most grave importance.

I realize that many of my distinguished friends are finding themselves in trouble because they fear that if they vote for the Barden substitute that will be a vote in opposition to universal military training. Personally, I cannot see their reasoning as to the UMT issue. We do not deal with the question of something that is important for the needs of the armed services or to the winning of the Korean War or something that is at all important in the matter of a reserve pool, but we are being asked to vote to direct that somebody appoint a commission to come back and make a report to the Armed Services Committee, and then the Armed Services Committee is supposed to do something that they could do at this very minute, if they wanted to—a perfectly ridiculous procedure by legislative act.

If we were going to vote on the question of the draft, I do not think there would be a half a dozen votes against it, but I am going to vote for the Barden bill upon the theory that I refuse to commit myself to some unknown principle, upon some unknown program about which I know nothing, and which may commit me to being for a permanent peacetime draft.

When the hearings were begun in this body and the other body there was a perfect uproar about the terrible shortage of manpower that was necessary for the armed services; that we would have to take the 18-year-olds, that we needed those 18-year-olds to fill up the gap.

I call your attention to the front page of the Washington Star of last evening, to an Associated Press report which says, "The draft boards are told to delay calls for May, to delay all calls for May, until further orders come from General Hershey."

Now, just what sort of a state of confusion are we in? Are we being given untrue facts as to the manpower condition so that we do not know what is the situation? Are we being kidded about the condition of our manpower pool, or are our armed services completely unable to take care of these youngsters who are being drafted to such an extent that they cannot equip and train them now? What is going on? I would assume that the members of the Armed Services Committee would know the answer, and I yield to them if they can explain why this announcement of the suspension of the draft call by General Hershey, if they know. There being no reply, I assume that they do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am in accord with the gentleman's views and will also vote for the Barden bill.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA. I have said all that I wanted to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I have waited a long time for the gentleman to get around to answering.

Mr. BROOKS. What is the question?

Mr. O'HARA. I asked if any member of the Armed Services Committee knew why the suspension of the draft call for May had been issued?

Mr. BROOKS. I heard the gentleman's question, but I just wanted to be sure that I understood it. I can say this, that draft calls prior to that had been sufficient, now they are catching up. They had deliquency trouble and they want to catch up and do things in an orderly manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized.

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support the Barden amendment, not because I am opposed to universal military training but because I am opposed to the abdication of its policy-making authority by this Congress. I have not heard one iota of evidence during this entire debate which would support any belief that the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives is unqualified and incompetent to write the details of this plan.

If the House Committee on Armed Services needs more staff to develop this plan in detail and present it here for enactment as a policy-making function of this body they should have the additional assistance they need. That is the way this law should be passed. We should not delegate to a presidentially appointed board or commission the right to draft our laws. On that basis and on that basis only I am voting for the Barden amendment.

Even aside from its constitutional responsibility, the Armed Services Committee is the peculiarly appropriate agency to draft military manpower legislation. Manpower is only one phase of our peacetime national defense and should be considered in its proper perspective, and in its proper relationship to other aspects of our national defense system. The National Security Training Commission will necessarily be confined to a consderation of manpower and would have no jurisdiction over related components of the defense machine.

We frequently fall into the error of speaking as if numbers of soldiers determined the strength of our defense. Our defense also rests upon our possession of strategic materials, the efficiency and vitality of our national production plant, our control of strategic overseas bases, the accuracy and extent of our intelligence, the comparative quality of our research and development in weapons and techniques, the efficiency of military logistics and supply, the smoothness and effectiveness of our industrial mobilization controls, and the fundamental health of our free economy to wage all-out war.

I wish to call to the attention of the Committee the Fifth Annual Report of the Senate War Investigating Committee filed with the United States Senate September 3, 1946—Report No. 110, part 7, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

This unanimous report sought to summarize briefly some of the principles of a sound national defense which emerged from 5½ years investigation of the national defense program by the members and staff of the Truman-Mead committee.

There is time here to quote only a very few of the committee's conclusions and a few passages from its comments relating to military manpower. However, even these brief excerpts should be convincing that the character and extent of our military manpower and the character of its training are an integral part of our entire defense effort:

1. Our national defense today requires a highly trained armed force, equipped with the most modern weapons, and capable of rapid expansion in time of emergency. At the beginning of World War II this Nation had no such force. It cannot be assumed that a numerically superior armed force is in itself an adequate defense. The quality rather than the quantity of our Army and Navy will be the best guaranty for an adequate defense.

2. Since service in the Armed Forces during peacetime should be such as to attract able, intelligent men, an intensive study of personnel matters in the Army and Navy should be made for the purpose of setting up a promotion system which will insure that the best qualified men, regardless of age or seniority in service, will obtain the most responsible positions (p. 1).

* * * * *

7. The United States is abandoning overseas bases acquired during the war at great cost in lives and dollars. Many of these bases are commercially useful during peacetime, and would have strategic military importance in another emergency. The War, Navy, and State Departments should have had plans, before the end of the war, to utilize those overseas bases necessary to our national defense, and they should have used the full weight of our bargaining power in executing these plans. The appropriate Government agencies must now work out and set into operation a feasible program for the acquisition or use of strategic overseas bases.

8. Under present world conditions the national defense will suffer unless the United States has a more efficient intelligence agency, in both military and nonmilitary fields, than we had before World War II. Knowledge of international economic, political, and social conditions is necessary if sound diplomatic decisions are to be made. Furthermore, data obtained by an intelligence service can assist in determining the size and character of the Armed Force to be maintained for the defense of our Nation. The establishment of a superior intelligence organization is good economy (p. 2).

9. More businesslike administrative methods in the Armed Forces during the emergency would have brought the war to a victorious conclusion at an earlier date, with less cost in life, dollars, and natural resources. Whenever practical, war should not be waged by decisions in disregard of sound business principles. The Armed Forces should bend all efforts toward improving administrative procedures and eliminating weaknesses in procurement and supply (p. 3).

* * * * *

We did not enter either World War I or World War II with an Army and a Navy equipped and trained to fight a major war. Primarily, we were able to fight and win both wars because of our industrial supremacy, our huge reservoir of certain important raw materials and the energy, ingenuity, and valor of our people. In an amazingly short period of time, we proved our ability to forge swords out of plowshares and to use them effectively against the enemy (p. 3).

* * * * *

It must not, however, be assumed that a numerically superior military and naval force is of itself an adequate defense. In the future we must maintain an adequate Army and Navy. History has indicated over and over again that a large and supposedly excellent Army and Navy may be useless props to rely upon for national defense. At the beginning of World War II France and Russia were thought to have the largest armies and the United States and Great Britain the largest navies in existence, but the combined total of this military array did not prevent aggressor nations from attacking them. Without our industrial supremacy those forces might not have prevented our utter defeat.

An adequate national defense today requires much more than merely an Army and a Navy. It requires the best Army and the best Navy, and it requires a national economy which can swiftly and smoothly be converted to a machine of defense superior to that of any probable combination of enemies.

The pitfall to be avoided is a military and naval force in being which gives the appearance of an adequate protective force, but which through obsolescence and backwardness is unable to cope with a more modern and more effective—although a smaller and less spectacular—opposing force (p. 4).

* * * * *

In 1933 the German army was composed of only 1,100,000 officers and men. In that same year, the French Army had 6,952,000 men. The sudden and comparatively easy defeat of France by the German Army in 1940 proved that size of a nation's army and even military expenditures, in which France led in the period between the two wars, do not guarantee adequate protection. The defeat of France in 1940 established that modern equipment and modern techniques were far more important than mere size (p. 5).

In this machine age of rapid transportation and more and more destructive weapons, great numbers of men in an army are, by themselves, of very little significance. Failure to realize this may induce a false sense of security, such as the French had prior to this war.

The committee expresses no opinion as to the optimum size of our armed forces, but the committee emphasizes that quality is much more important than quantity. A good little army is worth more than a poor large army. Whatever size we agree on will be valuable only if we maintain quality, both in equipment and in men. And it will always be better to sacrifice numbers for quality (p. 5).

Service in the Armed Forces during peacetime should be such as to attract the best and ablest of our young men, and having attracted them, we should be sure that we are exploiting to the fullest their talents.

With a high-grade leadership in the Armed Forces, many of the other problems of national defense can be more easily solved. Without a high caliber personnel, the best possible plans will mean little (p. 26).

The Armed Services Committee, and the House of Representatives, viewing military manpower legislation as an integral part of our entire national defense policy is in a better position to write a universal military training plan or bill than any board the President can appoint, even if every one of the five members turns out to be a genius.

I, for one, am unwilling to admit that the Congress has become incapable of writing the laws of this country. I am forced to the conclusion that the committee bill, even in its more palatable form, constitutes an admission of legislative incompetence and a repudiation of our solemn constitutional obligation to execute the legislative power of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

(Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to yield to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts the time allotted to him.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the whole country has been deeply shocked, wrought up, and is deeply unhappy by the removal of General MacArthur. They are very angry. There was no question of incompetency. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is a superb fighting general, an able and skillful administrator, and he is adored by the Japanese for his assistance in rehabilitation. Japan was safe with General MacArthur; everybody felt that the Pacific was safe with General MacArthur. They knew that General MacArthur was the last bulwark against communism. Now they wonder what will happen. His sacrifice, this horrible thing, must not have been in vain. We need to be strong now in a military way much more than we did when General MacArthur was in command there in the Pacific. Weakness would be disastrous for us, disastrous for every country in the world. General MacArthur would want our military defense strong.

I am voting against the Barden amendment. I feel that we need universal military training now. The Legion has wanted universal military training ever since its beginning. The so-called Vinson committee bill is better than anything that has been suggested thus far.

I have always voted for national defense and have never regretted it. I remember voting—and it passed by one vote—the continuation of selective service; then came the attack on Pearl Harbor. What would have happened had our forces been dissipated and we not had an army? I remember the fortification vote of Guam. I remember a Congressman whose son was killed on Guam who voted against its fortification. It might not have made a great deal of difference, but I know that it haunted him all his life. I voted for the fortification for Guam. I believed Japan only respected and feared strength.

I voted for the 70-group Air Force, and the naval airplane carriers. The removal of Admiral Denfeld for saying what was necessary for naval strength was not in vain. It resulted in a stronger Navy. The sacrifice of General MacArthur must not be made in vain.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a great deal about women not wanting UMT, not wanting a very strong national defense, not wanting their men to be soldiers. Do you suppose there is a mother or father today who would not want his son to have basic training before going to war? Do you suppose there is a wounded boy today in any hospital who does not beg to have the boys given basic military training before going to the front? UMT would assure this. The Daughters of the American Revolution have endorsed UMT. Mrs. Becker of New Jersey is the chairman of the women's national defense group. The following is the list of some 34 women's patriotic organizations participating in the twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense in Washington in January of 1951, who endorsed UMT. These women's patriotic groups represent 1,000,000 women:

Mrs. Walter H. Boyd, national president, American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., 1255 East Second Street, Long Beach, Calif.

Mrs. David Brughelli, national president, American Gold Star Sisters, Inc., 2046 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Mrs. Willis C. Reed, national president, American Legion Auxiliary, 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis 7, Ind.

Mrs. Paul Charles Wright, national president, American War Dads Auxiliary, 513 Railway Exchange Building, Kansas City 6, Mo.

Mrs. Gertrude Warner, national president, American War Mothers, 306 North Washington Avenue, Scranton, Pa.

Mrs. Thomas William Smith, national president, American Women's Legion of World Wars, the Embassy, Apartment 301, Sixteenth and Howard Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Hazel Rue Scott, national president, Blue Star Mothers of America, 111 Cherokee Trail, Willoughby, Ohio.

Mrs. Dolly LeBlanc, national president, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, Ladies Auxiliary, 70 Lenox Road, Brooklyn 26, N. Y.

Miss Frances Eddy Curtis, national president, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, 350 Monterey Avenue, Detroit 3, Mich.

Mrs. Claude W. Dudley, national president, Daughters of the United States Army, 111 Highland Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mrs. Beatrice Parmeter, national president, Ladies Auxiliary to the Military Order of the Purple Heart, 4500 Harvey Way, Long Beach, Calif.

Mrs. George A. Ilg, national president, Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 406 West Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo.

Mrs. Bessie Hart, national president, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, 527 North Noble Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mrs. Bessie Mittlesteadt, national president, Marine Corps League Auxiliary, 257 Division Street, North Towanda, N. Y.

Mrs. Evelyn McCaslin, national president, National Amvets Auxiliary, 2475 Parkview Drive, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio.

Mrs. Lillian E. Bauman, national president, National Auxiliary, United Spanish War Veterans, 40 G Street NE, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Minna D. Levine, national president, National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, 1776 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y.

Mrs. William B. Shelton, national president, National Society for Constitutional Security, 450 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn 5, N. Y.

Mrs. Marion U. Mansur, national president, National Society, Daughters of the Revolution, 32 Spruce Street, Malden 8, Mass.

Mrs. Franke Wolfe, president general, National Society, Daughters of the Union,

1861–65, Inc., The Lindens, 187 South Babylon Turnpike, Merrick, N. Y.

Miss Julia C. Fish, president general, National Society of New England Women, 13710 Shaker Boulevard, apartment 700, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. Ida Suber, national president, National Society, Service Star Legion, Inc., 409 Bell Avenue, New Castle, Pa.

Mrs. Eula M. Nelson, national president, National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, 848 South Spring Street, Springfield, Ill.

Mrs. Mae E. Shuttleworth, national commander, National Yeoman F, 658 East Fifty-seventh Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mrs. Jeannette Miller, national commander, Navy Club, U. S. A. Auxiliary, 1609 Central Tower, Youngstown, Ohio.

Mrs. Eleanor I. Coner national president, Navy Mothers Club of America, West Lake Road, Honeoye, N. Y.

Mrs. Edwin DeWitt Coddington, president, New York City Colony, National Society of New England Women, 321 Kenmore Road, Douglas Manor, Long Island, N. Y.

Mrs. Julian C. Smith, national president, Society of the Sponsors of the United States Navy, 5 Edgewood Terrace, Belle Haven, Alexandria, Va.

Mrs. Jassamine Doran, national commander, United States Army Mothers, State Fairgrounds, Lincoln, Nebr.

Mrs. John J. Doyle, national president, Women of the Army and Navy Legion Valor of the U. S. A., 13 Evelyn Avenue, Malden, Mass.

Mrs. Harrison Smith, chairman, Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia, 803 Weightman Building, 1524 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Albert Reinke, national president, Gold Star Wives of America, Inc., room 1436–37 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Augustus Dunaway, Reserve Officers Association Ladies Clubs of the United States, 5348 Broadway Terrace, Oakland, Calif.

Mrs. Evangeline M. Trenchard, national president, the National Gold Star Mothers, Inc., 664 Harrison Avenue, Ardsley, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, although the demands of necessity have eliminated an immediate program for universal military training from the pending manpower bill, there is still an opportunity remaining for UMT.

A vote for the pending Barden substitute will be a vote against UMT. A vote against the substitute is a vote toward the establishment of a regular system of universal military training.

UMT is the one hope for establishing a permanent system to preserve the strength of the United States without resorting to a permanent draft. With a large backlog of trained reserves, we can keep the strength necessary to resist communism all down the line.

America cannot long continue to move from crisis to crisis, from war scare to war scare.

The grave weaknesses in our foreign policy following World War II were largely the result of our depleted military resources. We followed the usual mistake of reducing ourselves to military impotence, and today we are paying the price.

UMT offers the one hope of avoiding this mistake in the future. We should vote today for American security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time may be given to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this very important issue and vital legislation has been carried on on a very high plane. The pros and cons of almost all points of interest have been thoroughly discussed and debated. The able and distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the members of the committee have made a most thorough, lucid, and impressive exposition of the measure before us. These gentlemen, the chairman and the members of the committee, have carried the burden of debate on the issue and certainly it could not be in better hands.

It shall not be my purpose, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to take the time of the committee to discuss in any detail the measure before us or to delay the vote on this bill.

I do, however, wish to be heard briefly to make a few observations. For certainly this is a most historic occasion—and this is a most historic debate.

The issue establishing universal military training has been long with us. Universal military training was first proposed and advocated by Gen. George Washington during the early days of our Nation's infancy. It has long been advanced in many quarters and much discussed. Such a proposal has been the subject of study and consideration outside this Chamber—but this is the first time that such proposal has ever reached the floor of the House of Representatives for formal debate.

This is why I feel that this is a most historic occasion. This is an occasion when I feel every Member has an obligation to make known his views and opinions on this important legislation.

As the measure now stands, I shall support it—the committee bill, not the adulterated substitute. We, in our search for peace, have so far not achieved the success for which we work and pray. As a nation, we must remain constantly vigilant and watchful and militarily strong and prepared. I regret that this bill is necessary—but, in all honesty, it must be said that the approval of this measure is one of the most pressing and urgent issues before us today in our history.

Two world wars have been thrust upon us because we were militarily weak. Danger of another hovers near or recedes in direct proportion to our gaining strength.

It is because of the truth of this fact that some form—some proper form—of universal military training fits into today's picture and is of such vital importance.

Almost everyone agrees, Mr. Chairman, that the present grave international situation may continue for an indefinite period. To meet the immediate challenge of this unrest and for our Nation's future security, legislation of the nature here proposed seems essential and necessary, and we must face up to the test and challenge of the hour pressed upon us. I shall vote for this measure and I want the people of my State and district to know why I shall vote for this legislation at this time.

My reasons, stated simply, are these:

First of all, this measure would guarantee to our Nation a steady flow of reserves into the Armed Forces—reserves that have been trained and would be ready to serve efficiently in time of emergency. Certainly the Members of this body do not need a further expression of the reasons why our country must be provided with such Reserve forces. Information made available to us discloses this fact and the daily papers tell us these reasons in very bold and black type.

Second, this measure would permit a reduction in the total strength of our military components and thus permit the return to their homes, their families and their businesses of many men with dependents and overage who have been called to duty. It is only by assuring a steady flow of trained and equipped reserves, that it will ever be possible to effect an over-all reduction in the numbers of our military manpower, and I, for one, would like to see our military requirements met with the most efficient use of both manpower and funds.

It should be pointed out, also, that by providing a system of adequately trained military men, we can protect our Nation against the tremendously expensive and wasteful system of sudden expansion to meet emergency situations, followed by equally wasteful demobilization after the crisis has temporarily passed. We cannot indulge in the luxury of meeting each new emergency with emergency measures. We should take action to solve these problems and provide for some stability of purpose.

Third, the measure as written by the distinguished committee provides for civilian control and supervision of the UMT provisions of this Act. I believe that no portion will be more generally approved than this provision to keep the initial training program of our young reserves in civilian hands. The measure further provides for a very close supervision of the training program by the Congress—another meritorious feaure—when such may be enacted.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the debate on this issue is in the very best of hands. I did, however, want to present these few points and to make my position clear, so that there be no misunderstanding of how I stand and how I shall vote. The vote which we shall cast may well be one of the most important cast in the history of the Congress. Action which we take here today may well be the greatest contribution which our Nation can make toward achieving and maintaining a lasting peace.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be given the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the committee will vote down the Barden amendment and let us proceed in an orderly fashion to pass upon the committee bill which was reported after more than 60 days of hearings. We have continually gone up in time of an emergency with our Armed Forces and have immediately gone down when the danger has passed.

It is essential that we have the UMT program set up, a plan submitted and adopted, so that when the time comes that men are no longer necessary for service we will have a place for them to be trained. Presumably when that time comes under present plans we will have 3,500,000 men with the system of UMT established. Those men would continue on duty, and when their tours had ended, then your active force would go down. You will have time to get your first men out of UMT into your Reserve, and your Reserves would go up.

It is essential that we have the plan so worked out and in readiness to start when we quit drafting for service so that those 3,500,000 or whatever it may be, on a level plane, will go down gradually as the 24- or 26-month period of service is terminated for the individuals. It would give us time to turn at least one or maybe two of the increments out of the UMT program. With your Reserves going up, we are in position to protect the country, and in that manner we will not face the point where there will be a hiatus in the program, where we will have to maintain men on active duty at full pay and have all of the 3,500,000 or whatever we have in the service.

When the time comes that we no longer draft them we will be able to put them in the Reserves on a permanent basis. It is highly important at this time that we see to it that both phases of the program are passed, that we continue the Draft Act as it is at present in order to take care of the present existing emergency, and that we be well prepared ready with the machinery, a plan approved, so that we can convert immediately from a large active-duty force to the orderly organization and build up of a reserve.

I know that many say here "I am going to vote for the Barden bill, but." There is no "but" about it. Throughout this debate there has been an attempt on the part of many—I felt it from the time we started—of saying "I am neither for or against UMT, but this time I am going to vote in a certain way because of certain objections." There have been as many objections as there are provisions in the bill. This idea of "I am going to vote for the Barden bill, but I am for UMT" is past. You are up against it now. It is a question of whether you are going to adopt the Barden bill and throw out the provisions of the House committee's bill without ever coming to a vote on it, or whether you are going to face the issue squarely.

I sincerely trust that the Barden amendment in the nature of a substitute will be defeated and that we will proceed to the orderly consideration of amendments and vote on the committee bill as reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the Barden amendment because I am for universal military training. It has been interesting to me to hear Members justify their votes on this bill and say that they do not believe that a vote against the Barden amendment indicates that they oppose universal military training. I think it is significant that all of those who are opposed to universal military training are supporting the Barden amendment. I am for universal military training because I believe that in voting for that I am reflecting the views of the great majority of the people of my district.

More than 2 years ago I sent out a questionnaire asking for the views of my constituents on this question. Out of more than 11,000 questions sent out more than 68 percent expressed themselves as being in favor of universal military training. The reason they are for universal military training is because they are for a preparedness program. Those people at that time voted more than 92 percent for a continuation of a strong preparedness program in this country. I do not think that the committee bill goes far enough, but at least it makes a start and will give us a start on universal military training which this country needs so bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

(Mr. CRUMPACKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, many subjects have been discussed in the course of the debate on this bill, but there is one subject to which the supporters of UMT have failed to address themselves: that is, their major premise that such a program will provide a reservoir of trained men; that it will provide an adequate reserve; that it will prevent the sending of untrained men into combat. I think that the gentlemen, instead of assuming this fundamental proposition, should have undertaken to prove it. I say that UMT will accomplish no such magic.

There are, in the armed services, many hundreds, if not thousands, of classifications of specialized jobs. Any man, to be qualified for any of these specialized jobs, must, in addition to receiving the usual basic military training, receive specialized training. This additional training requires anything from a matter of months to a matter of years. By the very fact of the multiplicity of these specialized jobs it would be impracticable to attempt to train men in all of these various skills in any mass military-training program. However, even were this not so, the very shortness of the proposed training period would make it impossible to adequately train men in any but a very few of these specialties.

Since the present bill does not set up any program, or give any indication of what form such a program might take, we must, for lack of anything more specific, assume that it will take a form similar to some of the programs which have previously been proposed. All of these proposals have been designed to train just one type of military men—infantrymen. Now it happens that combat infantrymen constitute at most only about 10 percent of the men in the Army ground forces. The Army, in turn, at most, has only half of all the men in uniform. Hence, at best, the UMT might train, to some degree, about 5 percent of the men who go through the program in the skills which they will need if they are some day called to the colors to defend their country. To put it another way, UMT, instead of providing us with a pool of trained men, would provide us with a pool of men, 1 out of 20 of whom would be trained—to some extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. NICHOLSON asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. BROWN of Ohio.)

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Barden substitute to the Vinson bill for the reason that I feel very strongly that UMT legislation has no part or place in any measure to extend the Selective Service Act.

I would also like to say to the Members of the House that the real reason why we have such a weak provision in the pending bill on UMT is simply because the committee, or the leadership of the Committee on Armed Services, came to the rather reluctant conclusion the House would not approve its original bill carrying provisions for an out and out UMT program to be established some time in the future as the administration might see fit. So they decided to bring in amendments to the original committee bill to make the measure more palatable and easier to swallow. Remember, however, that even the provision now contained in the committee bill is not the one you will actually be voting on. Instead, you will actually be voting on some unknown UMT provision as it comes back from conference. Whether you believe in UMT or are opposed to it, UMT should not be enacted into law as a part of the extension of the draft. Instead, it should stand on its own feet and be voted on in the American way. I do not trust, and I am saying this advisedly, those who will appoint the commission which will establish some sort of a UMT training program to become effective if this bill is approved. UMT cannot be put into effect now. It can only begin some time in the future long after those individuals who would name the commission have been driven out of office by the wrath of the American peo-

ple. One of the questions we must decide here, is whether we shall grant them these powers. I think I know, at least I have a strong opinion, as to the kind of people who will be named to serve on this commission to draw up the UMT program, if it is authorized. If we are to have UMT I want the plan for it to be drawn up by people in whom I have faith and confidence as good, honest-to-God Americans.

It is time we stop standing here in the well of the House criticizing many of the actions of those now in the control of our Government one day and then the next be turning around and casting our votes in favor of delegating the powers of this Congress, and of future Congresses to these very same officials and to those they may name to represent them.

We appreciate the need for extending the draft for as long as we are at war—but we are opposed to the using of the present national emergency as an excuse for fastening on America a permanent conscription and UMT program. Let UMT be considered on its own merits as a separate legislative action.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the section of this bill with regard to universal military training, it provides that the President will appoint a commission of his own choice subject to approvel of the majority of the Senate, that will submit a proposal for a universal military training program.

The proposed program is to be submitted within 6 months. It will be submitted direct to the House Committee on Armed Services, exactly the same committee that has charge of this legislation. The House committee will be required under this bill to either approve or reject the proposal within 45 days. If approved, the proposal, in the form of a bill, will come direct to Congress for consideration. Then, if enacted into law, the same commission that prepared the legislation, will administer the act.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the commission will write the bill and administer the act, if approved. This is subject only to amendments that may be approved by the House. If I am incorrect in this general statement, I would like to be so advised.

It seems to me you are going far afield when you authorize and direct a Commission appointed by the Executive to prepare and submit legislation which directs that the same Commission who writes the bill shall administer it. At least, it is a departure from the ordinary manner of handling legislation in Congress.

If a plan or proposal for universal military training is to be submitted 6 months from now, as you propose under this bill, why not let the Committee on Armed Services, who represents the Congress and the people, study the problem and hold hearings on it. What valid reason is there for delegating this important authority and responsibility to a group of people outside of Congress and appointed by the President. Let the Armed Services Committee study the legislation and hold hearings on it. Then let the great Armed Services Committee bring its bill to the House with its recommendations. If the House, by its vote, decides the legislation should be administered by a Commission, good and well, but, in substance, here you let the same Commission write the bill. Again, I say the Armed Services Committee should assume its responsibility of holding hearings and writing the proposed legislation, as is done with all other legislation. I remind you again, the Commission that will submit the proposed measure is appointed, not by the Congress or a committee of Congress, but by the President. Then you go so far as to limit your own committee to 45 during which to consider the proposal of the committee. Six months for the Presidential Commission to study the problem and then 45 days for your committee during which to take action.

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. HARRIS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Barden amendment because I am opposed to universal military training at this time. Legislation providing for an extension of the draft is sufficient at this time.

I am especially against that provision of the Vinson bill that sets up a commission with power to bring in a report which the Committee on Armed Services will be required to consider and which when the committee does consider will be given a privileged status so that it can be brought up for consideration in the House. This is contrary to the regular procedure.

If the Vinson bill is passed and a commission is set up, this commission will take the place of Congress for what the commission recommends will have to be considered by the Committee on Armed Services of the House. I know that Mr. VINSON claims that the committee will have the power to reject the recommendation of the commission but I also know that when this commission's report and recommendations come in, they will come in with the implied understanding that they have the approval of the President for the commission will have been appointed by the President. I also know that Chairman VINSON then with his usual zeal will argue that the work of this commission has the approval of the military authorities and that the Members of Congress should give consideration to the wishes of the President and the military. In other words, the reason for setting up this commission plan is that Mr. VINSON appreciated that he could not pass his original bill which provided for straight-out universal military training but that he could bring about universal military training by the setting up of this commission and then putting the burden on the Congress to reject the commission's report and if the Congress did not reject the commission's report, it would in due course become law.

From this you can see that if this commission is appointed and if it functions as Mr. VINSON would like for it to function, the recommendations of the commission would become law unless Congress expressly rejected it. In other words, if this Vinson bill is passed the action of the commission appointed under the Vinson bill may, if not rejected, become the law of the land.

Mr. Chairman, this is a complete abdication by the Congress of the rights and duties imposed upon it by the Constitution. This abdication will be in favor of a commission of five men appointed by the President and not elected by the people.

Mr. Chairman, the Barden amendment will provide for a draft law and will not provide for universal military training, and will not in any way call for the surrender by Congress of any of its constitutional powers or duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this is the critical vote. This vote is the one tat is going to decide whether or not you will have universal military training. If the Barden amendment carries, certainly it is the purpose of the author of it to dispense with the universal military training provisions of the bill, so this vote is critical.

I am supporting the original committee bill because I believe in defense through strength. We cannot fool ourselves and we cannot fol the American people. If we do not have national defense, we do not have national security, that is all there is to it.

I have seen two World Wars come on us when we did not have an adequate national defense, and I saw those wars engulf us. I believe that if we had had universal military training we would not be over in Korea today, fighting an ugly struggle over there and sometimes having to apologize for it.

I am supporting this bill because it also gives us a strong reserve program and an orderly, well-balanced reserve program. I think this is the way to do it. I do not apologize to anyone for coming into the House of Representatives on behalf of national defense. I do not think any of us ought to apologize for bringing universal military training in with another bill, or in a separate bill, or any way it does come in. When we are here to protect the American people and give them the security to which they are entitled, I do not think we ought to worry about how the measure comes to the Congress or what procedure is used. So I am supporting the original committee bill and hope it carries by an overwhelming vote.

[Mr. FISHER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I stated at the beginning of this debate that the Nation was at the crossroads. We will reach a decision shortly as to whether or not we will continue to force on this country the maintenance of a large standing army for an indefinite period of time or whether we can reduce that large standing army by establishing a program which will create a Reserve force to take the place of a large standing army. I certainly hope, in the interest of security and in the interest of economy, that it will be possible to create a Reserve and dispense with a large standing army which will be necessary for the country to maintain if the Barden amendment is agreed to. A vote for the Barden amendment means that this Nation will have to have a large standing army for an indefinite period of time. A vote against the Barden amendment means that we will have an opportunity to build up a Reserve and reduce the size of the standing army.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, in a few minutes we are going to vote on the substitute amendment which I have offered, and the bill as it was changed and brought in by the Committee on Armed Services and then of course changed greatly since it reached the floor. I say to you in all sincerity it has not been pleasant for me to carry on this fight. I am not a trouble maker in this House who goes around looking for an opportunity to pick on legislation or on some committee's legislation. But after I read the original bill which the Committee on Armed Services was considering, I had such a profound conviction that it was bad for my people, bad on our schools, colleges, and the American way of life, that I could not withstand the pressure. That original bill was changed and the next bill they approved was brought in and it was much better but I did not think good enough. Then they changed that bill, by the Vinson amendment which permitted this House to amend and consider whatever legislation the commission brought in. That was a great victory too, and while I could well have afforded to stop then for the major victory had been won, I disagreed with the 18½-year provision and the incompleteness of the bill, and what I regarded as an improper joinder of bills. Now it is a choice between a straight outright draft bill as it has been carefully amended by this House, after the House has worked its will on the substitute, and on the other hand the bill that the committee has brought in and amended under great pressure. If my substitute is defeated, then you will have to start all over again fighting on the committee bill. I think in my heart that win, lose, or draw, I have at least made some contribution toward provoking one of the finest debates it has been my pleasure to observe in the House of Representatives and in forcing a change in the bill so that the House and not a commission appointed by the President will write and pass on the legislation. The finest relations have obtained between the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for whom I have great respect, and myself, because I am sure the gentleman respects me likewise. We both entered into the perfection of this substitute bill with the sincere desire to give to the House the best possible outright straight draft bill. If we turn this down in this hour of great confusion which exists in the United States, and which all of us regret, then the news will go out to the country that we are not even together on a draft bill. If the news would go out tonight that the substitute draft bill is passed unanimously, that would be the finest news which could possibly go out to the American people. We are accused of being in such confusion—although they do not know whom to accuse—yet, we are accused of being in great confusion. If this substitute bill was adopted tonight, the news would go out to the American people that the United States House of Representatives is together. When the vote is taken on this bill when we return to the House, if it is adopted here, I do not believe there will be five nays. There was only one last time, and that Member is not here.

When the universal military training bill is considered, which the Armed Services Committee could have brought into this House, I would like from the bottom of my heart to see it given very delicate treatment. I would like to see the Committee on Education and Labor given an opportunity to make some contribution to the bill that is going to affect, more than any other piece of legislation on which you will ever cast a vote, the youth of this country. It will affect the schools and the school children, the young men who are coming on. We cannot afford to fail to recognize the value of the educational institutions of this country. We cannot overlook that fact. Yet in this proposal, S. 1, I challenge any man to get up here and explain it. What assurance do we have that these things will be given consideration. I do not know how long it will take this House to dissect it and amend it and try to approve it, if this substitute is voted down.

I am not an obstructionist in this House. I have enough to do in my office. I do not have any 18-year-old boys or any boy younger than that. I have one son older, and he is in uniform in this war today. Who am I to disarm Uncle Sam or decrease the chances of my only boy coming back home? God knows no man has ever stood in the well of this House with a more sincere desire to make his Nation strong and keep it strong, to preserve its every institution and its every tradition. If I am wrong, I wish to assure you that my every effort and move is prompted by my sincere love of my country and our American way of life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

(Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Barden amendment. I believe it will furnish all the manpower necessary and is to be preferred over the bill as reported out by the Armed Services Committee. I also voted for the Sutton amendment which in substance would have set up a civilian commission to study universal military training and report back to Congress for its consideration. What I intend to do on final passage will be determined by the final form of the bill after all amendments have been considered to the original bill.

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has just made one of the most illuminating speeches on the pending subject that has been made during the nearly 2 weeks debate on this bill. When my thinking on the pending bill began to bend toward the position so well espoused by the gentleman from North Carolina I was made to examine and reexamine the premises on which I was reaching a position in support of his contentions since they are in direct contradiction to the position so ably espoused by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] who is the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and who is the highly respected dean of the Georgia delegation in this House. Anytime I find myself in opposition to the position of this great Georgian I am made to suspect the fallacy of my position. Suspect though it may be, upon due and prayerful consideration, I am persuaded to believe that the position of the gentleman from North Carolina should prevail in this controversy.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been one to shirk my responsibility by delegating it to some other agency. Neither have I been one to believe in attaining my point by subterfuge. In my opinion, it is the constitutional responsibility of this Congress, composed of the duly elected Representatives of the people, to write whatever legislation that is written on the subject of military service to this country. And I honestly believe that the pending bill, even with the concessions that have been made, is a cowardly attempt to escape the real issues and delegate their determination to some commission within the executive department. I also believe that any plan for universal military training should be allowed to stand or fall on its own merit or demerit. I do not believe that any form of UMT should be tied on to a bill which simply calls for an extension of the Selective Service Act. This is dishonesty in its most reprehensible

form and should not be tolerated. We should separate the two issues and then the House should write the kind and type of UMT plan it sees fit to write.

If the emergency is as immediate in all of its implications as has been suggested here on this floor then the draft is the most expeditious and effective means of securing the manpower to meet the emergency. If it is not immediate then some form of UMT is in order but not the kind of complete military control of the youth of this Nation that has been proposed by certain committees and supported by certain pressure groups in this Nation. I certainly support the avowed purpose of UMT insofar as universal responsibility for service is concerned but I take definite exception to the theory that would hold millions of American boys to the task of learning the arts of war as they were conceived to be in order to fight World War I or World War II. Victorious war in this advanced technological age will not countenance emphasis on training the physical man to the exclusion of training the mental man. The manual of arms might have been all right for fighting World War I but training in the physical sciences is much more important in preparing for world war III.

The military is not capable of giving to the youth of this land the type of training that is needed for world war III without the help of the educational institutions of this country; therefore, I feel that any type of universal military training devised for the youth of this land should be integrated with the academic training that is given by our civilian educational institutions.

The emphasis that is given in the committee bill, which the Barden bill seeks to amend, to the work of a Commission will doubtless place the major emphasis on the physical military aspects of training since two members of the Commission will be wedded to the military concept to start with and it will be relatively easy for the Military Establishment to impress its will on one of the civilian members of the Commission.

If we are to survive in this atomic age we must place the emphasis on attaining and maintaining command of the air all over the world and this cannot be done by training all the youth in the arts of war that were standard operating procedure in World War I. In view of this reality let us proceed to extend the draft as is advocated by the Barden bill and then proceed to write legislation that will place universal responsibility on all citizens and make sensible plans to train them for discharging this responsibility.

(Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. JUDD addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I know of no debate that has occurred in this great body since I have had the honor and privilege of being a Member, which has shown more inconsistency and has created more enigmas in the thinking of the Members.

I have the greatest respect and admiration for all of the Members of the House of Representatives. Possibly there is something in what the great essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, said some years ago, that "inconsistency is the hobglobin of a small mind." Possibly he was pointing his finger at the debate which has transpired in this body in the last several days.

Let us, if we can, coolly examine some of the inconsistent positions which have been taken by the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Today the country is being subjected to a heated debate involving a great general. I have no way of knowing who is right or wrong on the foreign-policy question involved. Although I firmly believe, of course, in the civilian control of the military.

But let us examine those policy recommendations in the light of the Barden substitute now before this body; let us pose the question: How can you support the policy recommendations of General MacArthur and at the same time support the substitute bill of my friend from North Carolina?

What has General MacArthur been saying? As I understand, his thesis has been that we must employ the forces of Chiang Kai-shek and that we must use the American Air Force to bomb the China coast. But the forces of Chiang Kai-shek cannot be moved from Formosa to the mainland of China without employing the American Navy.

Mr. JUDD. Who says that? Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. JUDD. I just wanted to know where the gentleman got that information.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I may say to the gentleman that I do not see how they can move troops to the mainland without the use of the American Navy or merchant marine; they have no shipping available.

The point that I am making is that whether MacArthur be right or wrong his program envisages an expansion of the Armed Forces, not a contraction thereof. He might very well be wrong; he might be right in his central thesis, but in any event it does not mean adopting the Barden substitute which has come here in contravention of the work of one of the most distinguished groups of this body, the House Committee on Armed Services. So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is the height of inconsistency to support the policy of MacArthur on the one hand and at the same time in the same breath stand on this floor and support the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

That is not all the inconsistency about this thing. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] made his argument the other day.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I refuse to yield. My friend from Missouri has already made several speeches on this bill.

The gentleman from North Carolina based his plea on the fact that the military should not have control over the civilian functions of Government. I agree with the gentleman. But this bill, as I understand it, does not propose such control. I hope that the substitute of my friend from North Carolina will be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire recognition in opposition to the motion?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee is entitled to recognition in opposition to a motion to strike out the enacting clause of his bill, if he wishes it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where does the minority fit into that picture?

The CHAIRMAN. On a motion to strike out the enacting clause of a bill certainly the chairman of the committee is entitled to recognition in opposition to the motion if he claims that right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair if he will hear me?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I make the point that the gentleman from Louisiana moved to strike out the enacting clause which was a subterfuge to get 5 minutes to speak against the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could have made a point of order at that time if he had wanted to. He did not do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was fair. I wanted the gentleman to get the 5 minutes, if he so desired. Now the gentleman from Georgia is claiming 5 minutes to oppose it and he is getting 5 minutes for the same purpose.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels it is eminently fair that when a motion is made to strike out the enacting clause of a bill the chairman in charge of that bill on the floor should be allowed time to speak in opposition to that motion if he claims it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. From time immemorial it has been the rule to give the opposing party 5 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know of any such provision where the pending motion is to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to suggest that the committee vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana to strike out the enacting clause, and then let us vote on the Barden substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized to close debate on the Barden amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather peculiar position here this afternoon, in opposing my good friend who has offered a substitute for the committee bill. But I believe I am on sound ground.

May I call the attention of the Members at the present time that it is not only the issue of UMT that has been discussed so much here on the floor of this House that is involved in this substitute measure. The committee, in my opinion, went into this matter of the number of men from 19 to 26 and from 18½ to 26 as carefully and had as accurate figures as it could possibly get and they are accurate.

I have charts here and anyone can look over and study the charts we have. The gentleman from North Carolina has said there is a state of confusion existing. This is exactly what would happen under his amendment changing the 26 to 24 months. We would immediately have to call sooner than we would have under the 26 months' provision 75,000 more men. If we adopt the other amendment to the Selective Service Act he will knock out 254,000 more men, a total of over 300,000.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize the defense effort that we have got to put forth this spring and this summer because I believe that every Member of the House knows that defending this country is a matter of importance immediately and that the next 6 months mean so much to us.

You are going to necessarily have to defer more men for industry and farming if you expect to get production and food than we have deferred presently which is around 200,000. At the present time 150,000 are deferred for farming and more than 60,000 deferred for industry. We expect that number to be doubled. They are coming out of our barrel of 1,200,000 men. How did we get these 1,200,000 men? We got 600,000 of them by going back to the physical standards of 1945 when we were at the lowest point in the barrel of the manpower of this country, and we know we are going to lose a large percentage of those; we just cannot help it because, to begin with, many of them are physically handicapped. So, we are going to wind up, if you do not watch yourselves, with having to call all married men and veterans in the age groups from 19 to 26, and find yourself in the position where you are going to be called back here, because you will not have the necessary manpower to support your Armed Forces. Suppose we move this up to 4,000,000 men. We are preparing now on at least a 3,500,000 basis at the present time. So, it is not just UMT in this bill that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] affects, but it is the present status of your manpower and the Draft Act, which he himself says is necessary. I have always been for a UMT plan I think a long range military policy is important to this country. I guess most the Members the other day received a letter from a great statesman who served on that side of the aisle in former days, Mr. Wadsworth. I hope that if you did not read that letter, you will read it, because it is the opinion of one of the greatest statesmen that ever served in this House, who at all times during the last war expressed a sound view. Some Members who have spoken on this measure have been shedding crocodile tears about the mothers of this country. The mothers of this country are far more brave than the timid men. If they were not, the human race would have become extinct long ago. If we were to adopt this substitute measure, in my opinion, it would be good news to the Kremlin. So I ask you to vote this substitute down and pass the committee bill.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BENDER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the motion that the bill has not been changed since the last motion of that character was submitted, and therefore the motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. BARDEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 140, noes 232.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## EXCLUSION OF INCOME FROM DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2416) relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes from the Committee on Ways and Means by unanimous vote. It is a bill which we have heretofore passed for a 1-year period only.

This bill proposes to make permanent one section of the bill and to extend the other section for a period of 3 years. The bill is an amendment to section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code, and provides for amending sections 9 and 10 of that act. It relates to the purchase by corporations of their own bonds, and where the bonds are sold for an additional amount, that shall be taken into consideration for taxation purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 22 (b) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income from discharge of indebtedness) is hereby amended by changing the comma following the words "the Revenue Act of 1939" in the last sentence of said section to a period and striking the remainder of the sentence.

SEC. 2. Section 22 (b) (10) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation) is hereby amended by changing the date "December 31, 1951" at the end of said section to "December 31, 1954."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "amended", insert "effective with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1950, (1) by striking out 'if the taxpayer makes and files at the time of filing the return, in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribes, its consent' and inserting in lieu thereof 'if the taxpayer, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary by regulations prescribes, makes and files its consent', and (2)."

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 16, 1951
For actions of Apr. 13, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 67

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....5,13
Appropriations.....2
Education.....2,19
Electrification.....11,23
Farm organization.....21
Forests and forestry.....24
Grain.....7
Information.....19
Labor, farm.....2,25
Lands.....3,8,15
Lands, reclamation.....5
Livestock and meat.....9,20
Military training.....1
Personnel.....2,4,14
Postal rates.....18
Poultry.....20
Prices, farm.....20
Prices, support.....7
Property, surplus.....2
R.F.C.....6,17
Research.....3,8
Roads.....12,24
Selective service.....1
Small business.....10
Social security.....2
Trade, foreign.....16
Transportation.....11,23
Water pollution.....2
Wool.....9

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed military-training bill. Senate approved RFC reorganization plan. Sen. Young discussed need for farm-price guaranties. House committee reported Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill.

## HOUSE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Passed, 372-44, with amendments S. 1, the military training and service bill, after rejecting, 121-296, a motion to recommit it. House conferees were appointed. As passed, the bill provides for extending the draft until July 1, 1954, lowers the induction age to 18½ years, lengthens the training period from 21 to 26 months, and provides Congress a chance to vote later on a national security training program (pp. 3980-4017).

2. LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 3709 (H. Rept. 322)(p. 4020). The bill includes funds for the employees' compensation fund, Bureau of Employment Security (including farm-placement migratory labor program and negotiating and carrying out agreements for employment of foreign agricultural workers), revision of the consumers' price index, Wage and Hour Division, Food and Drug Administration, Office of Education, Public Health Service (including water-pollution control), Social Security Administration, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and disposal of surplus property for education and public-health purposes. (For excerpts from committee report see end of this Digest.)

3. RESEARCH LANDS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1149, to authorize transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College, for agricultural purposes, certain lands which were formerly in the Remount Service (H. Rept. 324) (p. 4020).

4. PERSONNEL. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3401, to increase certain retirement annuities in the Foreign Service (H. Rept. 323) (p. 4020).

5. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 16 (p. 4020). Majority Leader McCormack announced

that "there is no legislative business for Monday": that on Tuesday the Consent and Private Calendars will be read and various other bills, including the one on export control, will be considered; and that the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill will be debated Wednesday (p. 4018).

SENATE

6. R.F.C. Approved Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, to provide for a single administrator of RFC, by rejecting, 41-33, S. Res. 76, to disapprove the plan (adoption of the resolution would have required an affirmative vote of 49, a constitutional majority) (pp. 3921-8, 3933-4, 3941-8, 3952-62).

7. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Young, N. Dak., discussed the need for guaranties on farm prices to assure needed increases in farm production, and inserted a Washington Post editorial, "Trouble in Wheat," which suggests "another grain-conservation program" to assure grain reserves (pp. 3918-9).

8. RESEARCH LANDS. Sen. Aiken moved to consider the motion by Sen. Morse to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed S. 271, to provide for the transfer of a tract in land in Vt., used by the Department for research in horse breeding, to the Vermont Agricultural College. After discussion with Majority Leader McFarland, the motion was withdrawn with the understanding that it would be brought up this week. (p. 3965.)

9. WOOL;LIVESTOCK. Sen. Butler, Nebr., discussed the trends in wool supply and lamb population in recent years; claimed that the declines are "a result of unwise regulations by the OPA in World War II"; expressed the hope that "Price Stabilization officials avoid such errors during the current situation"; and inserted a 1943 address to the Livestock and Feed Conference by John R. Jirdon, president of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Assn. (pp. 3977-9).

10. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Maybank inserted a Munitions Board statement on policies with regard to purchases from small business in the defense effort (pp. 3960-1).

11. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Aiken inserted a Vermont Electric Cooperative resolution favoring this project (p. 3916).

12. ROADS. Sen. Wiley inserted a Wis. Legislature resolution favoring the proposed Mississippi River Parkway (p. 3916).

13. ADJOURNED until Tues., Apr. 17 (p. 3979).

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3713, by Rep. McGuire, Conn., to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to eligibility for retirement in case of involuntary separation from the service; to Post Office and Civil Service (p. 4020).

H. R. 3714, by Rep. Passman, La., to reduce the annual leave and sick leave of Government employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 4020).

15. LANDS. H. R. 3715, by Rep. Chenoweth, Colo., to authorize an exchange of lands in Pueblo County, Colo.; to Agriculture Committee (p. 4020).

16. FOREIGN TRADE. H. R. 3711, by Rep. Eberharter, Pa., relating to the temporary free importation of samples under bond for exportation; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 4020).

lamb-feeding industry is just as highly specialized as any other industry in the country. It requires especially designed facilities and equipment. It requires men of experience to carry on these operations. We do not believe that there is a bureaucrat in Washington who knows half as much about our industry as the average man who spends his time in the feed yards and on the farms in this country.

I want to make it plain right here that there is no such thing as a cost of production. An explanation of that statement is in order. If it were possible to secure all of the data from every feed yard in the country it might be possible to arrive at a figure which would represent the average cost of production for a given season, but those same figures would not apply for the following season because of the change in weather and labor and feed costs and death loss and other hazards. It is impossible for the feed lot operators of the country to produce lamb as cheap as it is produced when lambs are grazed in the wheatfields of Kansas and the Southwest, when nature is kind enough to provide the wheatfields with ample growth. It might be possible, under ideal conditions, to produce gains on lambs on the Kansas wheatfields as low as 8 or 10 cents per pound of gain, depending, of course, upon the value placed on the growing wheat and the fortunes of weather and other unpredictable conditions, while in certain feed lots of the country the cost of gain per pound on lamb may run as high as 25 cents per pound in extreme cases. Now, if ceilings are placed on the finished products with the intention of reflecting the average cost of production, it is easy to see that high-cost producers are forced out of the market. Our arithemtic will prove that if the average cost is used, approximately 50 percent of the producers will have a cost which is higher than that average. Consequently, these higher-cost producers must cease to operate. Understand this, that we are very happy to cooperate in any sound methods to curb uncontrolled inflation. Our industry has gone along a good many years risking our capital, taking both gains and losses as conditions developed, at the same time we have supplied the consumers of this Nation with lamb and mutton at prices they could afford and were willing to pay. You can rest assured that there will be no inflation, either in the pockets of the sheep producers or the lamb feeders of America under the present program and at the same time you can rest assured there will be continued liquidation of western breeding herds and materially reduced lamb-feeding operations this coming season, and with it a continuing reduction in the meat supply. I want to close by quoting from Thomas Jefferson who once said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread," and the same thing applies to meat.



## ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement perviously entered into, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

# House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our refuge and strength in times of trouble, grant that in these trying and tragic days we may be inspired with a greater faith in the moral order of the universe, a greater faith in the power of righteousness, and above all a greater faith in Thee.

We are confident that our beloved country will never go down in defeat or lose its national identity, if, as citizens of this great Republic and leaders in the affairs of church and state, we continue to turn our minds and hearts toward Thee and toward that which is true and just and right.

We pray that as a Nation we may be delivered from all enemies which assail us from within as well as without. Deliver us from those immoralities and those evils of crime and graft and corruption which are a blight upon our national character and a disgrace to our body politic.

May our domestic and foreign policies be Christian policies. Guard us against all hasty, intemperate, and ill-considered words and actions. May the spirit of unity prevail in all the various fields of national and international endeavor as we strive for peace on earth.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 322), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SCHWABE reserved all points of order on the bill.

## SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY AND INSURANCE ACTS OF 1921

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to call up a conference report on the theory that it is not going to take much time, not more than 10 minutes. If there is any roll call we will abandon the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. With that consideration, Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 12, 1951.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the reasons back of the conference agreement on H. R. 1, the gratuitous indemnity bill, are set forth very clearly in the statement of the managers on the part of the House which has already been read.

I simply want to stress that the agreement is the most reasonable one which could be obtained under the circumstances. The House Members were faced with a diametrically opposed proposition in the Senate bill as passed by that body. As agreed upon in the conference, we have been able to obtain all of the provisions of H. R. 1 as passed by the House and get the automatic coverage after discharge extended from 90 to 120 days. In addition, provision is made that a veteran within a 120-day period after his separation from service, may take out a 5-year level premium term, nonparticipating insurance plan, at a greatly reduced premium rate. This will give him the maximum amount of protection at a minimum cost, and at the same time greatly reduce the administrative burden placed upon the Government.

Tremendous savings will result from the passage of this legislation, and at the same time uniform protection will at last be achieved for all members of the Armed Forces.

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House has accepted the conferees' report upon H. R. 1.

It is good legislation, and a much better bill than that we passed here on January 24. You may recall that I spoke at that time and expressed a hope that when the measure was considered in the Senate some way could be found to permit the veterans to purchase Government insurance after leaving the service. The bill we have just acted upon does that. Within 120 days after discharge—during which time the veteran is covered by the gratuitous indemnity—he may apply for, without medical examination, a term policy up to $10,000. I know that this added feature of H. R. 1 will please many who have objected to the measure as it passed the House.

Another feature of the bill that pleases me, and in future days will lessen some of the burdens we face as Representatives, is the gratuitous-indemnity feature. Since World War I and World War II all of us have been confronted, time and again, with the problem caused by the soldier not applying for insurance, and later dying, leaving his dependents without insurance protection. Under this bill everybody is protected, and the widow and orphans of men dying in the service will receive $92.90 a month over a 10-year period.

Another change in the bill as it first passed the House of Representatives is the provision that the term policies issued to those who desire them, after service, will be paid by a premium based upon the 1941 Commissioners' Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality, with interest at 2¼ percent per annum. That means greatly reduced premiums, but no dividends will be payable. The savings in administrative expense because of this provision should be considerable.

I believe that the meeting of the House and Senate conferees was one of the finest and most cooperative that I have ever attended. The results show the unanimity of thought that prevailed.

## 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Permit the Chair to state that section 1 of the committee substitute is now open for further amendment. Are there any further amendments to this section at the present time?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 28, after subsection (d) of section 1, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], I think it was, offered an amendment yesterday to the Barden substitute dealing with this subject matter. We have sought to put it in proper language so that this not only applies to men who are inducted but to anyone in the service; in other words, it carries out what the gentleman and what the committee expressed its opinion on to let every man in the armed services have the privilege of writing his Congressman or Senator on any subject if it does not violate the law or if it does not deal with some secret matter.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Probably we should have had a quorum call before we went into Committee. I take it that the gentleman recognizes that the gentleman from Wisconsin should have been permitted to offer this amendment to the bill as it is presently before us. Now, I shall have word sent to him. But, if the gentleman insists on his amendment there is nothing I can do about it.

Mr. VINSON. I withdraw the amendment for the time being. I want to state this, the reason I am offering it is because I was afraid they would read section 2, and therefore he would be precluded from offering it, because the amendment is to section 1.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman's responsibility is as great as mine to have a quorum present, and I think probably that was expected generally by the membership. However, we were in the Committee before at least I recognized that we should have had a quorum call.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. It requires only 100 in Committee.

Mr. VINSON. I understand that, but I think some Members left the floor after the last count.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Celler | Gillette |
| Armstrong | Crosser | Kennedy |
| Barden | Davis, Tenn. | Morrison |
| Bentsen | Dingell | Murdock |
| Boykin | Fallon | Murray, Wis. |
| Brehm | Frazier | O'Konski |
| Buchanan | Gamble | Shelley |
| Sieminski | Whitten | Wood, Idaho |
| Sittler | Widnall | Woodruff |
| Smith, Wis. | Wilson, Ind. | |

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 1, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 401 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 39, strike out lines 2 through 7, inclusive.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is technical in nature.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this statement: I am hoping that the Committee can finish the consideration of the bill and all amendments thereto at least by 5 o'clock this afternoon. That would probably provide time for ample debate on every amendment to be offered. If we can finish it by then we will be able to dispense with a meeting tomorrow, but if we do not finish the bill today the House leadership has asked me to state to the Committee that it will be necessary to have a session tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON: On page 52, following the word "duty", insert the following:

"(y) That, commencing on July 1, 1951, the procurement of military personnel for the Army, Navy, (including the Marine Corps) and the Air Force, shall be under the direction of the Director of Selective Service, whether the same be by induction or by enlistment.

"The Secretary of Defense shall, by regulations, promulgate the rules governing the manner in which enlistees shall be taken into the respective services and how inductees shall be distributed among the various services. Said regulations shall, as far as practicable, provide for a unification of effort in enlisting personnel for the various services."

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, what part of the bill are we now considering?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 1 of the pending bill, which consists of 52 pages.

Mr. HAVENNER. Amendments to that section will still be in order after the pending amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this amendment should be free from any heat. It should really be noncontroversial.

As all of you know, we have a very large system of voluntary enlistment, in each of the services. The point I want to try to get you to understand is that if you will adopt this amendment, you will still get the recruits for the various branches of the service but you will get them at about 10 percent of the cost you are now paying under the enlistment system.

Up to January 31, 1951, that is, in 7 months of the present fiscal year, the Army and the Air Force, which have joint offices to enlist men, had spent $30,231,000. For only 7 months they spent over $30,000,000. The Navy had spent $1,860,000, the Marine Corps $1,135,000. All the services had spent an aggregate of a little over $33,000,000 for seven-twelfths of a fiscal year. The costs for the whole year at that rate would exceed $56,000,000 this fiscal year.

The cost of inducting men into the armed services during World War II by the Selective Service System was $25 a person inducted. The cost of enlisting them during that same time was about $250 per individual who was taken in as a recruit under the voluntary-enlistment system. If this amendment is adopted, and it is nothing but plain, common sense, every single office of the Selective Service System in every local district will be a place where a man may be enlisted for whatever branch of the service he wishes to enter, under rules that will be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I appreciate that the gentleman's amendment does not affect the situation, but there have been a great deal of inquiries as to why, since the start of the Korean emergency or the Korean War, there has been an insistence on the part of the different branches of the service on 4-year enlistments, except for the Army, which insists that these enlistees go in for a period of 3 years. That would seem to be far in excess of what the ordinary emergency enlistment should be, even under war conditions and immediately following the war. Would the gentleman care to comment on that, as to why there has been this insistence on such a long enlistment period?

Mr. JOHNSON. The reason for that insistence is that we get more for the dollar, which is expended by the Government, if a man goes in for a longer period of time. When you take into consideration the cost per individual for traveling, leave, and so forth, the Government gets more for each dollar that is expended, where the enlistment is for 3 or more years, as we have the soldier for a longer time, after he has had his basic training. But the point of this amendment is that the Defense Department will prescribe the rules for enlistment. As long as we have a way to procure men, and an efficient service set up, where available men must be registered, why not get those who wish to enlist at this place. It is fair to every service, and

provides a simple, efficient, and economical method for enlisting these men. It is obvious to anyone when it costs $30,231,000 for 7 months just for the Army and the Air Force that it is entirely too costly.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman's amendment make it possible to have recruitments, in one office, in the Selective Service office, and all the services would join in and be unified in that one office?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. And that would eliminate the competition between the different branches of the service?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, and it would cut out all the abuses that we have today because every single available man would go through that central agency.

Mr. STEFAN. How much would it cost?

Mr. JOHNSON. To induct men in World War I cost $25 per individual, and to enlist a man during World War II cost $250-plus.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman know how many men were recruited by the Army and the Air Force during that 7 months' period when $30,000,000 was spent?

Mr. JOHNSON. I was unable to get that information specifically, but an article from the Daily News of today states the number as 13,398.

Mr. JUDD. It would be very interesting to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the cost is very high. We had testimony on that in the hearings. This is not a plan which I have thought up. This plan was tried in Grand Rapids, Mich., and that is how I learned of it and became interested in it. The people testified that it was very successful there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this, as I said, was tried in Grand Rapids. It proved to be a tremendous success. I can see no reason why any group, whether it be the Marine Corps or the Navy or any other group, should object to this sort of a scheme when they may have enlistment officers, if they wish, in the Selective Service offices. The duplication we now have considering the fact that we have a shortage of manpower is almost criminal, to say nothing of the cost. Almost 14,000 men are engaged in enlistment work. That amounts to nearly enough men for a division. They are men who could be engaged in direct military work.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman's amendment should be adopted, it would dispense with all voluntary enlistments, would it not?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, it would not.

Mr. ELSTON. Well, it would mean they have to go through Selective Service, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSON. It would mean that the Selective Service offices would be the place where they could be enlisted, and there would not have to be offices duplicating the same work.

Mr. ELSTON. But suppose that a boy wants to enlist in the Marine Corps, the Selective Service would be under no obligation to see that he was enlisted in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, yes; the Selective Service office would be under an obligation and orders to take the enlistment for the Marine Corps or the Navy or any other particular branch of the Service. There is no doubt about that. Under the provisions of my amendment, the Secretary of Defense would be obligated to issue such orders.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman point out just exactly what he is trying to accomplish by his amendment, and how it differs from the language of the present bill? I wish the gentleman would make that plain, because I do not think it is clear exactly what the gentleman's amendment would accomplish.

Mr. JOHNSON. The language of the bill provides for the induction of the men, and where they register and are classified. Under my amendment the enlistment of the men which is now going on in Chicago and Milwaukee and all over the country, and which is being operated by the respective services, shall be combined with the Selective Service System and enlistments shall be according to rules prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, for the respective services.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is trying to consolidate the work of enlistment, is that what the gentleman's amendment is aimed at?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; I would consolidate the whole procurement of men by inducting and enlisting in one place and cut expenses down 90 percent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the House Chamber is equipped with microphones and Members are out of order who address the chair, so that other Members cannot hear.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no rule of the House requiring Members to use the microphones.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, let me ask this question. Suppose a boy's home is in Minneapolis and he happened to be working in Kansas City, and he decides to join the Marine Corps: Would he have to go back to Minneapolis to his local selective-service board, or could he enlist in Kansas City?

Mr. JOHNSON. No. He could walk right into the selective-service office in Kansas City and enlist there.

Mr. JUDD. He could enlist in any selective-service office?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. Of course, under the full-scale induction system enlistments were restricted, but a man could enlist. For instance, my own son enlisted in the Air Force after he registered for the draft.

Pursuant to leave granted me, I enclose the following article:

OUR WASTED MILITARY MANPOWER—FIFTEEN THOUSAND UNIFORMED PERSONNEL HOLD RECRUITING AND INFORMATION JOBS

(By Jim G. Lucas)

The armed services have more than 15,000 officers and enlisted men on recruiting and public-information jobs.

That's close to an infantry division. It's enough to man five big aircraft carriers or five B–36 groups. It's enough for 10 jet-fighter groups.

It would be erroneous to say there is no need for the services these men perform, but the numbers could be questioned.

Approximately 600 public-relations officers and men are serving overseas. Some have been killed in Korea. The Pentagon's daily briefing on the Korean War has been a real help. Without it you'd know much less about what's going on.

It would be physically impossible to report or interpret anything as big as the Defense Establishment—37 percent of the national budget last year—without competent relations men as contact points. They are able to tell reporters where to go to get the desired information. Frequently they get it themselves and give it to the press.

ONE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINE OFFICERS AND MEN

Last year the Armed Forces spent $8,400,000 on public information. They used 706 civilians and 1,789 officers and men. The Army had 600 public-information officers and enlisted men, and 362 civilians. The Navy, including the Marines, had 418 military and 58 civilians. The Air Force had 718 officers and men and 217 civilians. The Defense Department itself used 53 military public-information people and 71 civilians.

Of that number, 364 Army public information personnel were stationed outside the United States. The Navy had 63 abroad, the Air Force 157, and the Marine Corps 1.

CUT ROLLS SLIGHTLY

The military has been able to cut its public information rolls slightly. In the last 12 months it dismissed 142 civilians and transferred 69 officers and men.

Public relations is essential, but it can be argued that competent officers and men are holding jobs for which they were not intended, and which could be filled just as well by civilians. Take, for instance, the case of H. D. Schooley, head of the Defense Department's press section. Mr. Schooley took off a lieutenant commander's uniform to take the civilian job at approximately $8,400 a year. But serving under him are three full colonels. Their take-home pay is considerably more than their civilian boss gets.

THANKLESS JOB

There is no doubt that most uniformed public-relations men would prefer to be somewhere else. The job is a thankless one. If an officer is unfortunate enough to be assigned as a personal public-relations assistant to a temperamental civilian superior his career can be jeopardized by one unfortunate publicity break.

Much of the time they're torn between loyalty to their bosses and the people they serve—the press and the public. Many gen-

erals, admirals, and civilian officials expect their public-relations men to prevent publication of unfavorable items. When they can't they're in trouble. And often reporters are not satisfied with the answers they get, no matter how much work it has involved.

Most airmen on Pentagon public relations duty—Navy, Air Force, and marine—spend their free time pulling strings for a genuine flying assignment. That's their real love.

PARKS IS EXAMPLE

Nevertheless, all services have some of their best men at public-relations desks. Maj. Gen. Floyd Parks, the Army's Public Relations Chief, is generally credited with being one of the best in the business. He's so good he's probably stuck indefinitely in a job he doesn't particularly like.

General Parks is a former Berlin commandant, a fine administrator, and a top-flight soldier. He could command a division or a corps, and he would like nothing better.

Working opposite these men are former newspaper reporters and editors to whom it's just another job in their profession. Some people feel many more military public-relations posts could be filled by civilians, freeing competent line officers and enlisted men for other work.

RECRUITING PERSONNEL

Recruiting is another matter. During World War II it was suspended and all services got their manpower through the draft. The Navy, Marines, and Air Force don't like that system. The Army, on the other hand, contends that under recruiting the other services get all the best men first.

There can be no doubt, however, that the Defense Department could release thousands of good officers and enlisted men—now assigned to recruiting—for more essential jobs if it turned the task over to Selective Service. Currently Selective Service is operating with 229 officers and enlisted men borrowed from all services.

The three services have 13,398 on recruiting duty. Approximately 10 percent are officers. Of the Army-Air Force Recruiting Division's 9,446, approximately 250 are Wacs and Wafs. The Navy has 168 officers and 2,175 enlisted men, and the Marines 93 officers and 1,516 enlisted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has again expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KILDAY. Please permit me to make my statement first.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment transfers from the military service to the Selective Service System all power of recruitment. In addition to that, it provides that the Director of Selective Service may fix the manner, the plan, and the system by which they shall be enlisted or inducted. But, more important, it provides that the Director of Selective Service shall provide for the distribution of those taken into the service.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will yield, it does not provide that at all. The Secretary of Defense is the one who provides the rules and the distribution of the men. That is right in the amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. The amendment will speak for itself. As a practical proposition, when you transfer to the Director of Selective Service you know that his influence will be brought to bear with reference to that. I do not believe that the committee at this stage of the game would want to abolish or in any wise circumscribe the traditional right of Americans to volunteer for the service. Surely the great volunteer State of Tennessee would not agree to such an amendment. We happen to know the thinking of General Hershey along this line. He has advocated on many occasions since the expansion of the Armed Forces began that voluntary enlistments be suspended; that all persons be procured for all of the Armed Forces through the Selective Service System. Of course, the Marine Corps is proud of its traditional volunteer system. During the war, for a period, it is true, they had inductees, but on the other hand the Marine Corps is very proud of its position as an elite fighting corps of volunteers. This amendment could result in either the Secretary of Defense, who is an Army man, or the Director of Selective Service, deciding who shall go into the Marine Corps or into the Air Force. At this stage of the game I do not believe we want to deprive young Americans of the traditional right to enlist and to select the service in which they desire to serve. I am sure the Marine Corps would not relish a provision of this kind, and I know that the Air Force would not. Quite frankly, we are faced with the necessity of providing men for the Army. Up until this time volunteer enlistments in the other services have been adequate, but at this time we find it necessary to procure men for the Army.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that just the other day the Secretary of Defense inaugurated a new program of qualitative distribution of military manpower that will eventually lead to unification of all recruiting activities, and thereby reduce the cost?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. It is just going into effect. It has not been tried yet. It is something that was discussed with the committee at great length, to insure the Army securing its proper proportion of the high I. Q. inductees.

Mr. JOHNSON. This does not stop anybody from enlisting. It does not take any rights away from enlistment.

Mr. KILDAY. I know it does not say so.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Secretary of Defense came out with this proposition because he knew that we were thinking about the scheme.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, no; the gentleman cannot sustain that because the question that the Secretary of Defense brought to us was discussed with us in the first day or two of the hearings almost 3 months ago, the question of the qualitative distribution of personnel.

I agree that the gentleman's amendment does not state that he shall abolish voluntary enlistment, but it does advocate a channeling of recruitment through the Selective Service System. We know what will happen under the powers granted by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I read the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, it adds nothing whatever to the authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to enlistments which the Secretary of Defense does not already have. He already has the authority to do the very things referred to in the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, the qualitative distribution comes under the powers possessed by the Secretary of Defense. It is in an impartial exercise of that power that he has issued the directive regarding qualitative assignment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What about his claim of some economy in changing the service?

Mr. KILDAY. It is true that recruitment costs money. On the other hand, it is also true that we must maintain the pride of these services. It is true that we must have a channel for the dissemination of information with reference to the services. One of the great things in morale is the tradition and achievements of the particular service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. The distribution of information with reference to the pride of the various corps and the various branches of the service is well worth while in promoting the welfare of the services, the spirit and morale of the troops. We must sustain it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman from Texas has made a very significant point that all Members should bear in mind: Competition, I think, is just as healthy and necessary among our armed services in order to have efficiency as it is in business in order to have efficiency.

Mr. KILDAY. The man who enters the service and picks out one branch of the service because he thinks it is the best in the world makes a good soldier. He wants to think that his outfit is the best in the world, that his airplane is the best up in the skies, that his ship is the most efficient ship afloat.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. One other thought, if the gentleman from Texas will permit, is it not a fact that it would impose on

Selective Service the necessity of spending additional money in order to carry out this program?

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, yes; it would cost money to set up any system to supersede that now in effect. But it has been my experience that the principal result of these reorganizations has been merely to change the name on the door of an office. That is what generally happens in these reorganizations and consolidations.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. I think the position which the gentleman from Texas takes is very sound. I think the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. In view of the fact that the Selective Service System is not intended to be continued as a permanent agency of the Government, if we should adopt the proposed amendment would it not be necessary that we later change or be required to revert to the present Army system of recruiting?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; that is right; you would have to establish the organization which otherwise would be dealing with this now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the new rules which have been referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] can a man now go and voluntarily enlist under the new ruling and designate the service where he would like to serve and have any degree of certainty of serving in the service with this equalizing rule in effect?

Mr. KILDAY. It will depend upon what the quota happens to be at the moment that he seeks to enlist.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So, he can at least express his preference.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, yes. There is separate recruitment for the Navy and Marine Corps. The Army and Air Force recruit together, I am sure the gentleman understands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the ratio will permit, then he lands where he prefers.

Mr. KILDAY. He goes to the recruiting office of the service he desires to join, and if there is room he is accepted. If the quota is exhausted he gets his name on the list and enters when the new quota comes out if the draft board does not get him in the meantime.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Certainly the great State of Tennessee does not want to see anything done that will take away from her the reputation she has so proudly won. I think this amendment might do it.

Mr. KILDAY. At least it impinges on it. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The plan was first proposed to the Committee on Armed Services by a member of one of the draft boards in my own town, Grand Rapids, Mich., who came down here at his own expense and testified before the committee. As a result of the activity of the draft board members, I investigated the possibilities of this program a year and a half ago and at that time wrote the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, for some facts and figures as to the cost of the present recruiting program.

Here is a letter from Secretary Johnson, dated January 18, 1950, as to cost and I think you ought to listen to this very carefully:

> For fiscal year 1948 the Army and Air Force spent over $40,000,000 on recruiting activities in obtaining 281,171 enlistments or reenlistments. In the same fiscal year the Navy spent over $10,000,000, a total of over $50,000,000 for recruiting activities for the three branches of the service.

I know and you know that Selective Service could do the same job infinitely cheaper.

Again referring to the letter, for the fiscal year 1949 the Army and Air Force spent over $40,000,000, the Navy spent over $8,000,000, or almost $50,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949.

The gentleman from California has told you that for the first 7 months of this past year the various branches of the service have spent over $32,000,000.

Now, let us get this clear. The pending amendment in no way whatsoever deprives anybody of any right to enlist. It simply says that in your home town and in my home town instead of having four recruiting offices—one for the Army, one for the Navy, one for the Air Force, and one for the Marines, with men running all over your community trying to sell these boys at a terrifically high per capita cost, they can go down to one office and enlist.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, it would be a great saving of badly needed manpower if this amendment is adopted?

Mr. FORD. I wholeheartedly agree with the statement of the gentleman.

A recent article appearing in one of the Washington papers, the Washington News, pointed out that over 13,000 members of the Armed Forces are on recruiting duty throughout the United States. That is almost an Army division. These men could well be used overseas, in Korea and elsewhere. This is the most outrageous situation I think exists in the Armed Forces today.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman just stated some 13,000 of the armed services are detailed to recruiting. Does he not think that we would at least have to have a large increase for the selective service to do the work that those 13,000 are doing?

Mr. FORD. I respectfully suggest to the gentleman I am sure at least a 75-percent reduction in personnel could be achieved. I think the figures offered by the gentleman from California indicate that we could achieve the same success in recruiting personnel at 90 percent less cost.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. The figures quoted by the author of the amendment show that in 7 months the Army and Air Force spent $30,000,000 and the Navy and Marine Corps spent $3,000,000. Does the gentleman have any explanation as to this great discrepancy?

Mr. FORD. The figures I have for 1948 and 1949 show about the same ratio. I did not go beyond those figures.

Mr. MORTON. I think the gentleman was in the Navy; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. Absolutely correct.

Mr. MORTON. The gentleman knows that to get certain ratings were very difficult during wartime?

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. MORTON. Yet when we happened to get a little shore duty we found a recruiting office with a man with a good many hash marks in charge of that recruiting office. I assume that is going on today?

Mr. FORD. I think if anyone would go to their own local recruiting office they would find a rather sizable number of men assigned to such duty who have had vast experience in combat and sea duty. I think those men could do a little better job out in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON) there were—ayes 91, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Page 29, after line 16, add the following new subsection:
>
> "(1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, 'That, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaartion of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendment to the

Universal Military Training and Service Act'."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, competition among the services is a fine thing, but the fact remains that the Army is not getting the men. The glamor of the Air Force, the glamor of the Navy, and the glamor of the Marine Corps does not tend to increase Army enlistments. The average American boy does not fall head over heels in love with the idea of being flung into the mud of Korea. I want to make it a little easier for the Army to get the men they need without drafting them.

There is another consideration. A good many American boys still take pride in volunteering for service. Many of them are just finishing high school. They want to go ahead and do their bit. They want to serve their time now and not later, but maybe they do not want to make a career of Army service; nor do they wish to be hooked for a long-time enlistment. What this amendment does is allow them to come up before they get their first notice of induction and say, "I join up of my own free will and accord to serve my country for the same period of time as I would be required to serve if I were called through selective service. I want to volunteer; I want to enlist for that period." It is just as simple as that.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. To get the subject matter of the gentleman's amendment clearly before the Committee, it simply means that a boy who is within the draft age, instead of waiting to be called, can volunteer and will serve whatever time the inductee would have to serve.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. I will state that, as far as the table is concerned on this side, we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to raise this question with the chairman of the committee. The other day I had an inquiry from a college student out in my district who is married. He has no children. He is liable for induction. He sought to enlist and was told that he could not enlist, that they would not take him for enlistment. They said he had to be inducted.

Mr. VINSON. That is what this covers.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it was the Air Force. Certainly, if there is to be a consistent policy, if a boy is liable for induction the mere fact that he is married should not preclude him from having the right to enlist.

Mr. VINSON. The Army adopted a policy not to take any married men. For that reason, they would not accept the case to which the gentleman refers. What the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina does is this. If the boy is 18½ years of age and liable for induction, instead of sitting around and waiting to be drafted he volunteers and is taken into the service. By doing so he serves 26 or 21 months, or whatever is agreed to as the length of service. That is all the amendment accomplishes.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to be very sure that the will of Congress is understood in this thing, because this provision is the law now and is generally disregarded. The Army is not paying any attention to it. I want the Army to know what the Congress of the United States expects of it if this provision is included in the law.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that some 4,700 people were enlisted under the present statute along this line, but when it is written in now I feel confident that the armed services will follow it.

Mr. RICHARDS. From January 1949 to August 1950 not one single person was accepted for enlistment under the conditions of this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct that they were not taking those enlistments. The reason given to us, and whether it is the whole reason or not I do not know, was that there was a fear that the boy enlisting would enlist under a misapprehension. In other words, we have heretofore extended existing enlistments, and this bill continues the power to extend existing enlistments. However, the provision the gentleman has included in his amendment is that enlistments of this category shall not be extended except in the event of emergency or war declared by Congress. The reason stated to us is eliminated, so there should be no reason why the boy should not enlist. I think the gentleman's amendment is in order.

Mr. RICHARDS. My amendment corrects that situation, and the boy who enlists under this provision may serve only as long as a draftee will serve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Why does not the gentleman make his amendment apply to cover other branches of the service? In other words, if it is to be applicable to the Army, why should it not be applicable to the other branches?

Mr. RICHARDS. The other branches are getting the men anyway. They do not have a bit of trouble getting them.

Mr. HALLECK. What the gentleman essentially is trying to do is to make it possible for the boy to enlist in the service on the same terms as he would come in if he were inducted. If that is a good principle, then why should it not be applicable to all of the branches of the service? Personally I think it is a good principle, and I am impressed with the gentleman's amendment. Particularly am I impressed with that feature of it which will say to these boys as they go into the service, "Unless we are in a war or in an emergency declared by the Congress, we have a contract with you as to the time you are to serve and we propose to live up to that contract."

Mr. RICHARDS. Theoretically speaking the gentleman is probably correct, but I want to make it so that men will volunteer to join in the Army. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. REDDEN. I was just going to raise the same point which the gentleman from Indiana raised and to say that in my judgment it should apply to all the branches of the service. And this is my reason for making that statement. I called the Navy the other day about a boy who wanted to enlist. This boy who is 21 years old did not want to serve in the Army, but he wanted to go in the Navy. Their answer was that they would not take him unless he signed up for 4 years, and they did not want him unless he wanted to make a career of it. I say that that attitude is wrong, and the suggestion made by the gentleman from Indiana ought to be followed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Notwithstanding what the gentleman says, the fact remains that there are plenty of boys who are willing to join up for a longer term in the other branches of the service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK to the amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Strike out the word "Army" and insert "armed services."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it will not take me very long to express what I have in mind because I gave you my views on this just a moment ago. I think as a matter of principle if a man wants to enlist in the armed services he ought to have the same right to enlist in any of the services and under the same conditions which would prevail if he were to be inducted into the service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. May I point out to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that the weakness of his amendment is that instead of helping the army, it will channel all of this group right into the Navy and into the Air Force, because a boy will say, "I am 18½ years of age. I can enlist—I can go to my draft board and go in for 21 or 26 months. I will go into the Navy or go into the Air Force."

The original amendment is to help the Army and the substitute will build up where you do not want to build up and will destroy the benefit that we are trying to give to encourage men to go into the Army.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, if I understand the situation correctly the Air Force and the Navy and the Marine Corps are filling their quotas presently by enlistment. So far as I know they have not resorted to induction, is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. They are getting their quotas with 4-year enlistments.

Mr. HALLECK. If that is true, then certainly no man could be prejudiced any more than he is being prejudiced now because the processes of induction are not being used to put men into the services other than into the Army.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. The reason I am not willing to accept the gentleman's amendment is because I would be marching up the hill and marching right down again. The situation would be then just as it is now. The Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps will get all the men, and the situation will really be worse than it is now.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say that they are going to get all the men they want, as far as I can see, under the provisions of enlistment that are now prevailing. They have been getting them, so I cannot see where it would make any difference.

Let me say further, I have regard to the man in my district who wanted to enlist in the Air Corps. They said, "We do not want you." It has already been suggested by members of the Armed Services Committee that, in spite of the law on the books, the procedures have not been carried out as they expected they would be carried out.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I thought the Air Force and the Navy needed men of longer enlistments because there were so many specialties, where a short period would not permit time for training. Therefore, that is another reason why there should very properly be a shorter period for voluntary enlistments in the Army.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. REDDEN. I think the interests of the young man as well as the interests of the country ought to be considered when passing on the branch of the service he will enter. In the first place, when we require him to serve a minimum of 26 months, as this law authorizes, we are then imposing upon him the longest period of military service in the history of the world. There is no country in the world that has required anything like this period of service. If he is to be required to serve 4 years to get in any branch aside from the Army, then you are extending him for double that service as a minimum in the Army, which already has a minimum of twice the service of any other country on earth. I say under the circumstances he ought to be allowed to make his choice.

Mr. HALLECK. I have an idea there are many weapons used in the Army that will require just as much technical training as any of the weapons used by the Navy.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. At the same time this amendment will have the result of going back to the quota system where, for instance, the Air Force gets more recruits than they can handle at one time. They will have to go back to where they were some time ago.

Mr. HALLECK. The Air Force does not have to take any more recruits than they can handle. They may have taken more than they need. The Air Force can certainly be in control of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to say a moment ago that it was the policy of the services to not take married men into the service?

Mr. VINSON. Just the Army, at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. That is true of the Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. That is not the policy of the Air Force or the Navy.

Mr. HARRIS. I understood the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to say that they turned his man down because he was a married man; they would not let him enlist in the Air Corps.

Mr. VINSON. That was in the Army.

Mr. HARRIS. I understood he said it was the Air Corps.

Mr. HALLECK. I will have to verify that. I am not sure it was the Air Corps. My recollection may be in error. The chairman may be correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is adopted it would not do the Army any good, and would be a great disservice to the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps? They are now getting volunteers for 4 years, and under the amendment they would get them for only 26 months? The whole business of induction is unfair to the boys; there is nothing fair in war. But this amendment would hurt all the services and would not help any.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement I ask for a vote.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. What is provided by the amendment to the substitute is the very thing that you have been trying to do all the way through, give to the boys drafted into the service the right to choose whether they want to serve in the Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, or Army, insofar as it is practicable.

One of the things that has brought about more confusion than anything else is the fact that we have complicated the problem involved in the last 6 months by the breaking down of segregation and trying to do something in the Army and force it on the Army by strangling the Navy and Air Force. That process may be right, but I do not think so. Because I want to do something to straighten out the situation, I say accept the amendment.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi. As I said, I think in these days it may be that if we adopt this substitute amendment we will get more volunteers in the Army and we may be helping the Army, but I do not see how we can say to the young men of America that if you volunteer in the Air Force or the Navy you have got to serve longer than if you volunteer in the Army. I think the young men of America should have the right to say what kind of service they prefer.

Mr. WINSTEAD. They should have a voice.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. If he is mentally and physically capable of serving he ought to have something to say about the branch of the service he enters.

Mr. WINSTEAD. And may I say further that if you leave the provisions of my amendment in this bill you will solve a lot of the problems that plague us at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman realize that what this really is is a refuge from the Army? Just as soon as we dropped selective service, enlistments in the Navy and Air Force went right down; but when we put selective service back in they jumped up again. They do not want to serve in the Army; they want to serve in the Navy and Air Corps.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes; that is the point I have been making. Keep the provisions of my amendment in the bill and the problem will be solved in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. We have a serious duty not only to these boys who are coming into the service but we also have a very

serious duty to the United States of America. We cannot let the standards of the Army fall down below what they should be. We are involved here in Congress with that question, and I think we have got to be practical. We have got to insure to the Army men who are bright, alert, and capable of leadership if we are to maintain the Army that we ought to have.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I agree with what the gentleman says about maintaining the quality of the Army, but there is no common sense in penalizing the boys who enter the Air Force or the Navy because we have bungled in the case of the Army. We cannot curb every individual in America to satisfy that situation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER: On page 29, line 4, substitute a colon for the period and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no person inducted under the authority of this act shall be assigned to any theater of operation or to any area of combat of which the commander shall not have full authority to bomb all transportation supply and air-force locations and facilities and all troop concentrations and movements which in the opinion of the commander of such theater or area serve or support the enemy."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, briefly, this amendment provides that in the future our military commanders must use every military means necessary in an effort to achieve victories in war. It means that they will no longer be hamstrung by the asinine policy that has been in force in Korea for many months.

In Korea, which has become known to our troops there as "Massacre Valley," many of the 10,000 boys who have been killed and the 50,000 boys who have been wounded have been victims of that policy which prevented our commanders from destroying enemy concentrations and other facilities.

Our failure to protect our troops in Korea has been disgraceful and this Congress should do something about it. This amendment will make it clear that we Members of Congress do not want to be parties to future needless casualties.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under the Atlantic Pact our soldiers may fight over in another theater of war under some commander other than an American and perhaps not under an American flag. Maybe we ought to offer an amendment to straighten that out, too.

Mr. SHAFER. I would think that would be a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we in this Congress must assume the responsibility if we permit such a policy of warfare to continue. I do not want to be blamed for bloodshed that can be prevented through the adoption of this amendment. I want our soldiers to have every possible chance for their lives.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Michigan has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Georgia has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane.

The Chair has examined the amendment with some degree of care and while it does present a very close question in the opinion of the Chair, yet it does appear to impose a limitation on the use of troops sought to be provided by the pending bill. In view of the fact that it does appear to be such a limitation, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 62, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be open to amendment at any point thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. That means the entire bill?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why should we not finish with section 1 in an orderly fashion before we move to another section?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman insists, that may be done. I am just submitting a request.

Mr. JUDD. It seems to me it would be better to take it up section by section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JUDD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Page 28, after subsection (d) of section 1, insert a new subsection as follows:

"No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment in effect as the one offered yesterday to the Barden substitute. That amendment was adopted. There is a difference in language, and that difference is attributable to the chairman of the committee who kindly rewrote it. I think, in its present form it is a better amendment, a more effective amendment, and I sincerely appreciate the assistance and cooperation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as far as the Members at the table on this side of the aisle are concerned, we have no objection to the amendment. We think it is a very important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 26, strike out lines 14 to 25 inclusive and on page 27, lines 1 through 16 inclusive; and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen or national of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of 18 years and 6 months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be held to be applicable to any alien admitted for a temporary period (other than an alien exempt from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) who has remained in the United States for a period in excess of 1 year; any alien admitted for a temporary period who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President. But any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be

debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to impose upon aliens permanently residing in this country the same responsibility for the defense of this Republic as we are now placing on American citizens. It is necessary, because if you look at the bill you will find on page 27, line, 6 this language:

Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States—

And so forth. Well, that means just this, that in order to avoid military service an alien permanent resident need but fail to declare his intention to become a citizen of the United States. It is my considered opinion that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States should be made liable for training and service since they are being granted all the rights and privileges—except francise—which are enjoyed by United States citizens. Under the law, they are permitted to remain in this country as long as they please, they are permitted to work, to acquire real property, and to produce children who, under the law, are native-born American citizens.

The alien permanent resident enjoys full constitutional protection.

It requires no stretch of the imagination to visualize a picture where the alien permanent resident, if exempt from military service, is permitted to enjoy security, livelihood, and civil rights in this country due to the fact that the United States citizen, drafted into the Armed Forces, protects his "guest" by fighting those who might place this alien permanent resident in jeopardy.

Extending the liability of military service only to those alien permanent residents who have filed their declaration of intention to become American citizens appears to be a halfway measure.

By doing so, the alien is permitted to choose the nature of his obligations toward his country of permanent residence. The filing of declaration of intention to become an American citizen is a subjective act, conditioned by the individual's particular state of mind. Since the law imposes such liability upon every American citizen, any exemption of permanent residents from such liability appears to be unjust and unfair.

During the last 2 years alone we have opened our doors to over 230,000 refugees. In that number there are a large number—around 12,000—of young men within the draft age who most definitely should repay to this country the debt they have incurred in accepting its hospitality, its protection, and its opportunities.

Many of them are in uniform already. Names of young displaced persons already appear on our casualty lists.

But, unfortunately, we occasionally hear of cases where some of these young immigrants refrain from taking out their first citizenship papers and apply for exemption from military service. Legislation has been introduced in Congress to deport such draft dodgers who apparently believe in the possibility of having their cake and eating it, too.

The very question of the purport of the term "residing" was passed on by the Supreme Court very recently in the case of McGrath against Kristensen. Kristensen was a Dane who was a visitor in the United States but was unable to return to Denmark because of the war. He registered for the draft and then claimed exemption from the provisions of the draft law on the ground that he was a citizen of a neutral country. He then married an American girl, and had children, I believe. He attempted to have his status adjusted from that of a deportable alien to that of a permanent resident, which the Attorney General refused to do. The case then went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court held that he was not ineligible to citizenship because under this very language he was not "residing" in this country and there was no obigation on his part to register, and if he claimed exemption, it was a meaningless thing.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that the amendment he has offered is what the committee had in mind. We have had the benefit of the Judiciary Committee staff and our staff in examining the amendment, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. How does the gentleman's amendment affect the qualification of aliens for commissions in the armed services?

Mr. WALTER. I do not think they would become eligible until they became citizens. The point of this is that they would be required to register and serve just as native-born or naturalized American citizens are now required to register and to serve.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. That is is the information I wanted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. It is high time that we did something about this situation.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if the gentleman has given his consideration, and I assume he has, to the effect his amendment will have upon the possibility of American nationals who are residing in some foreign country which may have a program of universal conscription being liable for the same sort of treatment in that foreign country as we impose upon foreign nationals in this country.

Mr. WALTER. No, because this applies only to immigrants, to aliens admitted for permanent residence, who have come to the United States for the purpose of ultimately becoming citizens. It would not apply to a student, or a visitor, or a member of a diplomatic staff.

The amendment would preserve the authority vested in the President, by regulations to defer from military service certain classes of aliens temporarily residing in the United States, although certain such aliens would be required to register under section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

However, where a temporary resident, not entitled to deferment or exemption, resides in the United States for a period exceeding 1 year, he might be reasonably presumed to intend to establish such permanent residence at some future time and, therefore, under the amendment, he is made liable to service although he is permitted to apply for exemption, thus making himself ineligible for naturalization.

There is absolutely no intention of drafting into the Armed Forces, aliens residing temporarily, in good faith, in this country since nobody desires to have American citizens visiting foreign countries to be drafted into foreign armies. This consideration does not apply, however, to aliens who have accepted the privilege of permanent residence in this country.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have great respect for the gentleman's judgment. I simply ask whether he has given consideration to this question of reciprocity in connection with the treatment shown nationals of different countries. If he has considered it, which I assume he has, and if he is satisfied, I have no question about it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. May I ask the author of the amendment whether he has omitted the language now in the bill on page 27, which provides that this alien who wants to live here can get out of service merely by saying he does not want to be a citizen, or is that language in his amendment? The whole thing was not read.

Mr. WALTER. Under the language of the bill under consideration and under existing law an alien need but refuse or fail to take out his first papers in order to avoid service. It is entirely possible in the omnibus immigration bill which will soon be reported that first papers may be eliminated entirely.

Mr. VORYS. But does the gentleman's amendment provide that an alien permanent resident here who is of draft age has to register and serve?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly.

Mr. VORYS. I commend the gentleman. I have discussed this matter with him and I want him to understand it is a fine amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinios.

Mr. JONAS. I understand this amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is now offering is in accord with the bill H. R. 2000 which I offered and had before the Committee on Armed Services and which was dis-

cussed there, and which they presented and modified in form by deleting language which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is now inserting in his amendment. The committee substituted the following language: "any citizens of a foreign country." This does not meet the objective outlined in my bill. Therefore, I am heartily in accord with the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I am glad that it will be adopted, although I could not prevail upon the committee to adopt my bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which becomes necessary as a result of the adoption of the amendment just agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 41, strike out lines 17 through 23, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof, the following:

"(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted.'"

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment becomes necessary because of the adoption of the last amendment. It merely adds that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted. It is under the section which exempts certain officers.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAVENNER.. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAVENNER: Page 50, after line 19, insert the following new paragraph:

"(w) Section 12 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) The protection granted to officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard by sections 1114 and 111 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby granted to all persons inducted or enlisted in the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title, and to all members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces ordered into the active military or naval service under the provisions of this title.'"

And renumber succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, many Members of this House are probably not aware of the fact that existing Federal law affords protection to members of the Coast Guard against felonious assault while they are engaged in the performance of their official duties, but that no such protection is afforded to the members of any of the other branches of the armed services. If a member of the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps or the Marine Corps should be feloniously beaten or killed while performing his official duties by civilians or by local peace officers, and if the local authorities should not prosecute the assailant, no action could be taken to punish the guilty party or parties under any present provision of Federal law. The purpose of my amendment is to extend the same protection in Federal law to members of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps, which is now afforded to members of the Coast Guard.

The problem is one of long standing. Military authorities and the Department of Justice have been officially on record for nearly a decade in support of legislation to provide Federal protection for all members of the armed services against felonious assault. Under existing law it has long been a Federal offense for any person to kill or assault a Federal civil officer, such as a United States marshal, a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, secret service agents, post office inspectors and other similar officers as well as members of the Coast Guard.

I have placed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate in 1943, by the then Attorney General, Francis Biddle, stating that the Military Establishment had no jurisdiction over offenses committed by a civilian against a member of the military personnel, and expressing the opinion that legislation similar to the amendment which I am now supporting was desirable in the interest of protecting military personnel. In the same year a similar letter was addressed to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate by the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. He enclosed a draft of a bill to provide punishment for killing or assaulting officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police while engaged in the performance of official duties.

I can assure the Members of the House that the Department of National Defense is now in favor of the principle of this proposed legislation. Following the receipt of the letters which I have referred to, the Senate committee reported the legislation favorably and it was passed by the Senate at that time. However, it did not pass the House.

The list of Federal employees who have Federal protection against felonious assaults under various provisions of the United States law includes the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Department of Agriculture, Federal Home Loan Bank, and the Fish and Game Inspectors.

However, thus far the Congress has apparently not considered it to be equally important to protect the members of the armed services.

Mr. Chairman, there are many instances on record in the Department of National Defense of assaults by civilians on members of the armed services which have never been brought to trial in the local courts. In at least one instance, during World War II, a member of a military police detail was killed by a local peace officer. This soldier was on duty at the time he was killed, and had a right to resist arrest by civilian authorities. The United States Attorney General investigated this case but found that the matter could not be brought into a Federal court. In this case the local authorities refused to take the man who did the killing into custody.

In one instance, at least during World War II, a member of the military-police detail was killed by a local police officer. The local authorities never arrested this man and never brought him to trial. He got off scot free, without having his guilt determined. The soldier, as I am informed, was on duty at the time of this offense.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There has been a great deal of complaint, as the gentleman knows, about similar assaults taking place off the base when men are on leave. I gather that the gentleman's amendment does not cover that, and I understand why. I would like to emphasize it. I would like to emphasize that to the House, that the gentleman's amendment is confined only to the military service, and is an extension of existing law into what ought to be covered, to wit, all people who are in the service of the United States, as the gentleman proposes. It does not represent any drastic or new inclusion of matters about which many people have complained.

Mr. HAVENNER. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. I simply wish to say that I am in thorough accord with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman's amendment seek to give protection to the personnel of the Armed Forces while engaged in the performance of their official work?

Mr. HAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. With that understanding, I want to indicate my accord with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] close in 5 minutes, and that the committee be recognized to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee is not going to buy a pig in a poke. Everything involved here does not appear on the face of it.

For many years the law has provided that it is a Federal offense to assault a Federal peace officer in the discharge of his duties. The Coast Guard comes under that provision of the code, because in peacetime the Coast Guard exercises duties comparable to those of peace officers. In other words, they are those who enforce the customs laws. They patrol the ports and posts, and things like that. In that respect they are on about the same status as narcotic agents, United States marshals, and others who enforce the Federal laws. So this title of the Code covers all of those people who are in the same circumstances. But when you begin to extend it to the armed services, that is where you come to the bug under the chip. When would a man in the armed services be engaged in duty? Ordinarily a military man is on duty 24 hours a day. There are a number of different definitions in Federal law as to what constitutes duty. In passing upon whether a person disabled or killed is disabled or dies in line of duty, it turns upon whether or not the disability or death was the result of his own misconduct. If not the result of his own misconduct then it is in line of duty. So that the provision that is applied here is subject to interpretation as to when the member of the Armed Forces is on duty or in the discharge of his duty.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell us whether according to military law a man who is on leave or furlough is on duty so that if he is injured he is considered to have been injured on duty.

Mr. KILDAY. As far as compensation is concerned, if it were not the result of his own misconduct it would be in line of duty for death benefits, and under certain circumstances, for retirement purposes. There has been practically no difficulty about the enforcement of the laws of the State in which men are stationed when they are off of the posts. The Federal Government cannot compel law enforcement, it may be true, but why should we assume that the local officers and prosecuting agencies in all of the States are not going to discharge their duty? As a matter of fact, in times like these, when such large numbers of troops are in the service coming from homes all over the United States, there are the most impelling reasons why the assailant of a man who might be assaulted off the post would be prosecuted with great vigor. This provision, of course, is for the purpose of placing persons of the various States subject to prosecution under the Federal law.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. May I say to the gentleman that I do not desire to stigmatize any particular community or any particular section of this Union. Such offenses could occur anywhere, but the record shows that they have occurred repeatedly, over and over again, and in the one instance that I cited a man was killed without his assailant ever having been brought to trial.

Mr. KILDAY. That, of course, is reprehensible.

There is a long legal history to the question of assaults on Federal officers, the most famous case, of course, coming up in California many years ago where a deputy United States marshal shot or killed a man who attempted to commit an assault on Mr. Justice Fields, of the Supreme Court. The Federal Court there issued a writ of habeas corpus cum causa. It was tried in the Federal court with the Federal attorney defending and the State district attorney prosecuting.

The amendment offered to this bill has ramifications that do not appear on the face of it. It will make for disruption of the service and is a provision that will give us great difficulty.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COX. The amendment takes jurisdiction for prosecuting the crime now in the hands of local authorities and puts it in the hands of the Federal Government.

Mr. KILDAY. It takes such little things as simple assault, affray, and so forth, out of the State courts, justice-of-the-peace courts, and puts them in the United States district courts.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. May I point out that what we are now talking about is in line of duty or resulting from an offense which may occur in the performance of duty and that those terms have been well defined and construed by statutes which have been in existence since Civil War days?

Mr. KILDAY. It relates to civilian officers and members of the United States Coast Guard who have specific duties in peacetime about identical with the duties of peace officers. But when you extend it to all of the members of the Armed Forces then you are extending it too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time on the pending amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 46, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER: Page 29, line 9, strike out "26" and insert "24."

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I consider important and it should be considered very seriously by the committee. The amendment would cut the term of service of the men inducted under this act from 26 to 24 months, 2 months. The Senate bill provides 24 months, and I have not heard any sound arguments advanced so far as to why we should require 3 months more than the Senate bill requires. I am not certain but I believe that the President now has the authority that if conditions warrant men may be continued in the service for an additional year. This House recently passed a resolution to continue terms of service for an extra year.

Mr. Chairman, this 26 months takes every boy into his third year in the service and it is certain to disrupt the plans and programs of many of the boys because of the 3 months additional and going into the third year.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be seriously considered and should be adopted by the committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. Chairman, yesterday by an overwhelming teller vote the committee rejected this amendment. Now, what is the reason for increasing the length of service from 21 months to 26 months? It is due to the fact that under 21 months' service you only get about 12 months of actual military service. Under 26 months, considering leave, travel, and training periods, you will only get about 17 months of service. Listen. Out of an induction of 26 months you will only get 17 months of actual military service.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. There is not another nation in the world that requires a man to serve 26 months.

Mr. VINSON. That is no argument at all. This Government should run its affairs for its own interest, irrespective of how other nations run theirs.

Mr. SHAFER. The Government is doing that. It would not amount to a tinker's damn what we do here anyway; they will keep him just as long as they want.

Mr. VINSON. Do not talk that way. Let us be calm.

Mr. SHAFER. I am serious.

Mr. VINSON. Well, it is serious. It is certainly in the interest of economy.

I am glad the distinguished gentleman is here, because he is a little bit concerned this morning about economy. I have been trying to get him economy-minded all the time to show him why he should be for some form of universal military training to get away from the $35,000,000,000 annual expenditure now required for our armed services. It is in the interest of economy because for every month—and listen to this—that you decrease the length of service you increase the cost 5 percent. That is what happens. Now, it is cheaper for the Government to have 26 months' training and service than it is to have 21 months, and the shorter the number of months each inductee serves the greater the number of inductees required.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. This amendment would mean that you have got to necessarily put about 75,000 more men in the pipeline.

Mr. VINSON. It would mean that at least 75,000 more men would have to be immediately called than would be the case if it stood at 26 months. It would require 150,000 more if we did not go from 21 to 26 months. Those are the reasons that prompted the committee to go to 26 months instead of 21 months or 24 months. Now you have a pool of so many men, and the longer a man serves the fewer the number that must be drawn from the pool.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am open-minded on this matter, but it strikes me that there would be some advantage in drawing more men and thus equalizing the services.

Mr. VINSON. It might be, but it is very costly, very expensive, because if you only had 12 months or 6 months you would get more people trained, but you would get less service and it would cost more money.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What was the argument advanced when it was fixed at 21 months as it is now?

Mr. VINSON. Well, the argument advanced for 21 months was that that was about the best we could get at that time. The bill had 24 months and in conference it was reduced to 21 months. I am saying to you right now it is not going to disturb us, but it is going to cost us more money than any other one item in this bill, because your turn-over is so great. You are constantly drawing them from the pool and putting them in the service.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. When it was made 21 months we did not have a national emergency.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. And since that time the Government has been confronted with an emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am rather impressed with the gentleman's great interest in economy, and I appreciate it, but I am hard-pressed to understand how it comes that a plea for a 26 months' term of service can be made by the same individual, on the basis of economy, who brought to the House originally, at least, a plan to train all young Americans for only 6 months. That would be a more costly program than this one.

Mr. VINSON. This is for service in the Armed Forces; the other is a training program. I will say to you in all sincerity, if this Congress will adopt the 6 months' training program it will enable the armed services to reduce its standing Army. Instead of having an annual budget of $35,000,000, it will be considerably less.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman stating to the House that our Army will be reduced before the present national emergency is over?

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly not.

Mr. VINSON. Of course not, but it will enable them to be in a position where even if an emergency does exist they can reduce it because they have some reservists.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has it not been the gentleman's contention and argument that if universal military training is adopted and becomes effective the men who are now being drafted under his bill, which, if the provisions stand up, will require 26 months of service, will be discharged before those 26 months are up?

Mr. VINSON. I would say the President would have the authority under the language of the bill to do that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The President has many authorities which he has exercised only in part or not exercised at all, or properly, in the opinion of many Americans.

Mr. VINSON. I hope you will not reduce this to 24 months. If you do, it means it will cost that much more, and the armed services will lose that much more service. It means that you will just have to draft that many more men from home.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The chairman of course, and all of us, at the time we were drafting this legislation, were working on the basis of a pool of 1,200,000 men, having in mind the rotation system. No one can determine whether this thing is going to last 26 months or more. Another thing, when we asked them to put 600,000 back into the pool whom they had already deferred because of physical and mental disqualifications, it placed us in a position where we have to try to get these Reserves out with a pool of 1,200,000 men. If you cut it any lower, you could not do it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the gentleman be kind enough to tell us whether in his position in the conference committee, sticking to the 18½-year-olds as against the Senate's 18-year-olds will be joined with a 26-month provision as against the Senate's 24 months? That is a very important point.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to fight for 18½ if the House adopts it and I am going to fight for 26 months if the House adopts it, and stay there until—what would the gentleman from Michigan say?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Until the House directs otherwise.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago the executive branch at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue maneuvered us into World War II. The consequences was that 400,000 American boys died in that war and 400,000 more American boys came back home as neuropsychiatric cases, a form of living death. The national debt of this country went up $200,000,000,000.

But that is not all. The announced purposes of that war, the four freedoms, went down the sewer.

The Atlantic Charter went into the wastebasket.

But that was not all. The great dikes which have protected Europe and Asia against communism were destroyed in that war. Germany stood for a thousand years between western Christian civilization and the barbarians of the East. By unconditional surrender, American military power was used to destroy that dike. The blood and treasure of America was used to destroy that dike.

In Asia Japan stood between the people of Asia, and Japan was militarily and industrially and geographically able to hold the dike in Asia against communism.

Who destroyed that dike?

Not communism, not the Russians, but the blood and treasure of American boys was used to destroy that dike. The military might of America was used to destroy that dike. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all.

After the war ended and the brave purposes had gone down the sewers, more billions in American wealth were poured

into the hands of Russia and Russian satellite countries. More billions of American wealth were poured into socialistic England, which now seems to control our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, what tyrant in history has sent the boys of his country further from their homes to die in vain and futile conflict than the President of the United States?

This bill proposes to give more power to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, to the people who are responsible for blunder after blunder and who are responsible for western Christian civilization being in more peril today than it ever was before. The dikes against communism were destroyed—not by the Russians, not by the Communists, but by the policies formulated in the executive branch of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country expect this Congress not to surrender more power into these blundering hands. They expect this Congress to represent the people. They expect the Congress to save the people from the blundering hands that have brought the world to the brink of chaos.

Hence, Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment which will in a small way restrict in a small way the power in the hands of those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I am interested, after hearing the gentleman's speech, to learn what his belief is: Do you think Germany and Japan should have won World War II?

Mr. BUFFETT. We could have defeated Germany and Japan in World War II, if we had to insist on getting into it, without destroying those dikes completely by unconditional surrender.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I still do not have an answer to my question. Do you think the United States or Germany or Japan should have won World War II?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will read to the gentleman a little from the report of Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff, to the Secretary of War on September 1, 1945, about that war.

Here are pertinent excerpts from General Marshall's report:

> The available evidence shows that Hitler's original intent was to create, by absorption of Germanic peoples in the areas contiguous to Germany and by the strengthening of her new frontiers, a greater Reich which would dominate Europe. * * *
>
> * * * No evidence has yet been found that the German High Command had any over-all strategic plan. * * *
>
> * * * Nor is there evidence of close strategic coordination between Germany and Japan.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would still like to have an answer from the gentleman as to whether or not he favored Germany and Japan winning the war?

Mr. BUFFETT. I did not favor getting into the war.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the committee to have 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think he needs 5 minutes to answer that argument?

Mr. VINSON. No, but I saw the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] standing and I thought probably he wanted some time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why not yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON]?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment pending do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment.

If we are in a national emergency we should even cut it more than that, so that anybody who is sent to war will have at least some experience. I have listened to a great many queer things, it seems to me. We have had a draft bill since 1947.

It seems to me that if we drafted these boys for only a year and a half it would be sufficient.

In 1917 a great many of us saw service. I doubt if there was a man in the Army who was not an excellent soldier within a year. As a matter of fact, we won the war with recruits, with men who were drafted, and in a little less than a year and a half they were back home. If this is a question of money, that is one thing, but it is not a question of money. It is a question of taking a boy from his family for 2½ years. I almost laughed when I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for whom I have the greatest admiration, state that their actual service was only so much. Their service is 2 years and 6 months under this proposition. All the gentleman is trying to do is to cut it down 2 months. These boys are entitled to get an education. The longer you keep them away from it the less opportunity they will have to get it.

As for myself personally, I do not believe in drafting men to go to Korea to fight for something that they do not know anything about, or anybody else. I object to sending them to Europe or anywhere else, unless it is in time of war. If we are in such dire straits and we need all these things, let us protect our own shores.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, it will take me 90 seconds to say what I want to say. It is time for the MacArthur incident to be treated by everyone concerned solely from the standpoint of our national interest. Nobody is more sick at heart than I over the President's recall of General MacArthur. I personally believe it has done untold damage to our country. Also, nobody is more disturbed than I am over the developments since the President's action was announced, because too many are taking political sides in this situation. The one person who can present General MacArthur's point of view is General MacArthur himself, and the attempts of others to speak for him can only be dangerous to the interests of our country. Let us wait until we can hear from MacArthur himself in person.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe we all agree that one reason that we have to raise this large military force is to preserve the right of the gentleman from Nebraska and others of like mind to make a speech of the kind that he made just a few moments ago. I was amazed to find that a Member of the House would not give an unequivocal answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] as to whether he felt that Germany and Japan should have won the war. I accept that as an indication of the type of hysteria which has seized the country. Nevertheless, it stands as amazing when a Member of this House is not willing to state unequivocally who he feels should have won the war.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. For an answer, yes; for an argument, no.

Mr. BUFFETT. For an explanation of my statement. I was answering the question whether or not we should have got in the war. So far as winning the war——

Mr. KILDAY. I will ask the question now that the gentleman from Mississippi asked: Does the gentleman now feel that Germany and Japan should have won the war?

Mr. BUFFETT. The answer is emphatically "No."

Mr. KILDAY. Why did you not say so?

Mr. BUFFETT. And the question was an insult. If the question was phrased in the way the gentleman put it now, I misunderstood it.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman contends that he misunderstood him?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will have to look at the RECORD. Maybe the gentleman never

misunderstands another person; I admit very frankly that sometimes I do; most people do.

Mr. KILDAY. Perhaps I did the gentleman an injustice. It now appears that he will answer no question unequivocally.

Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

As to the amendment pending——

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman also spoke of World War I. I should like to know his position on World War I.

Mr. KILDAY. Now, as to the amendment; the amendment would reduce the term of service from 26 to 24 months. This was rather thoroughly discussed in the opening portion of the debate, and it was pointed out then, and it is abundantly clear now, that these men by the very provisions of the bill we are considering shall have 4 months' basic training in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; that they shall not be assigned to a combat zone until they have had 6 months of training. It is also clear that they will be entitled to approximately 1 month of leave, and experience shows that in travel and moving from station to station and getting to their outfits and things of that kind it consumes on the average two additional months; so by retaining it at 26 months you can only anticipate actual service of 17 months from those inducted under the provisions of the act. If you reduce it two aditional months, then you are down to 15 months of actual service under the provisions of the act.

I personally oppose any reduction in the period of training of 6 months, and I am sure we all oppose denying these boys a leave prior to departure from the country. That is all taken into consideration in the 26 months of service which we have provided in this bill.

The Senate bill, of course, does provide for 24 months of service and goes down to 18 years of age. Those are matters, of course, which must go to conference and should go to conference so that full discussion may be had as to the reasons for the Senate provision of 24 months and our provision of 26, and that we can bring it back to the respective Houses for final action.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the provision wil be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 60, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 30, strike out all of line 10 through 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Within the limits of the over-all military manpower needs of the United States and not withstanding any other provision of law any person whether a citizen of the United States or of any friendly nation and any national of Western Germany or Japan who meets all the other qualifications for service in the Armed Forces of the United States and who is determined by the Armed Forces of the United States to be attached to the principles of freedom and democracy shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"The terms of service and grade, commissioned or enlisted, for persons not citizens of the United States and accepted for enlistment under this section shall be in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the President: *Provided, however,* That no such person not a citizen of the United States shall be given a grade higher than that of captain or its equivalent.

"*Provided further,* That no veterans' benefits as now or as may be hereafter provided by the laws of the United States shall accrue to any enlistee or officer not a citizen of the United States and accepted under the provisions of this section; nor shall any such enlistee or officer acquire any special rights or preference in connection with the attainment of United States citizenship by reason of the service authorized herein."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas upon the ground that it indirectly affects the naturalization laws of the country which are not a part of the pending measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order in order for the gentleman to state his position.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it is the same amendment as was offered here yesterday. I do not care for the gentleman to reserve his point of order, but I would like to make a statement to the chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, of course, we did not make a point of order yesterday, but the committee rejected it.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. It is the same amendment the gentleman offered yesterday?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I want to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply changes the provisions under which persons may be taken into the armed services of the United States. The bill now provides that within certain limits persons of prescribed ages shall be given an opportunity to come into the service of the United States. We change those conditions and one of the limitations we impose is to say that no one shall become a citizen of the United States simply by virtue of this act. That in no wise changes or any manner affects the present immigration laws of the United States because there is no immigration law of the United States that says that anyone who serves under the terms of this bill shall or shall not become a citizen of the United States. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it cannot possibly affect the immigration laws of the United States because there is no law of the United States that relates to the matter.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am not pressing my point of order in order that the gentleman may discuss his amendment.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentlemen's forebearance but I want the point of order decided right now. If you gentlemen do not want to face this issue, I want the record to so show.

Mr. COLE of New York. We faced the issue on yesterday.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Would it not be necessary for him to take the oath of allegiance?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; he would have to take the oath.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. What kind of oath would he take, not being a citizen of the United States?

Mr. POAGE. He would take the same oath that any citizen takes who goes into the United States Army. The oath that one takes when he goes into the United States Army is not a citizenship oath.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from New York be kind enough to point out the provision in the pending amendment which he thinks definitely amends other existing law?

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I do not have the amendment before me. All I know of it is hearing it read at the Clerk's desk. My attention was arrested to the latter part of the amendent which related definitely to existing citizenship and other laws.

Mr. POAGE. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it does not relate to existing citizenship laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment presented by the gentleman from Texas states:

(2) Within the limits of the over-all military manpower needs of the United States, and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any person, whether a citizen of the United States or any friendly nation, and any national of Western Germany or Japan who meets all other qualifications for service in the Armed Forces of the United States and who is determined by the Armed Forces of the United States to be attached to the principles of freedom and democracy, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from New York if he thinks there is anything up to that point that would not be germane to the pending bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Certainly, if the Chairman, having the amendment in his hands, cannot find anything that is subject to a point of order, I am not in a position to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that on the face of the amendment, as it appears, it would be germane to the pending bill, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that a few of you voted down on yesterday after the committee limited debate to two 5-minute

speeches. I think that any proposal to save American boys and American dollars is worthy of more discussion. This is the same amendment that I have discussed before this House on several occasions.

The whole issue is, Are you willing to use all of the resources to secure all of the men we need in our Armed Forces to carry on our global defense, or are you convinced that you must place the entire burden of the world on the shoulders of American boys? Are you willing to pay the salaries of those who would volunteer from other lands to serve in this world-wide defense effort or do you prefer to go out and grab some American boy by the nape of the neck and force him to serve against his will and possibly to the injury of our domestic economy?

I want the members of this committee to understand the question this amendment puts before us. I do not want anybody to hide out behind the proposition, "How will you make citizens out of these people?" The bill does not make citizens out of anyone. It does not use American citizenship as a bribe. It simply says that if a man in Germany for example wants to serve in the United States Army, to stand with the forces of freedom between his own German home and the forces of dictatorship, that we will give him the opportunity to do so. It says that if we can recruit a man from Tokyo and put a gun over his shoulder and get him to go over and do some of the fighting in Korea instead of sending a boy from St. Louis, then by this amendment, we offer him the opportunity to do so.

It means that we give you a practical means of using the manpower now in the Nationalist Army of China. It gives the Army an opportunity to work out a method of using these men under the American flag, where they would take orders from our own military commanders; where we would avoid the dangers that so many see in depending on foreign leadership. It simply says that the United States of America is going to command those who fight at our expense over the far-flung battlefields of this world.

It leaves all the details to this Government. In fact, it lets the Armed Forces themselves decide on the qualifications of those who would enlist and on the conditions of their service. It simply proclaims the policy of using everybody we can. It even leaves it in the power of the conference committee to make changes and improvements in the details. Is the Armed Services Committee afraid of itself?

I call the chairman's attention to the great speech he made on economy a while ago. I know the chairman will be fair enough to realize that you can maintain a division of German nationals in Germany as a part of the American Army more cheaply than you can maintain a division of American boys in Germany under the American flag. You can strengthen the economy of every one of the countries from which we enlist men by carrying this program into effect. If you would but employ some of these Germans in the American Army, you would not have to be sending so much money and economic aid to Germany. For every dollar that you spend in paying the salary of a German national who you keep in Germany it will put a dollar into the economy of Germany, just as truly as if you sent it as a gift. Every time you spend a dollar under this amendment you can withdraw a dollar from the economic support you give to the countries in which you pay the soldier. If you want to save for the American taxpayers millions of dollars, if you want to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys, I cannot see how you can conscientiously say that you are not going to give consideration to passing this amendment this afternoon.

I know the chairman is going to tell you that they had General Eisenhower before the committee and he said he was not in favor of a Hessian Army. I hope the chairman will tell you why General Eisenhower said he was not in favor of it. I hope those who object to this will tell you why, rather than simply hiding behind some high-sounding words to the effect that "we do not want a Hessian Army," that we do not want any mercenary troops in the United States Army. Why do you not want them in the Army? Do you not want to do everything you can to avoid bringing back any more caskets with American flags over them than we have to? Are your feelings so strong against what you may consider an undignified position for the military commanders of our country that you would rather return caskets than to provide for the use of foreign troops? If any of you feel so strongly or have such a pride in our 100-percent American forces you might consider an amendment to this bill which would allow Congressmen to volunteer regardless of age or physical fitness.

How can you object to allowing anyone who will to join in the maintenance of the peace of the world, a job of protecting their own homes as well as our homes?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. As I recall the newspaper comment on General Eisenhower's statement, it was that he does not want a ragtag of mercenaries. He did not say he did not want foreign nationals enlisted to serve under our flag. May I point out that this matter already has been favorably acted on in the other body. It is a part of their bill.

Mr. POAGE. Under this amendment we do not ask that you force any man into the service of the United States. We say, "Give any man a chance to serve if he wants to."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas would not yield to me, I desire to ask him a question in regard to the proposal he has made. I do that because, while the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] had proposed an amendment here this morning, I was in my office checking the code and statutes working on an amendment along the same lines. They do differ somewhat, but I will not take the time to discuss that at this particular time.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] what does he say about the aliens or noncitizens who have already been inducted into the armed services or have volunteered their services and are now fighting in the uniform of the United States in Korea. Would he deny citizenship to them?

Mr. POAGE. My amendment does not say anything about them. This would not change their status one way or the other. They retain any rights that they may have acquired. I simply say that if a man comes in under provision, it does not give him any special rights. That is all the amendment says.

Mr. SADLAK. May I ask the gentleman, would he have any objection to a proposal that those now serving in the Army of the United States, in our uniform, and who had come legally to the United States and who had been inducted or volunteered, should be granted immediately the privilege of United States citizenship?

Mr. POAGE. I would not deny them any privileges that they have under the present law. This would give them every privilege that they now have. It neither adds nor detracts from their present rights.

Mr. SADLAK. There is no privilege given under the gentleman's amendment because the law granting expeditious citizenship to those serving in the Armed Forces expired on December 31, 1946, and therefore there is no way in which he can obtain citizenship now earlier than waiting the period of 5 years.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, but the situation is in nowise altered by this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I merely have a couple of observations to contribute. The very argument made by the gentleman from Texas in seeking to have his proposal adopted, would be answered by merely hiring these various foreigners to fight for the United States Government. I cannot see any reason for bringing them into the United States armed service to be classified as American boys if we merely want their assistance to prevent young men in this country from having to serve in the Army during the time of emergency. We can hire those foreign soldiers as cheap as we would need to pay them to become members of the United States Army. I think

it would be more logical to hire foreigners to fight for us than to hire them to become members of our Army to thereafter be treated as United States veterans of the United States armed services.

Mr. CLEMENTE. And if they were brought into the Armed Forces, they would be entitled to compensation for injuries and so forth.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; we will save money by hiring foreigners to fight for us rather than hiring them to become a part of us. Even though this proposal would not classify these foreigners for veteran benefits, a later Congress will be duty bound to treat such foreign veterans the same as veteran citizens of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] did not answer, and that is to say that the Poage amendment expressly provides against the payment of veterans' benefits to foreign nationals who are taken into the United States Army under this amendment. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, provides the means to answer that question which is being asked all over the United States of America today. The people are wondering why the nationals of other countries are not being used, and you know as well as I do that we are now feeling earth-shaking tremors because that question has not been answered.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I would also favor legislation which would allow us to hire soldiers to fight for the United States, but do you not know that the next Congress that comes here after some of these fellows are injured or wounded in action will pass legislation giving them the same benefits as soldiers of the United States Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I cannot say what some other Congress may do and I cannot be responsible for that. I do want to say this about the mercenary question. I have asked the military men about that and everytime I have asked the question they have told me that the United States Army does not want mercenaries. They say that mercenary soldiers are no good. I will grant that and go a step further. Mercenary citizens are no good. That has nothing to do with this amendment because foreign nationals who will be taken into the Army under this amendment will be joining a force that is dedicated to the destruction of communism, the common enemy of all free peoples. Therefore, I submit that such foreign nationals would not stand in the status of mercenaries. These foreign nationals who profess to want freedom and to fight communism will be given the opportunity under this amendment to do something besides talk, and they will have the opportunity to be paid for it. It is their countries which are primarily being overrun and if they want to fight to stop the tide, now is the time to put them to the test. People have asked over and over why the Chinese Nationalists have not been used. This amendment will permit the induction of as many of the Chinese Nationalists who want to come into the United States Army and I want to see the opportunity afforded them to show how sincere they are in their professed desire to fight communism. This country has furnished the materials and the guns to the other free nations of this world, and it is high time that we let those countries furnish some of the men to pull the triggers on those guns. We cannot continue to pay the bill and in addition to furnish the manpower. This amendment will permit these foreign nationals to be under the control of American officers, where they should be. You Members who have stood on this floor and spoken so eloquently and so exhaustively espousing the use of Chinese Nationalists have in this amendment the opportunity to realize what you have said you want. I want the Chinese Nationalists used and that is why I am going to vote for this amendment, and I think that if you are sincere in what you have been saying, you ought to vote for the amendment, too. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

[Mr. WERDEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized.

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support the pending amendment. However, I rose primarily to stress the fact that the legislation that we are presently considering is of the greatest possible interest to all classes of our people. There is no doubt that every Member of Congress agrees with me that this legislation is of tremendous interest to home folks of all classes. This fact was most forcefully brought out by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. Having served in the last war with an outfit in which there were many boys of about 18 years of age, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] would naturally know the interest of these young men who are now in a very uncertain attitude. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] held a number of meetings which were attended by many high-school boys and also by high-school girls and their parents. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] comes from the large city of Akron, Ohio, and his audiences were very representative. He threw the meetings open so that the boys could express their views. These meetings claimed the attention of many people. Life magazine took an interest in the meetings of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] and took many pictures which graphically depict the great interest shown in these meetings. The current issue of this magazine will be interesting to you. I recommend that you read this magazine and look at the pictures. I compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] on his great idea and of the success of his meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized.

Mr. BRAY. As for the theory that it is against our Government's policies for aliens to serve in American armies, that is entirely in error. To my personal knowledge, I remember both Chinese and Korean aliens serving in the American Army. I know nothing as to their numbers, but any such objection to letting them go into the armed services is entirely erroneous.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why we should not use these individuals from other countries to fight on our side if they are willing to fight.

Recently I was disappointed when we learned that some 150,000 South Koreans were sent home and not allowed to fight. I never could understand why the South Koreans should not be permitted to fight. There is another 300,000 Koreans who are anxious to fight. Instead of sending our 18-year-old boys to fight their battles for them, we should let them, we should let them do the fighting.

This amendment has a great deal of merit. I hope you will give it earnest consideration. This country can use the services of our friends from other countries. The committee should adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the idea of using troops other than from our own country, I have not been hostile to that idea. As a matter of fact, I have made speeches in behalf of it; but I have examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and I think it is in very poor form. It will give us a great deal of trouble. In the first place, the amendment strikes out a part of the bill which permits voluntary inductions of men into our own service. I do not think that part ought to be stricken out.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The amendment specifically allows any American citizen to enlist; it includes those boys stricken out.

Mr. BROOKS. But the gentleman's amendment on page 30 strikes out lines 10 to 17.

Mr. POAGE. And inserts the provision whereby all those boys can come in.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman can explain that in his own time. I am not convinced that it does.

Another thing that I find objectionable: I like the thought of the Philippine Constabulary. If his amendment contained a provision something along the line of the Philippine Constabulary which could be handled as a separate organization, not a part of the Army, I think maybe it would have serious merit. But when you come to take in a large body of troops made up of diverse nationalities I doubt the wisdom of doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think the proponents of this proposal have not thought through this problem to its full conclusion. This is not a new matter for the Armed Services Committee; we gave consideration to that problem a year or so ago and eventually authorized a bill which eventually became legislation approving an over-all total of 2,500 foreigners to be in our Armed Forces.

One of the main difficulties of accepting this kind of proposal is that the first thing we would have to do would be to spend about 2 years teaching these aliens the English language so they would know that when they got the order to charge they would charge instead of retreating. That is just one of the many problems entailed in bringing large numbers of foreigners into the Army to wear the uniform of the United States.

My other criticism of the amendment is that while we ostensibly welcome these people with open arms to fight with us we deny to them the financial benefits that other veterans enjoy. To me that is not right; to me that is rather shabby, cheap treatment accorded to a person who is willing to accept the risks of service in our Army.

Another objectionable feature is the limitation that no matter how brilliant the foreigner may be he may not rise above the rank of captain. What sort of treatment is that? In effect we say to them you can come in and do the dirty work but none of you can hope to progress and get ahead. These are just some of the problems that the amendment poses. Its objective is quite all right. The committee has recognized the value of the proposal in times past and has reported appropriate legislation with that end in view, but this amendment has been poorly drafted and will defeat its own good purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, to me this proposition proposed in this amendment is like having a man serve two masters. A man will necessarily have to take the oath of allegiance to the United States.

This has also been tried, if you will read history; it was tried by the English. The Hessians ran off and left them at a very critical time.

I think that a plan can be devised, and I am in favor of it, of trying to use all of the personnel we can possibly secure; there is certainly a proper place and a proper time to use it, but not in this proposal. In my opinion it would be disastrous to morale and it would be a positive hindrance and in my opinion to operations of a successful campaign in any theater of war. Then the complications after a war such as citizenship and benefits of many kinds.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, no major or insurmountable difficulties have been raised in connection with this question, no difficulty that cannot be surmounted by military discipline and by the terms under which these men are enlisted.

My friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] referred to the Hessians.

The Hessians did not enlist in the British Army; they were sold into service. On the other hand, the French Foreign Legion is an example of a workable system of enlisting foreign nationals. They apparently do not have serious language or other difficulties. For a few cents a day the French get all the foreign nationals they want for their Army; and they are depending on those foreign nationals, mostly German citizens, to save Indochina for them today.

Adoption of this provision means less disruption of American homes, less interference with careers and schooling, because it will lessen materially the requirements for service by our own people. It certainly provides additional opportunity to spread the teachings of Americanism.

Mr. Chairman, this is not offered as a joke. It provides an opportunity to save American manpower. That is not a joke. It provides an opportunity to save American lives. That is not a joke. It provides an opportunity to save money. That is not a joke, either.

There should be no question about this. It is already in the Senate bill and any difficulties in language may be worked out in conference between the two bodies. We do not offer these people much in return for their help in world defense, no veterans' benefits, no citizenship. But it is a known fact that many foreign nationals want to enlist in our forces. We will be able to get all of them that we want to use.

We seek to tap an almost unlimited source of trained manpower. They include some of the best soldiers in the world. This proposal would avoid sending some American boys to far corners of the world at considerable cost, if you please, and at a considerable loss of time.

It is well known that we must be prepared to defend much of the world. I think we should get all the help we can.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee overwhelmingly rejected this amendment after debate yesterday. I certainly hope the time has not come when America's battles will have to be fought by going out and trying to hire foreign nationals in our ranks. There would be one, two, or three companies or regiments of this race, and one, two, or three regiments of that race. There would be just as much confusion as there is going on up in the United Nations right now. You can see what that is getting us into.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 56, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that the entire bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request will not foreclose the offering of any further amendments to the first section of the bill?

Mr. VINSON. No; it will not. It opens the whole bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the 81st Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1952" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act."

(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953."

SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act, except members of the reserve components.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 26, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided*, That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written preference to discharge their obligation for training in the National Security Training Corps or training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race,

which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training or training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit."

SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE: Page 53, line 19, after the word "hereunder", strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the language in the section.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Price amendment ad all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I recall, yesterday we discussed this thing for about an hour. It was hotly contested and closely divided. May I suggest the gentleman give us 20 minutes, because I think there are Members who want to speak on it who do not happen to be here at this time.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest that the debate be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, this, of course, is the identical amendment which was adopted yesterday to strike from the Barden substitute the segregation language contained therein. With the rejection of the Barden substitute it becomes necessary to amend the bill now under consideration to accomplish what the membership of this House indicated it desired to do when by a vote of 178 to 126 it eliminated the segregation provision.

There is no need for extended debate on this amendment today as I believe it was fully explained in the 2 hours it was under discussion on yesterday. I propose at this time to very briefly reiterate the arguments which I presented then in support of the amendment in order to refresh the minds of the Members as to the importance of striking from the bill the present language.

For the purpose of clarification—my amendment will strike from the bill the proviso on page 53 beginning on line 19, which in effect calls for segregation under the law. In my opinion and in the opinion of the armed services the provision is administratively unworkable. The Department of Defense has indicated its opposition when similar provisions were offered to previous bills.

As I said yesterday the Armed Forces of the United States have in the past 5 years made progress away from racial segregation. The Air Force and the Navy today have a policy of nonsegregation throughout the services. The morale and efficiency of the troops have been improved as a result. No incidents have occurred to warrant a reversal of this trend.

Negro and white soldiers are fighting in the far corners of the world and they appreciate each other as United States citizens with equal responsibilities as well as equal rights. There is no room for second-degree American citizenship among our fighting forces in Korea—and there is no room for secondary citizenship anywhere in this great Nation—the Armed Forces included.

Both great political parties recognize this. In their party platforms in 1948 both pledged their efforts in opposition to the idea of racial segregation in the armed services of the United States.

Those entusted with the responsibility of directing our Military Establishment believe that the adoption of a provision—such as now contained in the bill—giving men the right to choose whether they wish to serve in segregated units and making it mandatory on the Armed Forces to carry out that choice, except where military necessity forbids, would interfere substantially with the efficient fulfillment by the services of their military missions.

Since there are no segregated units in the Navy or Air Force it would necessitate a major reorganization of both of these services to provide opportunities for segregation in training or in subsequent service assignment. Both services would be severely limited in their freedom to assign personnel where they could be used most effectively if such a requirement were written into law.

In the Army there are no segregated training divisions to which men could be sent. Outside the training divisions, where segregated Army units do exist, the proposed amendment would take control over assignment away from the Army and give it to the individual. Commanding officers would not be able to assign men where they were needed most but would be compelled to send them to segregated units unless they could find some imperative military reason for doing otherwise. Every assignment made contrary to a man's expressed wish would open up the prospect of disaffection, increased racial tension, appeals to higher authority and lawsuits.

Special difficulties would attend the assignment of men possessing critically needed skills. These assignments must be made on the basis of qualifications, rather than color. Failure to follow this practice would complicate the operating problems of military units.

Difficulties could also arise from the necessity for respecting the desire of men from relatively small racial groups to be in segregated units of their own. It would be hard to concentrate Malayans or Mongolians, for example, in special groups if they expressed a wish for such treatment.

The net effect of the proposed amendment would be to impair the flexibility of military assignment, with consequent great loss in the operating efficiency of the armed services.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman believe that one of the best arguments that has been made on behalf of the amendment is the remark made by the chairman of the committee in connection with the Poage amendment when he said, "We do not want any segregation in the Army on the basis of race?

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be controlled by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get recognition for the 4 days we have been considering this bill for amendment in order to propose an amendment, one which I have sponsored every time the draft bill has been up. The text of the amendment is as follows:

My amendment was intended to declare it as the policy of Congress that there should be no discrimination in selection, or service, on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.

I should like to inform the House that I will not now offer that amendment. I do that in deference to the antisegregation vote which the House cast yesterday, and because I have faith that the House will be consistent. I think a magnificent illustration was given yesterday of the fact that we believe in the principles of the Constitution, both in the general tone of the debate and in the vote that was cast. I think a great speech was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and I think a great speech was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. I think it is only fair, therefore, that the question not be labored further in this debate by anybody for any purposes, in the sincere faith that the House shall express its will on this amendment as it expressed its will on the situation yesterday.

I should like to add this one point: Let it be clear that if there had not been the votes against segregation in the armed services on the Republican side of the aisle yesterday this Winstead proposal could never have been stricken out of the bill, and it will not be today unless the Republican votes for the same purpose are available. So many of us have always maintained that this fight against segregation and discrimination is a bipartisan issue. The votes have to come from the Republican side of the aisle to be added to those on the Democratic side if a fight like this is to be won. That

is a happy idea, that we should combine in doing decent things. I am hopeful that the same votes we had yesterday will be forthcoming today to defeat this provision contained in the bill which would turn the clock back and force segregation even where it has already been eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, in voting on this amendment to the bill to increase the strength of the armed services, it seems to me that we are really voting whether or not to plant land mines and booby traps of prejudice all through our armed services—deadly deposits of fear, discrimination that would weaken the armed services from within and would hand to Communist propagandists throughout the world new ammunition with which to attack us.

We have heard plain talk from our esteemed colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], who is the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments. He speaks rarely on this floor, but always to the point. He has laid the issue on the line. Are we, by our vote to say that in the armed services we are going to legislate segregation and discrimination, to set up first- and second-class citizenship—and just at a time when the armed services themselves are making progress in breaking down such practices and are finding that unsegregated units are successful, that American fighting men can work and fight together better than in Jim Crow units that deny the very ideals for which we are fighting?

The gentleman from Illinois has challenged every Member of this House. He once laid his life on the altar of his country's need. He is a combat veteran, painfully disabled by the loss of a leg. I happen to know that the same heroism of stubborn fortitude he displayed on the battlefield is displayed in his work in this House. I know that he has walked from his office to this floor and back again when every step was pain and agony, that he has stayed on the floor for hours and days when a lesser man would have been in a hospital. Today he is the symbol of the principle that shall be upheld or denied by our vote on the amendment that proposes to require young inductees to elect, at the time of their induction, whether to serve in segregated or unsegregated units. If we vote for this amendment, we will not succeed in degrading the millions of members of minority groups for whom the gentleman from Illinois has spoken with such force and feeling, we will have succeeded only in degrading ourselves and the standing of our country at a time when our democratic preachments are under Communist attack everywhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to have served in the last war. I know that men under fire do not practice Jim Crow. I know that the reforms that the armed services have started will strengthen the morale and the fighting power of our men. To cancel out, weaken, or in any way impede those reforms will sap morale and weaken fighting power as effectively as could any deliberate sabotage.

I endorse the thorough, closely reasoned, and, to my mind, unanswerable arguments for the amendment that has been presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], to strike out the segregation requirement.

The eyes, ears, hearts, and minds of more than 1,000,000,000 people of the colored races are focused upon us as we debate and vote up this amendment. All of them are the continual target of Communist attempts at infiltration and subversion. If we vote to defeat this segregation amendment, we will have disappointed the Communists and we will have given renewed support, by action to the words that we and other members of the United Nations are saying to the peoples of the world. This, Mr. Chairman, is a show-down in the battle for men's minds and loyalties that is as important as any major military campaign. I urge the Members of the House to vote for the Price amendment to strike from this bill the provision for segregated units in the armed services.

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to yield the balance of the time allotted to him to Mr. HOLIFIELD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire in the limited time to make an impassioned appeal on this subject. It is a matter of conscience with all of us, and we are all entitled to our own opinion on it. In World War II we had the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regiment of Japanese, which was a segregated unit. Most of these Japanese-Americans came from California. That particular unit received more casualties than any other regiment, I understand, in World War II, and also more decorations. I recently talked with Mike Masaoka, one of the heroes of the Four Hundred and Forty-second and the national legislative representative of that organization, and here is part of the statement of his organization, the Japanese-American Citizens League:

We found that simply because we were Japanese-Americans, or that we were members of a segregated outfit, the German enemy did not alter his fire or his tactics.

We discovered that a bullet killed a man regardless of whether he was a Japanese-American from a relocation center, or a Mexican-American from Colorado, an Irishman from Boston, a Negro from Atlanta, or a Jew from Brooklyn. We saw that the blood of all men flowed red from the wounds of battle; we heard the same screams of pain from the lips of all the distressed.

We learned that all men can fight, and all can die.

The wartime experiences of the Japanese-American soldiers, both as members of a special segregated unit and, later, as members of a nonsegregated organization, suggests that in terms of human dignity as well as in terms of maximum efficiency to fight and win a war a policy of nonsegregation, of equal treatment and opportunity, is best and most in keeping with American ideals and aspirations.

We believe that segregation wastes manpower because it reduces the number of experts available for the more skilled operations of modern war.

We believe that segregation creates and foments distinctions and antagonisms between groups, destroying that harmonious relationship between troops that is necessary to achieve victory.

We believe that segregation plays into the hands of our enemies and thereby enables them to rally forces to their banners which ought to rush to ours.

We believe that in the armed services, where one serves his country, there should be no discrimination in treatment or opportunity because of race, color, creed, or national origin. For such sanctioned segregation by the Military Establishment serves to create and strengthen prejudice and discrimination in nonmilitary and civilian life. In this way, what the armed services do influences all other aspects of American life, to either the detriment or the betterment of our society as a whole.

Thus, we urge this committee to take positive action to end all segregation in the armed services. We urge this, not only that the services as a whole will benefit, but that individuals serving with the Armed Forces will take an increasingly cooperative part in them. And, in the final analysis, we urge this action so that all America will have another example of democracy at work.

On the subject of waste of human life and skills because of the inability to fill vacancies with segregated replacements it states:

Another problem faced by the Four Hundred and Forty-second because of its segregated nature was that of replacements. Since only Japanese-Americans could be used as replacements for the unit, there were times when the Four Hundred and Forty-second was hard put to field enough troops to carry out their assignments.

Most of the enlisted personnel of the Four Hundred and Forty-second qualified for officer-candidate schools, yet very few—less than five of the original group of almost 5,000 in the combat team—were selected.

Once the Four Hundred and Forty-second was committed to action, however, many Japanese-Americans were given combat or battlefield commissions as second lieutenants. By the time the infantry regiment was inactivated in 1946, some 367 officers had been assigned to it. Of this number, only 90, including the warrant officers, were Japanese-Americans. About 75 were combat appointments. The highest rank attained was that of major. Of the 11 Japanese-Americans who were commissioned captains, three were chaplains and five were doctors or dentists.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee support the Price amendment in the name of democracy.

(Mr. DAWSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I was born in the South. I lived there all during the days of my young manhood. When World War I broke out I was above the draft age. I did not have to go, but I believed then as I believe now that it was the duty of every citizen, when the welfare of the nation in which he claims citizenship is at stake, to rally to the call and to give his life, if need be, for the preservation of that nation.

I went to war. I was commissioned WILLIAM L. DAWSON, first lieutenant of infantry. I led Americans in battle—black Americans. This mark you see here on my forehead is the result of German mustard gas. This left shoulder of mine is today a slip joint. I cannot raise this left arm any higher than the shoulder unless I lift it with the other hand. That would have been a good joint, hospitalization would have been available, if I had not been a Negro American. I served in a segregated outfit as a citizen trying to save this country. How long, how long, my confreres and gentlemen from the South, will you divide us Americans on account of color? Give me the test that you would apply to make anyone a full-fledged American, and by the living God, if it means death itself, I will pay it. But, give it to me. Why should this body go on record at a time when we are fighting a world war to brand a section of its citizenry as second class. I have sat in the well of this House and I have seen you gentlemen from the South, and rightly so, stand up and applaud members of other races, nonwhite races, who were darker than I am. I have seen you applaud them, yet you will take me, a citizen of the United States, of your own flesh and blood, and brand me with second-class citizenship. If there is one place in America where they should not be segregation, that place is in the armed services, among those who fight for this country. Oh, I know how some of you feel, but there is but one God and there is but one race of men all made in the image of God. I did not make myself black any more than you made yourselves white, and God did not curse me when he made me black any more than he cursed you when he made you white. I would give up this life of mine to preserve this country and every American in it, white or black. Deny to me today, if you will, all that American citizenship stands for, I will still fight to preserve our Nation knowing that someday under the Constitution of the United States all of these restrictions will be removed, and that we will move forward before the world as one people, American people, joined in a democracy which shall set the pattern for all the world.

I say to you who claim to love America, in this hour of its stress that the greatest argument the Soviet Union is using among the black peoples of this world to turn them against you is your treatment of me and Americans like me.

No, I do not believe this body means to go off on this tangent, and I believe you who come from the South, if you would look back a little bit, would never, never again take a step to handicap any one of God's children for what they are. I believe that the South is big enough for all of us to live in together in peace and in happiness if we can but have understanding; but we cannot have understanding if you array one against another because of color.

I hope you will vote for the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] to close debate on the pending amendment.

(Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, talked on this subject yesterday. I will not burden you by repeating what I consider the unanswerable argument in favor of the provisions of the bill which I had inserted therein. Yesterday I presented statements from Gen. Omar Bradley and many other military leaders with reference to their views on the question of some segregation in the armed services. I would like to present to you excerpts from a pamphlet issued by the War Department in 1944—Command of Negro Troops. It says:

WASHINGTON 25, D. C., February 29, 1944: War Department Pamphlet No. 20–6, Command of Negro Troops, is published for information and guidance of all concerned.

Signed by the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
*Chief of Staff.*

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
*Adjutant General.*

Mr. Chairman, this shows a poll was taken and that a majority of the Negroes expressed themselves. Here is the question asked:

Do you think that white and Negro soldiers should be in separate outfits, or should they be together in the same outfit?

Here is the Negro poll:

Separate outfit, 38 percent; no preference or undecided, 26 percent; same outfit or integrated unit, 36 percent.

Mr. Chairman, that shows that more of the Negroes themselves expressed a preference for the segregated outfit than those who preferred integrated units, and the whites expressed themselves 88 percent in favor of the segregated unit.

Another question asked and I quote:

Question: "Do you think it is a good idea or a poor idea to have separate service clubs in Army camps?"

| | |
|---|---|
| Negro: | |
| Percent saying good idea | 48 |
| Percent saying poor idea | 39 |
| Undecided | 13 |
| White: | |
| Percent saying good idea | 85 |
| All other answers | 15 |

This chart may be surprising, in view of the statement made earlier that almost all Negroes dislike segregation. The number of Negroes who said they thought white and Negro soldiers should be in the same outfit was about as large as the group saying they should be in separate outfits, while a quarter of the men were undecided. The explanation is that the men were not asked whether they liked or disliked the idea of separate outfits. They were given a practical question about an immediate problem, not a question about an ideal situation in an ideal world. Men's written statements on why they favored separate outfits showed that they opposed segregation in principle, but also desired to avoid friction. On the other hand, many of the men who opposed separation in the Army thought such a policy inconsistent with the aims for which the Nation is fighting.

White soldiers, by a great majority, favored racial separation in the Army. This held true for both Northerners and Southerners. However sound their reasons may or may not be, this mass sentiment cannot be ignored.

These findings must not be taken to mean that white and colored soldiers dislike each other so much that they should never be allowed to come in contact with each other, or that there is certain to be trouble at a mixed post. There is a great body of evidence to the contrary. What the findings do indicate is no more and no less than that the odds are very much in favor of less interracial friction if colored and white enlisted men continue to be organized in separate military units.

War Department instructions provide that post exchanges and theaters, or sections of theaters, and other recreational facilities may be designated for the use of particular military units, but not for the use of a certain race or color group. Existing instructions make it clear, moreover, that it is not the policy of the War Department to require racial separation in off-duty activities. The burden of deciding whether or not there shall be some separation in the use of camp facilities is placed on the local command, with the assumption that local conditions will be taken into account. There is added the specific ban on use of resented reference to race or color.

Was not that sound? That is what the provision I proposed would provide. That is what the Price amendment would strike out.

May I ask you how you expect the military leaders who have said so often that they believed it was necessary to have at least some segregated units to be able to handle this proposition? Yet, they ask why the military leaders do not come out against the President's directive. We have had an example recently in the Pacific with General MacArthur, a real military leader. They say he did not go along. What happened to him?

How can it be said that I seek to make a second-class citizen out of any man? I have nothing but the highest praise to offer for our Negroes who have fought. I am only offering a peaceful solution of this complicated and rather involved problem, to let the military work this thing out with common sense.

May I say again, if we get these political committees, who are so active during political campaigns, to get their feet off the necks of the military, they will be able to solve this situation. That is all this amendment does. It gives to the Negro the same right as to the white. Why should he not express himself in a common sense way? Common sense would permit him some choice in the matter.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is not the Defense Department opposed to the inclusion of this provision and prefers to have it stricken?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I am glad you asked me that. If they have made a single public statement in opposition to my provision, I know nothing about it. In fact, many of them have assured me they have not. You are talking about a bill which I introduced 2 years ago and you are talking about an amendment that Senator RUSSELL presented on the Senate floor 2 years ago when even General Eisenhower and all of them were contending that they should have some segregated units in the UMT. If any man can bring forth a single statement for or against this amendment from any branch of the armed services, I would like to see it.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I can give assurance to the House that the position I outlined in my argument on this bill is the feeling of the Defense Establishment.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I have been advised otherwise and in view of General MacArthur you can understand they cannot publicly support my provisions which are counter to the President's directive. There is nothing compulsory about my amendment where it interferes with military efficiency. In the bill I introduced 2 years ago it demanded the military to give a man his choice, which would have involved an administrative problem. But there will be no administrative problem in connection with this amendment because the military determines when to have segregation and when not to.

I hope you will defeat the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL), there were—ayes 107, noes 101.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRICE and Mr. KILDAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 138, noes 123.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on all sections of the bill and all amendments thereto at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 52, line 14, after the word "duty", strike out the period and add the following: "and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter to be declared by the Congress."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the acceptance of this amendment. Because of the lateness of the hour and the number of amendments still to be acted upon, I have no desire to take a great deal of time.

I would like to assert, as emphatically as I know how, that this amendment does not even begin to provide fair and decent treatment for those in the Reserves, particularly those with service in World War II. Nor does it rectify the shameful injustices that have been perpetrated on great numbers of the Reserves since the outbreak in Korea.

As the committee bill stood, and as this amendment now stands, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps active and Organized Reserves are not eligible for release as are inactive and volunteer Reserves, even though, like the others, they serve 12 months of active duty since Korea and had previously served 90 days or more prior to June 1948. That is why, in my original amendment, I specifically covered men in all Reserve components in the Armed Forces. That would have provided at least a measure of decent, nondiscriminatory treatment, and would, for example, have included under the release provision eligible veterans of the Waterloo, Iowa, Organized Marine Corps Reserve unit. When the chairman of the Armed Services Committee made it plain he would not accept that amendment, and it was clear it would be defeated if brought to a vote, I had no alternative but to introduce a substitute which at least prevents the President from jerking back into service again for light and transient reasons those reservists now qualified for release.

I regret the Committee has failed once again to give all reservists the consideration to which they are entitled, choosing instead to make fish of some and fowl of others.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is this not the same amendment that the gentleman offered to the Barden bill yesterday?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly so.

Mr. COLE of New York. And it was accepted by the committee?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly so.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. Since he is anxious to finish the bill tonight, why not accept the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. VINSON. We accept the gentleman's amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 33, after the period in line 8, insert the following: "Said paragraph (1) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'No physician or dentist who is engaged in full-time employment as such at any hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection while so engaged after he has attained the thirtieth anniversary of the date of his birth'."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will state to the gentleman from West Virginia that the same amendment he offered yesterday was adopted. We accept the amendment the gentleman now offers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOWE: Page 29, line 5, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for duty in Europe in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty unless the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its approval of the assignment for such duty of such persons so inducted."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Towe amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered several days ago. I do not intend to take the time of the committee to make the same argument I made at that time. I think the House membership fully understands what is involved.

I would like to call to the attention of the House, however, some remarks that I believe need correction which were made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. In closing the debate in opposition to the amendment the gentleman suggested that my amendment would permit the President to send National Guard divisions, it would permit him to send reservists and it would permit him to send a lot of volunteers to Europe.

The fact of the matter is that most of those, including the person speaking, who favor this amendment do not concede that the President has the right to send large numbers of troops out of the country. Certainly it was a little unfair to place an interpretation upon my amendment which suggests that by offering it and having it adopted, if it should be adopted, I am responsible or those who vote for it are responsible for the use of that power, which by voting for this amendment we contest.

I asked the chairman to be on hand when this matter was before us so that he might make some observation, which he told me at the time he would make. I do not see him in the chamber at the moment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman from Georgia is coming into the chamber right now.

I was just going to ask if the gentleman did not agree that his amendment would not prevent the sending of volunteers?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct. However, there is a lot of difference between saying what it would prevent and what it would permit. The President assumes the power now, as I understand, to send troops. He is not getting any additional strength for his position from the amendment which I offer.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I ask my good friend, and he is my good friend and I have great respect for his judgment, if General MacArthur comes back and

states that we ought to have an all-out war in China and we need 12 or 15 more divisions in Korea, would the gentleman have any objection to sending the troops to Korea?

Mr. TOWE. I would say this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I understand that we have a position to maintain in the world, but I believe the Congress of the United States ought to decide when the proposition is put before us how many troops are to go and where they are to go. A great deal of the judgment which would be put to use at that time would depend, as far as I am concerned, upon what the countries whom we are being asked to help were doing to help themselves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Since the gentleman has spoken about the sending of troops to Korea, I said in the debate 2 days ago and I say it again that if the Congress of the United States had been permitted to participate in the making of that momentous decision, as it should have been, we might well have avoided a lot of trouble, and we would not have so much disunity in the country as we have today. That is the primary consideration in this very amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Under the parliamentary situation, to make the gentleman's amendment germane he must have it applicable to those that are inducted under the bill.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman had the opportunity, he would offer his amendment to prohibit the sending of those who are in the armed services?

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman is correct; without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, exactly. I think the gentleman is hemmed in on account of the parliamentary situation. It applies only to the inductees in this bill.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. That is a parliamentary situation, but the gentleman's objective would be that no troops could go to Europe unless the President had the consent of the Congress.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, has made that clarifying statement, because in his concluding argument on this matter the other day he objected to the amendment on the ground that it would leave the President free to dispatch National Guard units or other troops as he might see fit. There was no opportunity to reply to that at the time.

But now the gentleman says that under the rules of the House the amendment must be limited to the people who would be inducted under the act.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, at this point the debate becomes a little difficult to follow. Whether or not we are to make a real effort to defend against communism in Europe as well as in Asia affects the destiny and security of 150,000,000 Americans whom we represent in this House, and yet there is incipient in what has both been said and seems to be implied that some may possibly—and I happen to feel personally that it cannot be so—vote on this proposition on the basis of a quid pro quo. I have been here some time now. I have been here 5 years, and what I have found—which includes also the gentleman who made the statement—in which I have faith is that everybody in this House—everybody—on an issue as serious and profound as this is going to vote his conviction for the best interests of the country and is going to let whatever bygones there may be, be bygones. I hope everybody in the little time that has elapsed and with the heat of the last moment past and gone, will just forget the whole thing. I do not think that the statement would have come from anybody who voted the other way on the previous amendment if we had lost—I do not think so. And I do not think on reflection that that reaction will come from anybody in this House on the merits of the vital amendment now before us.

We have done a lot of talking about defending anywhere we want without our hands tied behind our backs, and yet regardless of the rationalization which the chairman of the committee now implies on this particular aspect of the bill it is a fact, parliamentary situation or not, that if you pass this amendment you are only going to keep the particular troops raised under this bill out as replacements or in organized units or in any other fashion from service in Europe. All other troops which are not affected by this bill, and there are 3,500,000 of them now, all other troops are perfectly subject to assignment to Europe, subject also to the provisions of the Senate resolution on troops.

This is a very big and a very major question. It is a major question which took some weeks to debate in the country and the other body. It was the great debate. Here an effort is going to be made in the House to decide the same question in an oblique way, applicable only to the number of troops who will be concerned under this bill instead of bringing the question out on the floor here to debate the foreign policy aspects of it and then pass a resolution as did the other body in a considered and precise way.

How will it look to the people of our country and to the people of the world to put in this oblique way, with reference to a draft measure, a decision on a question of vital national policy? What incalculable effect will it have on our allies under the Atlantic Pact? Will it not seriously undermine the whole support for General Eisenhower's mission? How will it look if we suddenly decide this very great question of national policy on 20 minutes of debate after having only yesterday decided the very same question the other way?

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. Will not the gentleman agree that if the House should adopt this amendment, it would be an expression of opinion which I assume the President would recognize that the House, so far as it is concerned, does not want a land army sent to Europe without the approval of the Congress?

Mr. JAVITS. I agree to no such thing considering the circumstances under which it would have been effected.

Mr. TOWE. Would not that be the meaning of it?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe so, and this is the reason. The question is raised collaterally and not directly, we have not had hearings on it and there is no committee report, we are not having any remotely adequate debate for such a great question, and even if the amendment passed it could have only limited applicability.

Mr. TOWE. Does the gentleman feel that the President has the right to send troops all over the world without referring the matter to the Congress?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not consider such power to be untrammeled. But I say if we adopt this amendment it would have no such meaning as the gentleman intends it should.

Mr. TOWE. That is the gentleman's opinion, but of course the gentleman's opinion is not necessarily correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is perfectly true, but when one assumes to debate a question here, one is under a duty to give one's opinion in the hope that it may convince others.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is not the practical difficulty with the gentleman's position that we should do it by a joint resolution the fact that we do not have such a resolution before us, and there is no probability that we will have? I agree that that is the preferable way to handle this, but we are here faced with the issue of whether we approve of sending these troops without the consent of Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I has been said time and again that the House, or at least a majority of the House, can work its will on any subject, including the bringing up of a resolution. What the gentleman has said is no reason for the consideration of a grave question in a "quickie" amendment, a question which is a major issue of national and world policy just because the majority of the House is afraid, if it really wants this resolution, that it cannot get it up.

Mr. KEATING. That requires the cooperation of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JAVITS. I sincerely believe that if the Republican members of the Com-

mittee on Foreign Affairs insist that this matter shall come up before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am confident it will come up.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. VURSELL. I rise in support of the amendment. I am opposed, and the people that make up this Government whom we represent as their voice in this Congress are opposed, I dare say by a majority of at least 2 to 1, to allowing the President to send unlimited troops to Western Europe; or to fight all over the world; and to engage in war without the consent of the Congress.

No President should want this great responsibility and no President should be permitted to usurp the constitutional power of the Congress and be granted this authority whether he be a Democrat or a Republican.

When the Constitution was founded in 1787 the purpose of the founders was to establish a Republic based on giving the people the power through their representatives to control the destiny of this Government. One of their main purposes was to vest this power in the legislative department of the Government. They tried to see to it that the President was granted very little power.

The power to levy all taxes; the power to raise an army and military forces and finance them for the defense of our country was clearly vested in the legislative department of the Government. True, the Constitution designated the President as the Commander in Chief of our military forces. Someone had to be named as an Administrator, and naturally the administrative power over the Army was vested in the President.

The Constitution in addition gave the Congress the power to declare war. There could have been no thought of the founders of the Constitution that any Congress would seek to interpret their action as giving the Chief Executive the power to send hundreds of thousands of troops to Western Europe, or anywhere else in the world to be amalgamated and joined with other hundreds of thousands of foreign troops, for the purpose of engaging in a full-fledged war for the defense of Western Europe and the Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who has read the debates incident to the writing of the Constitution knows that one of the main purposes of that body, many of whose ancestors had left Europe to escape the tyranny and totalitarian control of the heads of Government in Europe, was to see to it that the President of the United States should be restricted to the very minimum of power in our Government.

Mr. Chairman, they had before them the history of a century of continuous European wars lasting at times from 20 to 30 years, the sacrifices of which were forced on the people by the war lords of Europe. They wanted to prevent the war making power of anyone who should become President of the United States and for that reason they limited the power of the President and vested the control of this country in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, Washington's Farewell Address when he warned the people of this Nation to keep out of the wars of Europe which he said would continue unabated in the future as they had in the past confirms the purpose of the writers of the Constitution in their attempt to avoid the very world wars that face us today, by vesting the power to provide for the common defense of our country, to raise armies for defense, and to declare war, in the Congress of the United States.

Our military leaders and the President are not the Government. The Constitution designated the people who pay the taxes and furnish their sons and daughters to fight the wars of this country as the Government. It provided that the will of the people should be carried out by the elected Representatives.

They are demanding today by overwhelming majority as expressed by every poll taken in the Nation and by thousands of letters and telegrams to the Congress that we, their Representatives, write into this legislation a prohibition against the President sending troops to Europe to engage in war in the defense of western Europe without the consent of their Representatives, the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that the Congress take over greater control in our foreign policy because of the terrible mistakes that the administration has constantly made. The people are demanding that Congress take over greater control and we are the Representatives of the people.

We should exert that control by compelling the President, under this amendment, to abide by the Constitution.

The recent spectacle and the great tragedy to our country and the world in the President's dismissal of General MacArthur emphasizes and urges that we take such action. The fact that the dismissal of General MacArthur has been largely dictated by the British Government and the Socialistic Labor Party in power from 10 Downing Street, London, makes it incumbent upon the Congress to use all of its powers under the Constitution. Today the British Government, in much of our foreign policy, is exerting a greater influence in dictating our foreign policy under this administration than are the elected representatives of the people, the Congress of the United States.

The British Labor Government, the left-wingers, throughout the world and in this Nation, through apeasement will lose, if they have not already lost, the objectives of the war in Korea which will engulf all Asia in communism and will doubtless spread to take over the government of Japan which has cost billions of dollars to our Nation with the loss of thousands upon thousands of lives.

We have seen sacrificed on the altar of appeasement the interest of the United States Government in the Far East by removing General MacArthur who exhibited such brilliant American leadership in World War II, the war in Korea, and who by his great administrative ability and the confidence of the Japanese people, has established a stable government there. Yes, we have seen sacrifice in this tragic hour, the one man in the Far East who understands our problems there better than any other living person and who has stood as a symbol against the encroachment of communism in the Orient.

The leaders in Britain are elated. The Kremlin is jubilant, and their publicity stooge, the Communist Daily Worker, of New York, has published in glaring headlines the commendation of the removal of this foe of communism, General MacArthur.

This Congress should step into the breach today, follow the will of the American people and approve this amendment which would give some comfort and hope to our people whose sons are fighting and dying in Korea today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was debated the other day. I made quite an extensive speech on it then. It is in the RECORD, and a number of Members have spoken to me about it. I am glad some of them listened to it, and I hope some have read it since.

In my opinion there is no question but what this amendment should be adopted. In the first place, it is nothing more than our expression, as the other body exercised its right to bring about an expression, of this fundamental proposition, that the Congress of the United States must participate in making the great decisions that must be made for the safety and security of this country.

In the state of confusion and turmoil that exists in the country today, may I ask the Members on both sides of the aisle: Are you willing to abdicate your authority and your responsibility to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and say that we are willing to give up the power and responsibility that should be ours?

This amendment is nothing new. A parallel provision was contained in the Selective Service Act of 1940, a limitation that was written into the act to provide against sending American boys, drafted under that act, all over the world. Did anyone seriously complain about such a provision at that time? I do not recall that they did. That being true, why should we be so disturbed about this matter? If we are to permit the President to send great numbers of American troops to Europe without congressional authority, we may well be rendering academic the power of Congress to declare war. Day by day the representatives of the people of the United States are being euchred into impotence, because wars today culminate in shooting after step-

by-step processes, in which the Congress takes no part.

It was precisely because the matter of troop deployment is so closely alined with the power to declare war that the Congress was given ironclad assurance by the administration during the Senate debate on this proposed Atlantic Pact arrangement, and during the hearings, that acceptance of the treaty would in no way commit this country to the sending of troops abroad. Now the administration is asking us to do the very thing that they said they would not ask us to do.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts who made a splendid point in this connection the other day.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that under article 3 of the Atlantic union, to which this amendment is limited, that the boys who are sent overseas will be placed under the command of an individual who today happens to be General Eisenhower, but who tomorrow may be some other commander of some other nation, and will no longer remain under the Commander in Chief of the United States?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is correct. Those who assert the right to send these troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact under the power of the President as Commander in Chief, ought to recognize that when they arrive in Europe, as the gentleman from Massachusetts points out, they are not under the command of the Commander in Chief of the United States of America. They are under the command of the Supreme Commander of the Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. HERTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. And further is it not true that in order to implement article 3 of the joint Atlantic Treaty it was necessary for the Congress to take action and design legislation in order to get munitions of war and equipment overseas? Why should it not be equally applicable in sending the boys over there?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is exactly right; and may I point out and ask whether in taking a move which might plunge our Nation into the darkness of death and destruction the power should be vested in one single man? Is it conceivable that they expected the Congress to exercise no authority in that twilight zone between peace and war?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized.

Mr. GAVIN. I just wanted to tell my good and able friend from Indiana that I agree with him; I think the Congress of the United States has the right and should have the opportunity to participate in the determination of our foreign policy. Certainly you are right but you have a situation now where you are not being given that opportunity, and now you want to pass legislation which has no bearing on that matter merely in my opinion confuses the issue, because we—I think the gentleman will agree with me—are in the Atlantic Pact whether we like it or not, and, therefore, in view of the fact that we are in and pledged to go to the assistance of any country that may be attacked by Russia—it is already an agreement and there is not much we can do about it now.

We have had a situation develop in Korea where General MacArthur is concerned, and we are gravely concerned because he had been "United Nationized," he had been hog-tied, he had been shackled and not permitted to operate with any degree of military freedom.

So now that we have accepted the Atlantic Pact and the Members of Congress have voted not with my vote for the MDAP appropriations to implement the Atlantic Pact we are in. We send General Eisenhower to Europe. We believe in him; we think he is a practical, sound, clear-thinking American. He told us that he was going over there to look the situation over and make an effort to build up the military strength of European countries in the Atlantic Pact. However, before the general commences to develop the program we start to debate on troops to Europe and whether or not we are going to cooperate. I am certain that no Member of this House wants to hog-tie or shackle General Eisenhower. If we believe in him and believe he is the kind of American who should represent us, we should stand back of him, we should have faith in him, we should have confidence in him to do the right thing; if after a reasonable length of time he does not secure results and the Atlantic Pact countries are not cooperating, we should ask him to come back home and tell us the story. But we are considering legislation that will restrict him, which will cause the people of the Atlantic Pact countries to feel that they cannot have any faith in the Atlantic Pact agreement and we are not going to stand with them in the critical hour.

Now, I want to say if we do not have confidence and faith in General Eisenhower, certainly we should call him back home, pull our troops out of Europe, get out and stay out and let them go it alone.

Before I yield I want to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for whom I have great admiration, who yesterday voted against the Towe amendment, why he changed his mind in the last few minutes.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman want me to take the floor?

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman is such a courageous man and so honest in his convictions. In view of the fact that you voted against the Towe amendment yesterday I am asking——

Mr. COX. Let me settle that question for myself.

Mr. GAVIN. That is perfectly all right; the gentleman has that privilege.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I shall be pleased to yield to my good friend from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Reference has been made to the statement made by the Chairman of the Committee in the closing of the debate in respect to the exclusion of other people. I know a lot of Members here who were persuaded by that argument that he raised, that such a provision could not really be applicable because an amendment to be germane must go only to the people inducted.

Mr. GAVIN. Permit me to go on a bit further.

The arguments you propound here today I think should have been propounded in 1946 when you had devastation and destruction in Europe when the continent of Europe was a wreck. But since 1946 you have pumped twenty-two thousand million dollars of the American taxpayers' money into the economy of Europe not with my vote to rehabilitate the economic and industrial life of Europe. It is now a going concern. Stalin & Co. would like to take it over. Pick off the European countries one at a time and make them satellites of Russia.

What is the prize today? It is Europe not Asia. We fought our way in. We are dug in now and we should stay. We should support General Eisenhower as long as we sent him over there to the fullest extent of our ability and within reason in order to build a military defense program in the Atlantic Pact countries. It is our last fighting chance. Weaken, and Stalin & Co. moves in and you will have plenty of trouble to iron out later on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Towe amendment because it preserves to Congress its constitutional power of declaring war.

To give to the President unlimited power to send troops beyond the borders of the United States in excess of the four divisions authorized for Europe would be to give him power to get us into war without the action of Congress.

The President already has us in a sizable war in Korea. We know now from experience that he may well involve us in a war in Europe without action by Congress.

This amendment relates to the basis of our form of government. To give to the President this unlimited power is tantamount to dictatorship. The amendment would prevent that dictatorship.

The overwhelming majority of the people of America prefer that Congress should pass on the question of additional troops to Europe. They do not want dictatorship.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a closing statement?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. After we are dug in, if we pull out of Europe it will be like pulling out of Korea. You will turn it over to Joe Stalin; he will solidify his strength over there and in a year from now you will wish you had not done so.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust we will pass on this amendment based upon its merits. I have been unable to understand how a vote on this amendment should be controlled by a vote on any other amendment which is in no wise related to the pending one.

This is, of course, one of the great constitutional questions before the country today. I fully appreciate the fact that men equally well-informed on the provisions of the Constitution come to opposite conclusions with reference to it.

This is an indirect approach, and admittedly so. I agree thoroughly with what has been said as to the parliamentary situation in not permitting the amendment to go further than those persons inducted under the provisions of this act; nevertheless, the situation is that the amendment would constitute a restriction upon the use of only such members of the Armed Forces as may come into the service under the provisions of this act. That is the situation, even though it is the result of a parliamentary difficulty that controls the gentleman from New Jersey.

So that the situation is that all those persons already in the service and all who come into the service by any means except through induction under this act would not be subject to the limitation. Any National Guard organization hereafter called or any Reserves hereafter activated would not be subject to this limitation.

The gentleman from Indiana referred to the 1940 act. Many of us remember the provisions of that act very well. It provided that persons inducted under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act could not be assigned at any point outside the Western Hemisphere, so that those persons who came into the service by any manner except under the Selective Training and Service Act were not subject to the limitation. What happened? In a matter of a very few months we found it necessary to remove that restriction because those who came into the service under the Selective Training and Service Act were implemented into organizations already existing, National Guard, Regular divisions, and what-not, and when it was sought to deploy an organization to any point outside the Western Hemisphere the administrative difficulty became impossible. You had to stop and screen out of the organization everybody who had come in, so that you destroyed the organization on the eve of its sailing.

You will do here exactly what developed under the 1940 act if you restrict the persons who come in now and they are not going to be assigned to any segregated unit. They are going to be integrated into already existing units. Then you are going to have the situation that you cannot use any of these units until you have screened out of them the men who come under the provisions of this act.

I submit that a great constitutional question ought not be decided in this way. The other body took weeks of debate and discussion before it ever came to its conclusion. This resolution is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That is the proper way to decide it; decide it straight out on the basis of the resolution and not come in and handicap the military forces in the use of the troops which it has by placing into existing organizations men whom you cannot use in the same manner as you can use the other men in that organization. You are disrupting and handicapping all of our armed services.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman explain the stigma that will follow the individual taken from his organization? Then also, what effect it is going to have on morale?

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, it disrupts the morale; it disrupts every portion of the command that is trained as a team, that has been trained to fight together. Let us not handicap the morale or endeavor to decide a great constitutional question in 20 minutes on a collateral issue.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York to the amendment offered by Mr. TOWE: Strike out "persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title" and insert "members of the Armed Forces."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLE of New York. No, Mr. Chairman. I am ready to abide by the Chair's decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. TOWE.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 158, noes 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close not later than 5 o'clock.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How many amendments are there at the clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that there are about 20 amendments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close not later than 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. HALLECK.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 164, noes 94.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to make a statement. The following Members were listed as standing at the time the motion was made to limit debate. The Chair would feel it would only be fair to require any Member requesting time to state that he was standing at that time. Messrs. CASE, VINSON, ROGERS of Florida, TEAGUE, HOEVEN, SADLAK, MILLER of Nebraska, FORD, COLE of New York, PRICE, STAGGERS, YORTY, HEFFERNAN, REES of Kansas, JENSEN, JAVITS, HALLECK, HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., STEFAN, BUSBEY, POWELL, MACHROWICZ, BRAY, KEATING, MEADER, LARCADE, HINSHAW, Mrs. ROGRES of Massachusetts, and Mr. VURSELL.

Can any other Member state that he was standing at the time whose name does not appear on this list?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. A number of us have amendments at the desk. Will those who have amendments be given preference in addressing the House under this limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to state that it will be the purpose of the Chair to try to recognize Members having amendments on the desk. Members of the Committee, of course, are entitled to prior recognition, but as far as the Chair is able to do so, the Chair is going to recognize Members already having amendments at the desk.

The Chair is advised that there will be about 3 minutes for each of those listed.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Page 52, following line 14, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. The active duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the Reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of 4,000,000 persons at any one time."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this amendment places an over-all ceiling of 4,000,000 persons in our Military Establishment at any one time. Historically the Congress has always controlled the Military Establishment by imposing a ceiling upon the over-all strength, which has never been removed at any time except during wartime.

When the military people came before the committee in support of this bill originally, they asked for 3,200,000. When the figures indicated that their

request for the lower-draft age could not be justified upon the basis of 3,200,000 it was raised to a total of 3,500,000.

Subsequently in discussing this problem the chairman of the committee suggested that a limitation of 3,500,000 perhaps might circumscribe the effective operation of the military and suggested a figure of 4,000,000. By that statement I do not mean that he approve the ceiling of 4,000,000; at any rate, that is the genesis of arriving at the figure 4,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. They justified the size of the first request which was 3,200,000; now they have an 800,000 cushion. I think that is ample.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is true. The last ceiling that the Congress imposed upon our military forces was 1,200,000. That was removed during the early part of the Korean affair, a year ago.

It is now proposed to reinstate the historic practice of Congress to control its Armies, Navies, and Air Force by imposing an over-all ceiling on the total strength.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if the situation warrants it Congress is always here and will correct the situation?

Mr. COLE of New York. The proof of that is what happened last June when the Korean affair broke out; the ceiling was removed completely and overnight.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps the most important amendment to be offered to the whole bill; at least I consider it to be such.

The psychological effect throughout the world today should the gentleman's amendment be adopted would be bad. It would say to all the nations on earth that the great Republic of America has reached the decision that it will only have an armed services of 4,000,000 men to defend its liberties. It is terrible.

No living man knows what tomorrow will bring forth. The Joint Chiefs of Staff say that for the time being three and a half million men will suffice, but tomorrow or next month, with the world in the precarious situation it is in today, they will probably have to ask for more. Of course, you can say, "We will be here." But you have to make plans before you begin to bring 500,000 men into the service. You cannot tell what we may face, you cannot tell what is in front of us, the Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot say that three and a half million men in the armed services will be sufficient. Of course, the Congress cannot say. Suppose conditions get bad? Then you would be right back here asking that four, four and a half, or five million men be brought into the services.

What is the psychological effect? What will Europe say? What will the world say? It will say that America makes the statement that she only needs 4,000,000 men. It would be bad.

The thing to do is to leave it discretionary with the Department. If it were peacetime I would say "Yes," I would be for it, because we should establish a limit in peacetime. But we are not at peace today. The world is on fire. Men are dying in Korea. Think about the boys fighting in Korea. Should they read in the papers that we will only have an Army or so many million men, they would tell us, "We need a little help."

We do not know how many we will need. This would be the worst amendment that could be written in this bill. The psychological effect throughout the world will be bad and, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may have written that provision in there, our committee debated the matter, our committee rejected it, and I certainly hope this Committee now will reject the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of New York) there were—ayes 89, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS, of Florida: Page 37, strike out lines 5 through 9 and insert the following:

"(i) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which program shall include (A) the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps, and (B) measures for utilizing the existing plants and facilities of schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable in providing initial military training (along with academic training where appropriate) for members of the National Security Training Corps."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. This amendment merely permits the commission to consider that in its plan when it submits it to the Congress.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. We accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. ROGERS of Florida addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 51, after line 23, add a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps after July 1, 1957. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps before July 1, 1957 shall, not later than January 1, 1958, be released from training in such Corps but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is clear. Under it, the basic law authorizing a military-trainng program would provide that any such program shall end not later than 6 years from this July. I believe we must have compulsory military training as a part of our effort to make our Armed Forces strong during this emergency. I am opposed to compulsory military training or compulsory service in peacetime. I believe that at the end of 6 years those who favor a continuation of military training should have to come forward and prove affirmatively that the emergency which now exists still continues. The basic law should indicate that we do not intend to institute compulsory military training as a permanent American institution.

It may be said that a time limit can be put into the plan when it is presented to us by the Commission or the Committee on Armed Services after it has the Commission's report. I agree that is so, but this is a matter of basic principle. It may be noted that we are now establishing certain principles by the proposed bill, that of $30 a month for trainees and that no trainee shall be sent for training abroad. I believe that my amendment involves a far more important basic principle than either of those two matters.

I hope, as a friend of military training in this emergency but also as a friend of the American tradition against compulsory training in ordinary peacetime, that this amendment will be carried.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Do I correctly understand the time limit is 6 years under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. CASE. Six years from this July.

Mr. VINSON. Six years from July, not 6 years from the time of the adoption of the plan?

Mr. CASE. No, 6 years from July; in other words, July 1, 1957.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we all want to do what is the right and proper thing. Let us try to do things in an orderly way. Here, as was said the other day, we are trying to exterminate the plan before it is born. We are trying to say it can live only 6 years, or 4 years, or whatever number of years it may be. Let us get the plan in here. We are sound in getting the plan here, and we are going to write the plan here. When we get the plan in here, then we will probably put a date on it. But let us not go ahead and say that when the plan comes in it can have a life of only a certain period of time. When the plan comes in is the proper time to do that. I no doubt can assure the Committee that it might be a period shorter than suggested by the gentleman, or it might be a little bit longer. But the proper time to determine the life of it is when you create it, and not before it is created.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE) there were—ayes 62, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offere . by Mr. BRYSON: Page 36, line 17, after "Corps", insert "including the suppression of vice, gambling, and the sale, furnishing or possession of alcoholic beverages containing over one-half of one per cent of alcohol by volume upon or in close proximity to any place or institution to which members of the National Security Training Corps may be assigned for training."

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, under date of April 3, 1951, I gave notice of my intention to offer the amendment which has just been read; and my remarks appear in the RECORD of that date on page 3253. As some evidence of the importance of this amendment, it will be observed that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] offered yesterday a somewhat similar amendment to the Barden bill, which bill, of course, was acted on adversely by the committee. Today, I have been in conference with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who proposes to offer an amendment of this subject, which, in my judgment, is far more effective than my own amendment. I hope that the gentleman from New York will have an opportunity to present his amendment; and, if he does, it is my purpose to vote for the same.

Of course it is to be regretted that due to the lateness of the hour and the limitation of time, many of you, my colleagues, who have assured me of your support will not be permitted to speak.

Under the committee bill, which I have consistently supported, we will be calling from our homes younger men than have ever been called into military service before and under requirements of longer service than have ever been exacted before. With world conditions as they are, it is entirely possible that many of these young men will be sent to distant places across the several seas; and, of course, many of them will never return. While I probably entertain more extreme views against alcoholic beverages than many of you, I am happy to observe that even those of you who indulge in the use of alcohol yourselves have expressed your interest in this important matter.

Surely the least that we can do in calling these young men into service will be to try to protect them from those vendors of vice who have no regard for decency or humanity.

There are those who believe and it is possible that if true facts were known could establish that excessive use of alcohol might have contributed to our present chaotic plight. It cannot be denied that many, many important decisions are made here in Washington and elsewhere after cocktails have gone around. I have observed in conferences I have attended here and in foreign countries following the late war that before the business of the day is discussed, cocktails must be served. Hardly an invitation is issued here in Washington to any sort of a meeting unless it is indicated that cocktails will be served. It is a shame that here in the Capital City where not only the policies for our own country but for other countries as well are being made, more liquor is consumed than any other place in the world. The per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages here in Washington exceeds that of any other city.

The idea of throwing some protection around our men in the service is not new. Practically every bill heretofore considered by this body has had some restrictions written into it on this important subject.

Those of us who know from experience by our services in some branch of the Armed Forces know that the temptations are great.

To be sure, you cannot do much by way of improving a man's morals by legal action. You can, however, at least try to place the average home atmosphere around our younger men insofar as is possible.

I urge upon you to vote favorably upon my amendment; and, as stated above, if the gentleman from New York offers his amendment as a substitute or amendment to my amendment, I shall be pleased to support it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote the amendment down. The proper way to approach this subject is somewhat along the line of the amendment offered yesterday by the gentleman from Kansas, and probably to be offered today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The Commission will have authority to go into all these questions. This amendment provides that the Commission must adopt such rules and regulations that beverages containing over one-half of 1 percent of alcohol cannot be used. They might not be able to even get shaving lotions. Probably they will get Coca-Cola. All of these kinds of amendments should be voted down. Let the Commission submit it, and then we will write the plan later on.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BRYSON: Page 54, add a new section, as follows:

"The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the regulations authorized hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, let me say that every time a measure dealing with the personnel of our Armed Forces comes to the floor we are faced with this problem. Of course it is an important one. I would like to see a provision of law such as contained in my amendment made permanent. We should leave it up to the President to impose regulations with respect to the control of this problem, which we all admit is severe.

My criticism of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is that it applies only to the Training Corps and not to all camps and posts of the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. In other words, it would be permanent law.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would hope it would be permanent law.

Mr. VINSON. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is along the right line, and as far as the committee is concerned we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEVEN: Page 35, line 3, after the comma, insert "of which not more than three shall be members of the same political party, and."

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on this bill we have discussed about every possible angle but have practically forgotten about the composition of the commission itself. In the interest of conserving time, I suggest the committee accept my amendment.

Mr. VINSON. The trouble about the amendment is that we do not know to what political party the two military men may belong. If you were going to have a civilian board of five men, I would not have any objection to it, but with two military men on the commission, we do not know what their political affiliations may be.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would say to the chairman that military men, if they are good American citizens, should affiliate themselves with some political party.

Mr. VINSON. But they may have been out of the country so long that they have not had an opportunity to become affiliated.

Mr. HOEVEN. The commission proposed to be set up in this bill is perhaps the most important commission Congress will ever set up. It will deal with the lives and destinies of our young manhood and should be entirely nonpartisan. The commission not only is to propose a plan for universal military training, but will also administer it. We must see

that this commission is made up of the highest caliber men possible. As long as our American system is centered around our two great political parties there is no reason why both major parties should not be represented on a commission of this kind.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I suggest that if the gentleman would revise his amendment to provide that not more than two of the civil members of the commission shall be members of any one political party, then he will avoid the difficulties raised by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield, I would further suggest to the President that at least two of them would come from the minority, because I have two such distinguished men in mind that I hope will become members of this commission. So I think it would be better not to put any limitation on this thing.

Mr. HOEVEN. I prefer to have the amendment considered in the form in which I have presented it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. If these military men do not belong to any political party then the gentleman's amendment is all right.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will vote this amendment down because it is one of those things which should be left entirely to the discretion of the President to get the best men even if all of them come from one party. What we want is outstanding Americans; and I will say that if the President selects the right type of men——

Mr. VORYS. If!

Mr. SHAFER. If!

Mr. VINSON. Yes; and he is going to do it; he is going to do it in this case. If he selects the right kind of men, then the country will get behind his program, and you will have a worth-while result. I think that the President should have a free hand in selecting his men.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOEVEN) there were—ayes 101, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is recognized.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCARTHY: Page 52, line 14, strike out the quotation marks and insert after line 14 the following new paragraphs:

"The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from active duty (1) of members of the inactive and volunteer Reserves whose occupation, employment, or other activity is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, and (2) of members of the inactive and volunteer Reserves whose deferment is advisable by reason of the fact that other persons are dependent upon them for support. To the maximum extent practicable, deferments of such members shall be on the same basis as deferments under section 6 (h) of this title.

"The President is authorized to create and establish in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, one or more civilian Reserve deferment appeal boards (not within the Selective Service System). Each such board shall consist of five citizens of the United States who are not members of the Armed Forces, and who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such boards shall function in the same manner and have the same powers, and the members of such boards shall receive the same compensation, as in the case of appeal boards within the Selective Service System.

"Any member of the inactive or volunteer Reserve may, if his claim for deferment is denied at the time he is ordered into the active military or naval service of the United States pursuant to the first paragraph of this section, appeal to the civilian Reserve deferment appeal board for the area within which he resides, and such board shall hear and determine his claim for deferment in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the second paragraph of this section. The decisions of such boards shall be final, except that any such decision adverse to the appellant reservist shall be subject to modification or change by the highest reviewing body of the service concerned having authority to hear and determine questions or claims with respect to the deferment from active duty of members of the inactive and volunteer Reserve components of such service."

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which was debated yesterday for 15 or 20 minutes, then adopted by an overwhelming voice vote of the Committee.

It proposes to set up a civilian appeal board to which members of the inactive and volunteer Reserves can appeal, if they are dissatisfied with the treatment their appeal received from the military authorities. We all know that the manner in which inactive and volunteer reservists were treated in the last year was most unjust and inequitable. This amendment simply sets up for them the same kind of protection a draftee has when he is called into service, namely, to ask for deferment on the ground of hardship or to ask deferment on the grounds of necessity in civilian occupation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Let the Committee understand this, and it is very important. The amendment means that a reservist who is called to active duty and makes application for discharge on account of hardship may go before an appeal board. The gentleman's amendment proposes to set up 49 appeal boards, to which these people may go after the armed services has denied their application. He then has the right of appeal to a civilian board to be discharged.

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is right, in the same way that a draftee can appeal, and on the same ground that a draftee can appeal. The committee may say this proposal comes too late. Yesterday they said that, and then stated, "We are considering this problem and at some future time we are going to submit something to the Congress." I submit that this is the time to act on this particular proposition so that at least we can prevent further injustice to the volunteers and inactive reservists of this country.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be given further study. It sets up civilian boards in a military organization; it provides for a multiplicity of boards and it means that in time of emergency when you need your reserves quickly they will all have the right to go to civilian boards and have their cases handled. A hundred boards will be distributed throughout the United States. They will have the right of appeal to any of these boards. This arrangement will delay your mobilization in time of critical emergency. Then a lot of other things are wrong which should be studied. For instance, it refers to organized and inactive reservists.

In the new law we are working on, those terms may be abolished and you may have a different set-up entirely, so the law itself may not be applicable.

I appeal to the Members of the House to let us write a fair, workable bill that will give these reservists a reasonable opportunity to have their grievances redressed in a proper manner. It has not as yet been brought out, but we are working on a new program to be recommended to the Congress and on which we will begin work Monday morning at 10 o'clock. I make a special appeal to the members of the committee to give us an opportunity to go into these things and dispose of them as should be done. I assure you these things are receiving my most careful attention.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we discussed this matter yesterday. In all probability some changes should be made in this amendment, but we also know that the bill is going to conference and that the committee will bring the bill back without this amendment in it, in any event. It seems to me that this is a very good opportunity for the membership of the House to express to the Committee on Armed Services, and through them to the military establishment, our dissatisfaction with the method of handling the deferment of our reservists and others who are being called into active duty. I recognize the situation parliamentarily as you do, and that the bill will come back from conference without this amendment in it. But, I think we ought to express ourselves at this time that certainly the question of deferment of involuntary Reserves should lie at home. We are proposing to set up an involuntary Reserve under this bill, of those who will be required to have 6 months of training and then go into the Reserve for 6 years involuntarily. There must be

some local appeal board to which they can appeal, in the event they are suffering severe hardshinp by being called to active duty, in the interest of their families. The bill, I believe, will not permit that.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think the gentleman could express himself more strongly than I have already expressed myself with reference to dissatisfaction. I have already made an effort to get this thing straightened out, and I want to see it straightened out, and what I am appealing to the gentleman for is an opportunity to work it out properly.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman will have an opportunity to work it out and I trust he and his committee will do so, particularly if this amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 54 after line 9, add a new section:

"*Provided, further,* That not more than one person may be inducted into the armed services under the provisions of this Act so long as the President of the United States retains Dean Acheson as Secretary of State."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman reserve that?

Mr. VINSON. No; I will not.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman on the point of order only.

Mr. JENSEN. The Chair will note that this is a limitation. The language of the amendment reads that not more than one person may be inducted into the armed services of the United States, and hence I contend that it is germane due to the fact that it is a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has offered an amendment which has been reported and the gentleman from Georgia has made the point of order against it on the ground that it is not germane. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the subject matter covered in the amendment is not embraced within the subject matter covered by the pending bill and would impose certain limitations and restrictions on the President of the United States not contained or referred to or mentioned in the bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, has my time been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman insists, he will be recognized, but it will be to the prejudice of other Members having amendments who probably will not get to be heard.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the time of other Members. I would like to say, however, that this is an amendment which I am sure a majority of the Members of Congress would like to have adopted, and I am also absolutely convinced that a great majority of the thinking people of America would like to see it adopted for good and sufficient reasons well known to everyone.

I am sorry the Chair has seen fit to rule my amendment not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: On page 41, line 3, after "President." strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "and provided further that until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the ninteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19 unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of 19 to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as 90 days older, (ii) has not attained the age of 19, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

[Mr. TEAGUE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, we debated this rather fully during general debate. The idea of restricting the local boards on taking 18-year-olds until all 19-year-olds are exhausted looks good at the first glance, but, as was stated in general debate, it will not work, because when you go down to the local board you hit the situation where one board has exhausted its 18½-year-olds and a board adjacent to it or maybe just across the street has not, and you have the situation of 18½-year-olds going on one side of the street and only 19-year-olds on the other side of the street.

It creates tremendous confuson. We had this situation during the war with reference to married men. The local board in one city would be taking fathers while another board would still have a considerable supply of unmarried men. It creates inequality between neighbors. It creates a great deal of confusion and hard feelings. If it were to be done at all, it should be on a State-wide basis. Objections have been made to that on the ground that the inventories are not complete, and it is impossible to state which local boards would be in a position to furnish those over 18½, and then they would have to go down to that.

A similar provision is in the Senate bill. I discussed it at length in general debate, and the reasons that they will not work. I assure you our previous experience has shown that this is a sort of gimmick which, while it looks good and seems really workable to some, is nothing in the world but a troublemaker. It creates confusion. It creates hard feelings and is entirely unworkable. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. I was going to offer the same amendment had the opportunity been presented for me to do so. This amendment was adopted in the other body. Of course, there will be some problems in administration. There are many difficulties now because in some counties students and farm boys are inducted and in some counties they are deferred. The amendment is necessary because against my wish and by a narrow vote the House gives the President the right to send troops all over the world without approval by Congress. The 18-year-olds are too young for foreign service. Adopt this amendment and those in the 19- to 26-year class will be called first.

I would also like to point out that there are now a large group of men that have not yet been examined, according to the testimony. That group numbers 1,632,249 individuals who are over 19 years of age. They have not yet been examined and they are between the ages of 19 and 26. An additional number of men, 799,155, because of some physical difficulty, have not been inducted into the service.

Now the standards are going to be lowered so that some of those can be taken in. Also, I would like to point out that all of the Atlantic Pact countries that we are helping now have an age limit of 20 years, with one exception. The other body proposes 18 years, and we propose 18½ years here. Let us be honest about this thing. Of course, there are going to be some difficulties in the administration of the act, just as we are presently having trouble administering the present law, but it can be done. We ought to be reasonable about it, as long as we have 1,632,000 young men who have not been examined and who are eligible for service. This thing comes close to the heart of every American home and every American mother and father. Let us be reasonable about taking these 18-year-olds for combat service. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas should be adopted. It is the same amendment I have on the desk. It should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. It ought to be approved.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a combat veteran wounded in World War

II, who is certainly informed on this particular subject, and author of this amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, there are members of the committee who will spend their time telling you that it is a gimmick and that it will not work, but they will not take the time to tell you why they cannot get men to replace the Reserves out of the 20 guard divisions in this country. They will not tell you these figures they give you run up to June 30. They will not tell you that by July 1 another 200,000 men who have been to college and who have been deferred will be available. Not one of them will try to justify those figures, except the chairman did on the first day.

They do not need the 18-year-olds and they should not be drafted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has made a clear and effective statement. I trust his amendment will be adopted and hope it will be adopted by a good majority.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, also a wounded combat veteran in World War II, who by experience certainly has knowledge on this subject matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This amendment would provide for going back and getting those men who could not go to college because of the unreasonably high mental standards they put in before the limit was dropped to 18 years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right, that is exactly the situation. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. We ought to support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Chairman, I now want to call attention to a parliamentary situation or a maneuver that I think is entirely unfair to the membership of the House.

I am advised that when final vote comes in the House on this bill, there will be no opportunity to vote for recommittal with an amendment of any kind. I am informed this is by reason of the peculiar wording of a rule under which this legislation is submitted. This rule takes that right away from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Since I have been a Member of the House, it has been my understanding and, I believe, the understanding of almost everyone, a motion for recommittal with an amendment is in order. This gives opportunity for a Member, if he desires to do so, to submit for vote at least one amendment considered in the Committee of the Whole. Several amendments were considered in the Committee but rejected by narrow margins. The usual rule should apply in considering this bill. Irrespective of the manner in which Members may choose to vote, the procedure of the Committee in this respect is, in my opinion, not only unusual but unfair, especially when such important legislation is under consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I would like to use the time allotted to me now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. First, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this amendment. As I understand, it is in the measure as it came from the other body, and I cannot see any reason why it should interfere with the action here contemplated.

I just want to pay my respects to those who have arisen here time after time and bemoaned the psychological effect of some amendment that might have been offered. Speaking of psychological effect, the most terrible psychological effect credited in this country in a long time resulted from the dismissal of General MacArthur. For proof of that get the Daily Worker of yesterday. Who applauded it? Not the American people, but the Communists and all of their fellow travelers. If you want to look for psychological effect, look for the psychological effect where it really belongs.

Now, I wish to make an announcement that is not apropos of that, particularly: Our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will speak on NBC, Columbia and Liberty networks at 10:30 o'clock tonight. I hope everybody will listen, even my good friends on the right. They might be enlightened.

Now, there is another matter that I wish to comment on, because this is the only opportunity I will have. For a long time rules have come out of the Rules Committee of one sort or another, designed to expedite the business of the House of Representatives. Frequently, in order to so expedite business, it is made in order to consider a committee substitute as an original bill. That does expedite consideration. Generally the rule provides that when you have a circumstance like that——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Ordinarily, as I recall those rules, special in nature, they have provided all the way through that the matter be considered as an original bill. This particular rule under which we are operating provides that this bill shall be considered as an original bill only for purposes of amendment. It is limited to that. Now, what is the effect of that sort of rule? It is to shut off the minority from making a motion to recommit, with instructions.

I want to say, certainly with no intention of criticizing anyone unduly or improperly, if that rule, not understood by many members of the Rules Committee may I say advisedly, because I have talked with them—if it was done inadvertently, then it should be corrected. This should be done so that a motion to recommit, with instructions—which, since time away beyond me, has been considered inviolate for the minority—should be protected. If it was, as I say, inadvertently done, it ought to be corrected and no Member should make a point of order against a motion with instructions. If it was done with malice aforethought, then it is—well, I will not say it is sharp practice, but it is pretty clever practice.

As far as the rights of the minority are concerned, it borders on the reprehensible. May I say at this point that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] tells me he did not know of the restrictive character of the rule. I would hope that when we get back into the House a point of order would not be made against a motion to recommit, with instructions. I would not like to believe that any Member of this body or any Member having this very important measure in charge actually undertook——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time to which I am entitled to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to believe that in the effort of the Rules Committee to coperate to expedite consideration of this measure, in the action of the membership generally in going along with the rule, since it was not known—certainly it was not known to me that that particular gimmick was in there—I would like to believe that no one in the membership would make a point of order on a motion to recommit, with instructions, if one is made by someone qualified to make it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a member of the Rules Committee, when this matter was before the Rules Committee it was my understanding, and I believe the understanding of all members of the Rules Committee, that it was to be a regular rule, waiving points of order, considering the Vinson bill as an original bill, and being an open rule, as we usually treat it, so that the rights of the minority would be protected on a motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish to concur in the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, that there was certainly no intention on the part of the Rules Committee to deprive the minority of their right to a motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN. And this rule does not do it; this rule provides that there shall be one motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; but I have checked it with the Parliamentarian. I believe we should have completed the wording of the rule by adding after the word "recommit" the words: "with or without instructions."

Mr. RANKIN. No; that is not necessary. You can get that under this rule.

Mr. HALLECK. When I read the rule I hoped that it would not be interpreted that way, but it has been so interpreted by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. RANKIN. That is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEAGUE) there were—ayes 105, noes 81.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. VINSON and Mr. TEAGUE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 158, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 28, line 14, substitute a colon for the period and add the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That the physical standards prescribed in the preceding proviso shall be construed so as to permit the voluntary induction of physically disabled persons for limited service in such numbers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, when such disability could not reasonably be expected to be aggravated by such service."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and I think the distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], made the best argument for it that I know. This is to relieve the manpower situation of this country. It permits the Defense Establishment to take into clerical and guard jobs veterans who may have lost an arm or a leg, but who are able to do clerical, guard, or desk work. That will relieve these other men for active service. The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, says it will interfere with the rotation problem. He knows as well as I do that the men in the combat units do not rotate in the desk jobs in the Pentagon Building. Now, we are talking about troops to Europe and more men in the armed services and drafting of 18-year-olds. This is one way of relieving that situation. There are thousands of these boys who have been maimed by losing an arm or a leg who want to serve their country. They are anxious to take the jobs and let these other men go into combat. If this amendment is adopted, I feel confident there would be sufficient manpower so that the Congress would not have to consider drafting 18-year-old boys at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the Committee that all of these amendments are very important, and when we go to conference, of course, we have to represent the viewpoint of the House, and we will have to fight for everything put in this bill to stay in the bill. The trouble about the gentleman's amendment is this: It means that if the Army or the Defense Department can take in one-legged or one-armed men or cripples, that it simply means a limited service is being created. We are going as far as we possibly can when we reach down to the standards set in January 1945. Now, the gentleman wants to go still further, so I trust that the Committee will reject this amendment because these amendments have to be defended in conference and have to carry the voice of the House if it supports these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 36, line 2, after the word "Commission", strike out the last two words on line 2 and all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "shall receive $15,000 per annum."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I feel, as a lot of you do, that this is the most important issue that will come before the Eighty-second Congress, and when universal military training goes into effect it will alter the course of this Nation. Only history will tell whether it be for better or for worse. This commission, I feel, is the most important commission that possibly the Congress will ever appoint because it will affect the homes and the lives of every man who reaches the age of 18 or 19. I feel it should be a full-time commission and not a part-time commission that comes here and draws up some plan and then goes back home and lets the military run the program. The question was raised in committee that we could not get any good men for $15,000. We must remember that a Congressman gets only $15,000.

This commission is called upon to report every 6 months to Congress. It is important that it be on the job because the bill states that this commission shall direct and control all the training of the boys enrolled in UMT. Therefore, I believe the commission should be a full-time commission. If you want to get college and university presidents, the commission can get assistance from the college and university presidents to help them draw up the plan and give any advice they might need.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if you follow out the suggestion of the gentleman from West Virginia you just create a $15,000 job for some politician who did not receive sufficient votes to get back to the House or the Senate. Let us not create those jobs for anybody, but let us do a worthwhile job here by having an outstanding Commission that is not dependent upon this salary. That is the reason we put it as we did, at $50 a day for the days they work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD:

Page 52, strike out lines 15 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The first section of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States,' approved July 27, 1950, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'That until July 1, 1952, the President shall be authorized to extend all enlistments in any branch of the Armed Forces for 12 months, except enlistments of persons who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive. *Provided*: That all persons whose terms of enlistment are extended in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall continue during such extensions to be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the Government of their respective services. No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act. Any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve now or hereafter ordered to active duty who served for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between September 16, 1940 and June 24, 1948, whose enlistment has been extended pursuant to this Act prior to the date of the enactment of this amendatory section shall within 3 months following the date of enactment of such amendatory section be discharged upon application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of the service in which he is serving'."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does two things. First, it states that there shall be no authority to extend involuntarily enlistments of those men who served for 1 year or more in any branch of the armed services during World War II. Second, it provides that those inactive and volunteer reservists who have already had their enlistments extended involuntarily and who are on active duty at the present time as a result of recall to active duty can be discharged within 3 months after they make application to the Secretary of their respective branch of the Armed Forces.

All of us know that the men who are in the Reserves have a contract for a definite period of years. Under legislation the Congress enacted last year in the emergency we said the President for a year could involuntarily extend any enlistment.

My amendment says only this. The man who served for 12 months in World War II cannot have his enlistment extended involuntarily. It further provides that those who have had their enlistments extended and who are now on active duty can be discharged at their own request within 3 months after the passage of this legislation.

I want my Government to live up to its contracts except where there is a declaration of war by Congress. The United States, your Government and mine, should abide by its agreements. Where there is the unlimited authority to involuntarily extend enlistments the Government does not keep its word. My amendment to a large degree corrects this situation. I hope for the benefit of

our veterans and their families, that my amendment is approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the committee had a chance to understand this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, I am satisfied it would not receive the support which he has asked the committee to give to the amendment. The effect of the amendment, which he was kind enough to give to us so that we might examine it, is that a man who has served 12 months in World War II could not have his enlistment extended beyond the time when it expires, for 12 months. It would apply to Reserves and Regulars.

Yo see what you are getting into here. It would have the effect of immediately authorizing the discharging of some 60,000 people, most of them well-trained personnel and many of them noncommissioned officers. This is too critical a proposition to be dealt with by amendments in this manner. We worked for months and months and months with experts on this bill and I think the committee knows what it has done. I do not think the amendment offered by the gentleman will help the bill. All of these amendments are very destructive to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 41, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: On page 34, before the period in line 25, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That the National Security Training Commission established by paragraph 3 of this subsection may provide that the initial military training of any individual or group of individuals inducted into such corps shall be accomplished during two periods of 3 months each in successive years, rather than during one period of 6 months."

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, this is a friendly amendment. It is a permissive amendment. It merely provides that when the National Security Training Commission presents to Congress a plan that it may provide for the division of the 6 months' basic training period into two periods of 3 months each in successive years. This would enable a boy, upon his graduation from high school, to take his 12 weeks of basic training in the summer following his graduation from high school; then go to college and finish his training the summer after he completes his freshman year in college. Therefore, he would be able to get a 6 months' basic training without the interruption of his schooling in any manner whatsoever.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Of course the Commission would have the authority to deal with that question when it submitted the report. But if you place it in the bill the Commission might interpret it as a mandate to follow what is written in the bill.

Mr. LANTAFF. I disagree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question which the gentleman asked me, that is not true, because this is a permissive amendment. The amendment says "may". Under the bill as drafted it "requires" that the training period be six successive months. My amendment is merely permissive.

Mr. VINSON. The Commission will consider all of these things written on page 37 as congressional intent. That is the trouble. It proposes 3 months' training in 1 year, 3 months the next year, and so on. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANTAFF), there were—ayes 59, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 35, strike out line 1 and all that follows down through line 2 on page 37, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on National Security Training (hereinafter referred to as the 'committee'), to be composed of five Members of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to perform the functions of the committee, and any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(4) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (7) of this subsection, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or vice chairman.

"(5) The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the functions vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

"(6) The committee shall have power to appoint, without regard to civil-service laws, and to fix the compensation, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such experts, consultants, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives from the contingent fund of the House, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that the plan or statutory basis for universal military training will be written by a joint committee of the Congress, rather than by a commission appointed by the President. The joint committee thereby created would have full leeway in the employment of experts and staff personnel, without regard to civil-service laws, and without regard to limitations upon salary.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has expressed the hope that the five members of the Commission provided by S. 1 will be top-flight men and has said that he has some names in mind. If my amendment carries, he would not need to beg the President to appoint such men. He could have a great deal to do with it himself since he would undoubtedly be a member of that joint committee.

Formulating a universal military training plan by a congressional committee would preserve the constitutional principle that laws should be written here in the Congress, where our constituents expect them to be written, and would avoid turning over to a Presidentially appointed commission the authority to write laws in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER) there were—ayes 114, noes 153.

So the amendment was rejected.

(Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this bill. Why? Because we are at war. We are at war, where American blood flows more freely than in the first bloody year of World War II, engaged in war because of the stupidity of the President and the chicanery of his Secretary of State.

The stupidity of which I speak was compounded in the President's recent radio address when he asserted that real peace can be achieved: First, if the fighting stops; second, if it does not break out again; third, if aggression ends. In other words, we shall have peace if we do not have war. Such a conclusion is worthy of the powers of ratiocination of our lamentable Commander in Chief.

"The Communist side must now choose its course of action," said the President in his radio apology to the American people. This is a clear admission that the President has no ideas of his own about how to get peace, that he has surrendered the initiative. Since the President's admission means that what happens next is Stalin's choice, we had better get prepared, we had better have this legislation.

The picture of a President without a plan as opposed to the clear cut objectives of the aggressive, militant Communist enemy, is a hard dose for the American people to swallow. Is it any wonder that the Communist Party in America, through Eugene Dennis, and the Daily Worker, praise President Truman for his service to their cause. Is it any wonder?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment, but the Chair will state that all time for debate has been exhausted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SADLAK:

Page 26, following the amendment offered by Mr. WALTER, insert the following: "Any citizen of a foreign country who, notwithstanding the relief from liability for training and service under this title afforded him by the preceding sentence, shall have enlisted in or shall have been inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall be eligible for full and immediate United States citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of this title."

On page 52, after line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"(y) The Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title I thereof a new section, as follows:

"'NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS INDUCTED OR ENLISTED IN THE ARMED FORCES

"'SEC. 22. (a) Any person not a citizen, regardless of age, who on or after June 25, 1950, and not later than June 3, 1952, has actively served or actively serves, honorably, in the Armed Forces of the United States and who, having been lawfully admitted, temporarily or otherwise, to the United States, including its outlying possessions and including the Canal Zone, shall have been at the time of his enlistment or induction within any such areas, may (notwithstanding the provisions of sections 303 and 326 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended) be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that (1) no declaration of intention and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; (2) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner; (3) the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign the petition in his own handwriting, or meet any additional test; and (4) no fee shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certificate of naturalization, if issued: *Provided, however,* That (1) there shall be included in the petition the affidavits of at least two creditable witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each such witness personally knows the petitioner to be a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States; (2) the service of the petitioner in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be proved by affidavits, forming part of the petition, of at least two citizens of the United States, members of the Armed Forces of the United States of the noncommissioned or warrant officer grade or higher (who may also be the witnesses described in clause 1 of this proviso), or by a duly authenticated copy of the record of the executive department having custody, of the record of petitioner's service, showing that the petitioner is or was during the period hereinbefore described a member serving honorably in the Armed Forces; and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1952. The petitioner may be naturalized immediately if prior to the filing of his petition the petitioner and the witnesses required by the foregoing proviso shall have appeared before and been examined by a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"'(b) Any person entitled to naturalization under subsection (a), who while serving is not within the jurisdiction of any naturalization court, may be naturalized in accordance with applicable provisions of subsection (a) without appearing before such court. The petition for naturalization of any such petitioner shall be made and sworn to before, and filed with, a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service designated by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, which representative is hereby authorized to receive such petition, to conduct hearings thereon, to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the admissibility of such petitioner for naturalization, to call witnesses, to administer oaths, including the oath of the petitioner and his witnesses to the petition for naturalization and the oath prescribed by section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, and to grant naturalization, and to issue certificates of naturalization: *Provided,* That the record of any preceedings hereunder together with a copy of the certificate of naturalization shall be forwarded to and filed by the clerk of a naturalization court in the district designated by the petitioner and made a part of the record of such court.

"'(c) Any person otherwise qualified for naturalization pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), (1) who is discharged under other than honcrable conditions from the Armed Forces of the United States, or is discharged therefrom on account of his alienage, or (2) any conscientious objector who performs or performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, shall not be entitled to the benefits of such subsections (a) or (b): *Provided,* That naturalization granted pursuant to subsections (a) or (b) may be revoked in accordance with such section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, if at any time subsequent to naturalization the person is separated from the Armed Forces of the United States under other than honorable conditions, and such grounds for revocation shall be in addition to any other provided by law. The fact that the naturalized person was separated from the service under other than honorable conditions may be proved by a duly authenticated certificate from the executive department under which the person was serving at the time of separation and such department shall supply such certification.'"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, how much time will be allotted to me for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the discretion of the Chair. The gentleman's argument must be confined to the point of order.

(Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that a time limitation has been fixed, and not because of any inattention on my part, I shall not have time to present my amendment and the reasons for adopting it.

May I say that the policy which I desire to have added to this bill is not a new one. It was a policy which was inaugurated during World Wars I and II and provided for the expeditious naturalization of noncitizens who served in the armed services of the United States. When I began working on this amendment this morning, Mr. Chairman, I was of the opinion that it only concerned a limited number of noncitizens. Originally, this matter was brought to my attention because of two Polish boys in my district who enlisted and are now fighting in Korea and who must wait 5 years before they become United States citizens. I learned just about on hour ago that there are not a half dozen noncitizens in the uniform of the United States but 73,546 noncitizens presently in the United States Army.

Under the provisions of S. 1 aliens who are legally here in the United States will be more readily inductible into the armed services than heretofore because of the provisions that have been added to the original measure. Since we are bringing them into service under the bill and because many will continue to come within the provisions of this act voluntarily by enlistment, I feel my amendment has positive germaneness since it is directly concerned with those actively engaged in the common defense and security of the United States as is this title of S. 1.

I am not interested in making each of the noncitizen soldiers and sailors a captain, general or admiral but I do want to make it possible to have the technical skill of each utilized to the fullest extent in their respective services and such is prohibited because they are not citizens of the country in whose uniform they are now serving or may serve. During World War II, the Second War Powers Act—March 27, 1942—permitted all aliens who were serving, or had served, honorably in the United States Armed Forces to apply for full and immediate citizenship. After the war, this naturalization section of the Second War Powers Act was replaced by a new naturalization act which gave even more complete coverage. On June 1, 1948, Public Law 567 in which I had a part, granted full citizenship on application to all aliens who had served honorably in the United States Armed Forces during the First World War—April 6, 1917–November 11, 1918—and

during the Second World War—September 1, 1939–December 31, 1946.

Since hostilities broke out in Korea, in June 1950, the draft laws have again come into operation, we are further extending them today, but to date no short-term naturalization has been made available to noncitizens serving under them. Aliens have donned our uniforms but they do not have the constitutional protection their United States uniform should afford. If they are captured, and such is not a remote possibility since many are engaged in Korea, they are destined to certain liquidation or release behind the lines to Soviet Communists as might readily be the case with the two boys of Polish birth in Poland on whom they would like to get their hands on since they were active in the Polish underground forces prior to their escape. American citizenship to them would give them a better chance of being saved and would lessen the great concern of their parents and loved ones who are here in the United States.

During the last war Immigration and Naturalization Service personnel travelled over the globe wherever our troops were serving and administered the oath and bestowed United States citizenship to the noncitizen troops serving and dying for this Nation. Many became citizens just prior to being assigned to overseas duty. No provisions today make the same process possible though my bill in the last Congress H. R. 9438 introduced August 15, 1950, and H. R. 371 introduced by me on January 3, 1951, would again grant this privilege. I ask the members to study H. R. 371 which in effect is my amendment of today and to give me some assistance with it on the legislative highway in the event the chairman sustains the point of order raised against it at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment and I insist on its germaneness to the present bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Connecticut has offered an amendment and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has made a point of order against it on the ground it is not germane to the pending bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment as carefully as possible within the time available. It appears clearly that the scope of the amendment is beyond the scope covered by the pending bill and, therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

(Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Chairman, I deem it necessary to vote against the pending universal military training and service bill as a vigorous protest on behalf of the people I have the honor to represent in the Congress against granting more and more power to an administration bankrupt in leadership, in policy, and in results.

I yield to none in my devotion to sound and adequate national defense. The people I represent share that devotion.

But the present bill is a hopeless hodgepodge of confusion embodying a shotgun merging of present needs with future possibilities. It represents an effort to write as yet undetermined policy regarding eventual universal military training into legislation which ought to be concerned immediately and primarily with the overwhelming needs of the present hour. It refuses to recognize the necessity for doing first things first, with resultant weakening of our capacity to meet the grave threats facing us in the months and years ahead.

Moreover, every attempt of a militant minority to improve the bill by amendment has been frustrated by administration forces in solid control of the majority of this House. How else, then, may we express the opposition felt by our people at home except to vote against the bill as it is now before us?

In its present and final form, this measure which is so vital to the preservation of our security abandons the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to declare war for it fails to provide consultation with the Congress on the use of American troops, in peacetime, in Europe or elsewhere around the world. This bill, in its present and final form, fails to accept the responsibility of the Congress for formulating the proposed program of universal military training contemplated to follow the draft and leaves this controversial task to a presidential commission. The bill, in its present and final form, fails to set a terminal date which would guarantee congressional reexamination of the question in the light of future conditions.

Mr. Chairman, these are but a few of the obvious and more important shortcomings in the measure driven through the Congress by an administration in which vast numbers of indignant citizens no longer share any confidence. I know full well, at this late hour, that this measure will pass by an overwhelming vote because so many of my colleagues feel some portions of it are essential to our survival. But I cannot do so. In good conscience, and in full confidence that there is a better way, I must vote against the pending bill to keep faith with our people who want to raise a voice of protest against an administration that is squandering our military resources in human strength with the same abandon it has shown in dissipating our economic resources.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the most vital of our democratic traditions has been that which stresses the distinctly civilian character of our Government—the concept that the military branches are no more than arms of a supreme civil administration. In keeping with that tradition I have always personally opposed tendencies toward militarization and military dominance. Much of my career in Congress has been devoted to fighting against specific instances of military encroachment on what I consider to be distinctly civilian spheres of operation, and I am keenly aware that the present emergency and the mobilization program have multiplied the opportunities for such encroachments—small businesses have suffered from too great a voice by the military in defense contracting and allocations of scarce materials before the real need has been analyzed by congressional or other civilian bodies—the Navy has moved too far into the field of ocean transportation of goods and supplies as well as personnel—many policy controlling jobs in the over-all defense effort have been given to men with military backgrounds and military minds. I am strongly opposed to the tendencies which those factors signify, and I shall continue to seek to limit the expansion of military control which they promote.

However, the Korean emergency has set a spark to a fire which has been kindling since the end of World War II. We are now facing a situation which requires that we reexamine our policies in the light of world events and the foreseeable future. I have gone through that process of reexamination, and it has not been easy. The thought of a system of universal military training has always been obnoxious to me as a violation of the traditions which I have just mentioned. But we are now confronting a future of crisis after crisis, deliberately created to test our strength and will. Unless we resolutely demonstrate that we are prepared to meet those crises—to fight the fire of communism with a stronger fire of our own—I am forced reluctantly to conclude that we will be consumed. Unless we exhibit to the world a determination to stop at no sacrifice to preserve the principles upon which we stand, the rest of the democratic world, which now looks to us for leadership, will falter and be lost to us. We cannot stand alone. We must demonstrate our firmness of intention to our friends as well as to our potential enemies. The institution of a system of organized military training for all the youth of our Nation at this time, will, I am now convinced, have a tremendous psychological impact upon the rest of the world. It will as well fulfill a real need in preparing us for what may become a world conflict.

The psychology of the Kremlin has been to alternate periods of seeming conciliation with periods of aggressive action. If this psychological warfare is continued there will be times when we do not need in our active standing armies a heavy complement of men. Yet, the Soviet may choose just such a time in which to strike. For that reason, I believe that we must have available, perhaps for years to come, a force of trained men to throw into action with little preliminary training or indoctrination. The National Security Training Corps, for which the bill we are now considering provides, will give us that force. I am, therefor, prepared to vote for these provisions with reservations.

In connection with the crying need for unified action by the United States as a demonstration of our fitness to lead the fight against communistic imperialism, I feel impelled to comment on the distressing contrast evident in the Houses of Congress between the spirit shown immediately after the outbreak of the Korean war and that which is apparent today. That contrast is making itself felt throughout the United States and throughout the world. It does not bode well for the future of democracy—it may

indeed spell national suicide. At the end of June 1950 when the United States and the United Nations had committed themselves to the defense of the Republic of South Korea—and in a larger sense to the defense of democratic principles throughout the world—there was a tremendous wave of enthusiasm on both sides of this House. There was serious and apparently sincere determination to support that action to whatever extent necessary. However, the entry of the Chinese Reds, the December defeats, and, let us be frank, some of the mistakes which have been made, have dimmed that enthusiasm. There has been in some quarters a regrettable attempt to make political capital of the mistakes and to make a political football of the entire problem of the emergency situation and its administration. The military manpower problem and the question of the prerogatives of the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, have been used to further the political ambitions of individuals, and to create disunity as to the United States' part in the world struggle. I repeat that I am opposed to making the military paramount over the civilian arm of our Government, but I am equally opposed to political maneuverings at a time when we are engaged in a life-or-death battle. Just as I shall oppose the overweaning ambitions of some elements in military circles, so shall I oppose the placing of hamstringing restrictions on the justified and recognized prerogatives of the Armed Forces and their Commander in Chief.

Because of those considerations I shall oppose inclusion in any bill which this House may pass of provisions such as that now contained in the Senate bill to place a numerical limitation on the total strength of our Armed Forces. We are not now engaged in a game of tiddledy winks—we are in a cold war. A limitation of troops to 4,000,000 or to any similar number will be accepted by the world as a limitation on the extent to which we are prepared to defend ourselves and to help in the defense of the democratic world. In this situation we should not place hobbles on the Defense Department's ability to best utilize the full resources of the country. We should not place arbitrary restrictions on their ability to plan and to make recommendations to Congress for the moneys needed to carry out the planning which is their proper function. If in any given situation the Congress feels the need for some measure of control over the size of our forces, adequate means are provided in the congressional power to appropriate and specify the purposes to which appropriations shall be put. An arbitrary limitation now would serve no useful purpose and would only weaken our position in the eyes of the world—all as a sop to political motives. We are engaged in a psychological war with communism and such a limitation would be a psychological victory for our enemies.

I have stated that I will support the universal military training provisions of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act now under consideration with reservations. My primary reservation is directed at the fact that no termination date has been set for the universal military training provisions of the act. To me the inevitable result of whole generations of young men trained in military thinking, and imbued with the military tendency to pursue ends without a scrupulous regard for the civilian economy and our democratic traditions, would be a nation dedicated to militarism and possibly controlled by a military dictatorship—just the type of control we are now fighting against. I do not favor permanent universal military training. I believe it to be a present necessity but a possible future danger. For that reason I propose that it be made mandatory that Congress reexamine the necessity for its continuance. Once such legislation is on the books it becomes exceedingly difficult to get it off unless provision is made in the law itself for such action. I, therefore, shall propose an amendment to the present bill, or shall support amendments which may be introduced by others, to place a 6-year limitation on the National Security Training Corps provisions of the bill. Six years of universal military training, together with the provisions for service in the Reserves incorporated in the bill, should provide trained forces for a period of at least 12 to 15 years. At the end of 6 years we may, God willing, be able to see our way out of the present dismal state of affairs.

With regard to the second of my reservations, I am pleased to note that the House Committee on Armed Services has incorporated in its amendment to S. 1 a requirement that at least 4 months "full and adequate" military training before an inductee may be sent overseas, and that such an inductee may not be assigned for duty in an overseas combat area with less than 6 months service in the Armed Forces. I shall vigorously support that provision. I would not favor drafting of either 18- or 18½-year-old boys were it not included. My mail has been filled with too many complaints from parents whose sons were sent to Korea without adequate training. It seems obvious that there has been laxity and inefficiency on the part of the military in this regard. The lives of young men are too precious to their families and to their country to permit their being trifled with in this way. The use of untrained men in modern warfare is likewise inexcusable militarily. I believe that circumstances have shown the need for some safeguard against a repetition of this condition, and I shall therefore support the provision.

A further limitation on the authority of the military which is contained in the House bill, and of which I heartily approve, is that placing a limitation on the length of service required of members of the Reserves who have seen previous service in the Armed Forces. Here again is a matter upon which the Defense Department has apparently not made the best use of opportunities available to it to minimize the distress caused civilians and their activities. It has been over 9 months since the beginning of hostilities in Korea. In that time definite policies should have been formulated with respect to service by reservists and a plan for systematically relieving them of duty in as short as possible a time should have been developed. This has not been done. I, therefore, believe that Congress should now step in and make such a provision mandatory. As long as we are not engaged in a war of greater scope than the Korean operation I see no reason why this cannot be done.

As a brake on the overmilitarization of our citizenry, and as an assurance that our educational system, particularly in our colleges and universities, shall not become moribund, I favor the provisions of the House bill, giving the President authority to defer from training and service any category or categories of students as he may deem appropriate. I believe that the provisions written into the Senate bill are too restrictive, and that the plan for inducting such students into service for preliminary training and then releasing them for a return to school would prove difficult to administer and would make for confusion. While the continuance of our civilian education programs is necessary to counterbalance excessive militarism, the changing picture with regard to military manpower needs makes flexibility of administering deferments for educational purposes necessary. The authority for providing this flexibility should properly lie with the President. However, I believe that the Congress should closely scrutinize the administration of the program to assure that the maximum numbers of students consistent with national security are permitted to complete their civilian education, and to assure that there are no abuses or cases of favoritism.

I wish to make one final point on specific provisions of the bill before us. The House Committee on Armed Services saw fit to include in their amendment a proviso in section 3 of the bill which I consider to be abhorrent to the democratic principles which we are seeking to protect. I refer to the proviso effectively requiring setting up of racially segregated units in both the National Security Training Corps and the Armed Forces. If permitted to remain in the legislation finally passed we will have undone the Defense Department's good work of the past several years in fostering equality of treatment for all races. The provision is not only obnoxious—it has been proved unnecessary by the successful fusion of racial groups in the Armed Forces since the program was originally undertaken. These men have lived and worked together without undue friction and in direct contradiction of the dire prophecies made by such groups as are sponsoring the present proviso. That proviso will give our Communist enemies a wonderful piece of ammunition for their propaganda guns if it is permitted to remain in the bill. It should be killed. I shall, therefore, support the amendment which I understand our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is to offer to strike out that proviso.

It may be that all of the provisions which I hope to see included in the

bill are not in it when it comes up for a final vote. It may be that some of the provisions which I should like to see stricken still remain. It is my present intention to vote for passage of the measure even though it may not completely satisfy me. I shall do so because I feel very strongly that the need is great. I do not wish my objections to be construed as mere obstructionism, neither do I wish their importance to be underestimated. I must, in good conscience, voice a solemn warning that the action we take on this bill may well change the whole course of history—not only for the United States but for the world. Failure to act will indicate to the world that we are not prepared to give full and unqualified support to the defense of democracy. It will leave us unprepared to meet the next aggression of the Soviet regime. It will, indeed, tempt the Kremlin into new acts of aggression. However, in acting, we must insure ourselves against falling into the pitfall of military dictatorship. Congress, by setting a termination date on the universal military training provisions of the bill, can pay the first premium on such insurance.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAY:

Page 26, line 17, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

Page 26, lines 18 and 19, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

Page 26, line 25, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

Page 27, lines 5 and 6, strike out "18 years and 6 months" and insert in lieu thereof "19 years."

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this suggested amendment to the bill is very simple. It merely fixes 19 years as the minimum age of induction instead of 18½ years. Nineteen years is the minimum under the present law, and that is even lower than most of the Atlantic Pact nations. Under this present law—that is, the draft of 19-year-olds—we have filled up our Armed Forces to such an extent that the Army is now 100,000 over strength; in addition, the draft quotas are being cut drastically every month.

Then why should the age be lowered to 18½ years? In the limited time allotted to me I do not care to discuss in detail the various figures advanced by the proponents of the 18½-year-old draft, but I doubt that anyone on this floor really believes that it is necessary to lower the draft age below 19 years in order to get the needed men for our Armed Forces. Then why this great pressure to lower the draft age?

Secretary Marshall and Mrs. Rosenberg were most confused when they attempted to juggle figures to justify their request for lowering the draft age.

The Secretary, although he said that he only desired an Army of approximately 3,500,000, objected vehemently when the Senate fixed the limit of the Armed Forces at 4,000,000. He objected bitterly when Congress attempted to prevent American troops from being sent willy-nilly over the world without the consent of Congress. Frankly, I believe that this desire to draft children is a part of this vast plan of regimentation that the administration under the direction of Secretaries Marshall and Acheson, is attempting to force upon the American people. Yes, they want 18-year-olds, not that they are better soldiers, but that they can mold and regiment their minds easier. The American brass tells you that 18-year-olds are great soldiers and have great courage. Yes, they are reckless and suffer great casualties, if that is what you want.

I was never a general, but I did serve more than 5 years during the last war, 4 years of which were spent in the Asiatic-Pacific theater. I was in the tanks and I believe that I am capable of judging the effectiveness of troops, and I can say from certain experience that, at least in the tanks, 18-year-old boys lacked the maturity to make the best soldiers. If reckless disregard of life is your goal, then the 18-year-old soldier is okay; otherwise he is not.

Then I oppose the 18-year-old draft for a much greater and more fundamental reason. These boys are the future America. I shudder to think of these boys away in the Army, away from the influence of the home, the church, and the school for 26 months. I have been interested in the youth problem for many years and I know that Army life is not for the 18-year-oldds. I have heard the old story that soldiering builds character and while I admit that I have seen instances where I felt that that was true, on the whole, it is not true. For after all what is the purpose of an army. Let us be realistic. The purpose of an army is to kill and destroy. All training is toward that goal. If the training is not toward that goal, the training is ineffective. Does that build a character that you want for 18-year-olds?

The 18-year-old boy that goes to the Army loses the proper influences during that formative period of his life in which his character is patterned and at the same time he is lost from useful civilian pursuits. He ceases to till the land, to run the lathes, to work the mines, to go to school. He ceases to produce and he ceases to grow intellectually and spiritually. That youth is the America of tomorrow.

While I realize that perhaps now we must be prepared to meet aggression, I also realize that you cannot stop thought by armies; communism is, in a way, a thought. It is the philosophy of the hopeless. Communism is like a vulture; it preys upon a dead culture and economy, never a healthy, free, virile economy and culture. If America ever, by sword rattling and stifling normal production and living, wrecks its fine culture and standard of living, then communism won't have to move in—it will be here.

The pages of history are filled with nations that wreck themselves by turning their youth into parading soldiers instead of useful, productive citizens.

Let us not create a Frankenstein that will destroy us. Let us not draft the boys before they are 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRAY) there were—ayes 118, noes 154.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. BRAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 140, noes 179.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute, as amended.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 171, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHORT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 29, line 4, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for duty in Europe in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty unless the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its approval of the assignment for such duty of persons so inducted."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit on the ground that it seeks to modify an amendment which has been adopted by the House, and therefore the motion is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it be in order at this time to move to amend the rule under which the measure is presently being considered?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. HALLECK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: If the previous question on the motion to recommit were to be voted down, would it then be in order to offer an amendment to a straight motion to recommit, which might be offered, to include a motion to recommit with instructions?

The SPEAKER. The Chair must say that the answer of the Chair to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will be an answer to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule, but if the gentleman desires to be heard, the Chair will hear him.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think the point of order is well taken. I know that when it comes to a straight amendment of a bill, when an amendment changing any part of a bill has been adopted and that amendment has been voted on in the House, then it is not in order to change that amendment by a motion to recommit. But where you take an entire bill—and that is the case here—and bring it to the floor of the House and pass it, it is just as much in order to amend it by a motion to recommit as it would be to amend it on the floor. I have a dozen rules in my hand similar to this one. I have been in this House a long time and I have been through about as many parliamentary battles as anybody else; and I submit that this motion is in order under the Rules of the House.

The point of order should be overruled.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may be heard on the matter.

Mr. HALLECK. After discussing the matter with our able Parliamentarian, whose judgment I respect, I am afraid that I must recognize that the point of order is probably well taken. However, I must again say that it is certainly—shall I say tragic?—that although apparently no such thing was intended, the minority has been by this resolution which we adopted, and which we incidentally helped to bring to quick action, shut off from what I have considered to be an inviolate right of the minority to offer a motion to recommit with instructions, when a measure in the nature of an original bill was being considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not in a position to be helpful to the gentleman from Indiana in the remarks he made.

The Chair knew this question would be raised and has looked into it.

The rule is well established that a motion to recommit may not include instructions to strike out any part of an amendment which has been agreed to by the House or to perfect an amendment which has been agreed to by the House—sections 2712 to 2725 of volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents.

In the present instance the House has just adopted an amendment which strikes out all of the bill after the enacting clause and inserts, by way of amendment, an entirely new text. Therefore, it seems to the Chair that any instruction embodied in a motion to recommit to change any of the text of the amendment which has been adopted or to strike out any part of it would not be in order. The net result is therefore that that the only motion to recommit now in order is a plain motion to recommit without instructions.

The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is still opposed to the bill; the Chair assumes?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I am still opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to recommit the bill S. 1 to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 296, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—121

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Dondero | Philbin |
| Adair | Doughton | Phillips |
| Allen, Ill. | Elston | Powell |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Fellows | Rankin |
| | George | Reece, Tenn. |
| Andresen, August H. | Golden | Reed, Ill. |
| | Gossett | Reed, N. Y. |
| Angell | Gross | Rees, Kans. |
| Arends | Hagen | St. George |
| Ayres | Halleck | Schwabe |
| Barden | Hand | Scrivner |
| Beamer | Harden | Secrest |
| Bender | Harrison, Wyo. | Shafer |
| Bennett, Mich. | Harvey | Sheehan |
| Berry | Hoeven | Short |
| Betts | Hoffman, Ill. | Simpson, Ill. |
| Bishop | Hoffman, Mich. | Smith, Kans. |
| Blatnik | Horan | Springer |
| Bolton | Hull | Stefan |
| Bow | Irving | Taber |
| Bramblett | Jenison | Tackett |
| Bray | Jenkins | Talle |
| Brehm | Jensen | Thompson, Mich. |
| Brown, Ohio | Jonas | |
| Brownson | Judd | Vail |
| Buffett | Larcade | Van Pelt |
| Burdick | LeCompte | Velde |
| Busbey | Lovre | Vorys |
| Bush | McCulloch | Vursell |
| Butler | McGregor | Weichel |
| Chenoweth | McVey | Werdel |
| Chiperfield | Mack, Wash. | Wheeler |
| Church | Marshall | Whitten |
| Clevenger | Martin, Mass. | Williams, Miss. |
| Colmer | Mason | Williams, N. Y. |
| Crawford | Miller, Nebr. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Crumpacker | Morris | Winstead |
| Curtis, Mo. | Murray, Wis. | Withrow |
| Curtis, Nebr. | Nelson | Wolcott |
| Davis, Ga. | Nicholson | Wood, Ga. |
| Davis, Wis. | O'Hara | |
| Dolliver | Passman | |

NAYS—296

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aandahl | Gary | Mitchell |
| Abbitt | Gathings | Morano |
| Addonizio | Gavin | Morgan |
| Albert | Goodwin | Morrison |
| Allen, Calif. | Gordon | Morton |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gore | Moulder |
| Andrews | Graham | Multer |
| Anfuso | Granahan | Mumma |
| Aspinall | Granger | Murdock |
| Auchincloss | Grant | Murphy |
| Bailey | Green | Murray, Tenn. |
| Baker | Greenwood | Norblad |
| Bakewell | Gregory | Norrell |
| Baring | Gwinn | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Barrett | Hale | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Bates, Ky. | Hall, Edwin Arthur | O'Neill |
| Bates, Mass. | | Ostertag |
| Battle | Hall, Leonard W. | O'Toole |
| Beall | | Patman |
| Beckworth | Hardy | Patten |
| Belcher | Harris | Patterson |
| Bennett, Fla. | Harrison, Va. | Perkins |
| Bentsen | Havenner | Pickett |
| Blackney | Hays, Ark. | Poage |
| Boggs, Del. | Hays, Ohio | Polk |
| Boggs, La. | Hébert | Potter |
| Bolling | Hedrick | Poulson |
| Bonner | Heffernan | Preston |
| Bosone | Heller | Price |
| Boykin | Herlong | Priest |
| Breen | Herter | Prouty |
| Brooks | Heselton | Quinn |
| Brown, Ga. | Hess | Rabaut |
| Bryson | Hill | Radwan |
| Buckley | Hillings | Rains |
| Budge | Hinshaw | Ramsay |
| Burleson | Holifield | Reams |
| Burnside | Holmes | Redden |
| Burton | Hope | Regan |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Howell | Rhodes |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Hunter | Ribicoff |
| Camp | Jackson, Calif. | Richards |
| Canfield | Jackson, Wash. | Riehlman |
| Cannon | James | Riley |
| Carlyle | Jarman | Roberts |
| Carnahan | Javits | Robeson |
| Case | Johnson | Rodino |
| Celler | Jones, Ala. | Rogers, Colo. |
| Chatham | Jones, Mo. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Chelf | Jones, Hamilton C. | Rogers, Mass. |
| Chudoff | | Rogers, Tex. |
| Clemente | Jones, Woodrow W. | Rooney |
| Cole, Kans. | | Roosevelt |
| Cole, N. Y. | Karsten, Mo. | Sabath |
| Combs | Kean | Sadlak |
| Cooley | Kearney | Sasscer |
| Cooper | Kearns | Saylor |
| Corbett | Keating | Scott, Hardie |
| Cotton | Kee | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Coudert | Kelley, Pa. | |
| Cox | Kelly, N. Y. | Scudder |
| Cunningham | Kennedy | Seely-Brown |
| Dague | Keogh | Shelley |
| Dawson | Kerr | Sheppard |
| Deane | Kersten, Wis. | Sieminski |
| DeGraffenried | Kilburn | Sikes |
| Delaney | Kilday | Simpson, Pa. |
| Dempsey | King | Smith, Miss. |
| Denny | Kirwan | Smith, Va. |
| Denton | Klein | Spence |
| Devereux | Kluczynski | Staggers |
| D'Ewart | Lane | Stanley |
| Dingell | Lanham | Steed |
| Dollinger | Lantaff | Stigler |
| Donohue | Latham | Stockman |
| Donovan | Lesinski | Sutton |
| Dorn | Lind | Taylor |
| Doyle | Lucas | Thomas |
| Durham | Lyle | Thompson, Tex. |
| Eaton | McCarthy | Thornberry |
| Eberharter | McConnell | Tollefson |
| Elliott | McCormack | Towe |
| Ellsworth | McDonough | Trimble |
| Engle | McGrath | Van Zandt |
| Evins | McGuire | Vaughn |
| Fallon | McKinnon | Vinson |
| Feighan | McMillan | Walter |
| Fenton | McMullen | Welch |
| Fernandez | Machrowicz | Wharton |
| Fine | Mack, Ill. | Whitaker |
| Fisher | Madden | Wickersham |
| Flood | Magee | Widnall |
| Fogarty | Mahon | Wigglesworth |
| Forand | Mansfield | Willis |
| Ford | Martin, Iowa | Wilson, Tex. |
| Forrester | Meader | Wolverton |
| Fugate | Merrow | Yates |
| Fulton | Miller, Calif. | Yorty |
| Furcolo | Miller, Md. | Zablocki |
| Gamble | Miller, N. Y. | |
| Garmatz | Mills | |

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Gillette | Teague |
| Armstrong | Hart | Wier |
| Buchanan | O'Konski | Wood, Idaho |
| Crosser | Rivers | Woodruff |
| Davis, Tenn. | Sittler | |
| Frazier | Smith, Wis. | |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Sittler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Frazier against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hart with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays, 44, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—372

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aandahl | Byrnes, Wis. | Fisher |
| Abbitt | Camp | Flood |
| Abernethy | Canfield | Fogarty |
| Addonizio | Cannon | Forand |
| Albert | Carlyle | Ford |
| Allen, Calif. | Carnahan | Forrester |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Case | Fugate |
| | Celler | Fulton |
| Anderson, Calif. | Chelf | Furcolo |
| Andresen, August H. | Chenoweth | Gamble |
| | Chudoff | Garmatz |
| Andrews | Church | Gary |
| Anfuso | Clemente | Gathings |
| Angell | Cole, Kans. | Gavin |
| Arends | Cole, N. Y. | George |
| Aspinall | Colmer | Goodwin |
| Auchincloss | Combs | Gordon |
| Ayres | Cooley | Gore |
| Bailey | Cooper | Gossett |
| Baker | Corbett | Graham |
| Bakewell | Cotton | Granahan |
| Baring | Coudert | Granger |
| Barrett | Cox | Grant |
| Bates, Ky. | Crawford | Green |
| Bates, Mass. | Cunningham | Greenwood |
| Battle | Curtis, Nebr. | Gregory |
| Beall | Dague | Gwinn |
| Beckworth | Davis, Ga. | Hagen |
| Belcher | Davis, Wis. | Hale |
| Bender | Dawson | Hall, Edwin Arthur |
| Bennett, Fla. | Deane | |
| Bennett, Mich. | DeGraffenried | Hall, Leonard W. |
| Bentsen | Delaney | |
| Berry | Dempsey | Halleck |
| Betts | Denny | Hand |
| Blackney | Denton | Harden |
| Blatnik | Devereux | Hardy |
| Boggs, Del. | D'Ewart | Harris |
| Boggs, La. | Dingell | Harrison, Va. |
| Bolling | Dollinger | Harrison, Wyo. |
| Bolton | Dolliver | Harvey |
| Bonner | Dondero | Havenner |
| Bosone | Donohue | Hays, Ark. |
| Boykin | Donovan | Hays, Ohio |
| Bramblett | Dorn | Hébert |
| Bray | Doyle | Hedrick |
| Breen | Durham | Heffernan |
| Brehm | Eaton | Heller |
| Brooks | Eberharter | Herlong |
| Brown, Ga. | Elliott | Herter |
| Brown, Ohio | Ellsworth | Heselton |
| Bryson | Elston | Hess |
| Buckley | Engle | Hill |
| Budge | Evins | Hillings |
| Burdick | Fallon | Hinshaw |
| Burleson | Feighan | Hoeven |
| Burnside | Fellows | Hoffman, Ill. |
| Burton | Fenton | Holifield |
| Bush | Fernandez | Holmes |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Fine | Hope |
| Horan | Martin, Mass. | Sabath |
| Howell | Meader | Sadlak |
| Hunter | Merrow | St. George |
| Irving | Miller, Calif. | Sasscer |
| Jackson, Calif. | Miller, Md. | Saylor |
| Jackson, Wash. | Miller, Nebr. | Schwabe |
| James | Miller, N. Y. | Scott, Hardie |
| Jarman | Mills | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Javits | Mitchell | |
| Jensen | Morano | Scrivner |
| Johnson | Morgan | Scudder |
| Jones, Ala. | Morrison | Secrest |
| Jones, Mo. | Morton | Seely-Brown |
| Jones, Hamilton C. | Moulder | Shelley |
| | Multer | Sheppard |
| Jones, Woodrow W. | Mumma | Sieminski |
| | Murdock | Sikes |
| Judd | Murphy | Simpson, Pa. |
| Karsten, Mo. | Murray, Tenn. | Smith, Miss. |
| Kean | Murray, Wis. | Smith, Va. |
| Kearney | Nelson | Spence |
| Kearns | Norblad | Springer |
| Keating | Norrell | Staggers |
| Kee | O'Brien, Ill. | Stanley |
| Kelley, Pa. | O'Brien, Mich. | Steed |
| Kelly, N. Y. | O'Neill | Stefan |
| Kennedy | Ostertag | Stigler |
| Keogh | O'Toole | Stockman |
| Kerr | Passman | Sutton |
| Kersten, Wis. | Patman | Taber |
| Kilburn | Patten | Tackett |
| Kilday | Patterson | Talle |
| King | Perkins | Taylor |
| Kirwan | Phillips | Thomas |
| Klein | Pickett | Thompson, Tex. |
| Kluczynski | Poage | Thornberry |
| Lane | Polk | Tollefson |
| Lanham | Potter | Towe |
| Lantaff | Poulson | Trimble |
| Larcade | Preston | Van Pelt |
| Latham | Price | Van Zandt |
| LeCompte | Priest | Vaughn |
| Lesinski | Prouty | Vinson |
| Lind | Quinn | Vorys |
| Lovre | Rabaut | Vursell |
| Lucas | Radwan | Walter |
| Lyle | Rains | Weichel |
| McCarthy | Ramsay | Welch |
| McConnell | Reams | Wharton |
| McCormack | Redden | Wheeler |
| McCulloch | Reece, Tenn. | Whitaker |
| McDonough | Rees, Kans. | Whitten |
| McGrath | Regan | Wickersham |
| McGregor | Rhodes | Widnall |
| McGuire | Ribicoff | Wigglesworth |
| McKinnon | Richards | Williams, Miss. |
| McMillan | Riehlman | Willis |
| McMullen | Riley | Wilson, Tex. |
| McVey | Roberts | Winstead |
| Machrowicz | Robeson | Wolcott |
| Mack, Ill. | Rodino | Wolverton |
| Mack, Wash. | Rogers, Colo. | Wood, Ga. |
| Madden | Rogers, Fla. | Yates |
| Magee | Rogers, Mass. | Yorty |
| Mahon | Rogers, Tex. | Zablocki |
| Mansfield | Rooney | |
| Martin, Iowa | Roosevelt | |

NAYS—44

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adair | Golden | Reed, Ill. |
| Allen, Ill. | Gross | Reed, N. Y. |
| Barden | Hoffman, Mich. | Shafer |
| Beamer | Hull | Sheehan |
| Bishop | Jenison | Short |
| Bow | Jenkins | Simpson, Ill. |
| Brownson | Jonas | Smith, Kans. |
| Buffett | Marshall | Thompson, Mich. |
| Busbey | Mason | |
| Butler | Morris | Vail |
| Chiperfield | Nicholson | Velde |
| Clevenger | O'Hara | Werdel |
| Crumpacker | Philbin | Williams, N. Y. |
| Curtis, Mo. | Powell | Wilson, Ind. |
| Doughton | Rankin | Withrow |

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Frazier | Smith, Wis. |
| Armstrong | Gillette | Teague |
| Buchanan | Hart | Wier |
| Chatham | O'Konski | Wood, Idaho |
| Crosser | Rivers | Woodruff |
| Davis, Tenn. | Sittler | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sittler for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hart with Mr. Gillette.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment to the bill S. 1 and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, KILDAY, DURHAM, SHORT, ARENDS, and COLE of New York.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes."

CORRECTION OF SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to correct the numbers and subnumbers of the sections of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar, which under the rules it would be in order to call on Monday next, be in order on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no legislative business for Monday.

On Tuesday the Consent Calendar will be called, and there will be four suspensions, unless some of the bills are passed on the Consent Calendar. One is the bill S. 82, relating to burial benefits for Philippine veterans, another is the bill H. R. 318, which amends the Veterans' Act of 1924, the third is the bill H. R. 316, relating to a minimum pension for veterans with arrested tuberculosis, and the fourth is House Joint Resolution 197, to extend the Export Control Act of 1949.

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday, and there will also be the exercises celebrating Pan-American Day.

Following that there will be general debate on the bill H. R. 3709, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill of 1952.

Tuesday is primary day in New Jersey, and in accordance with the proper and fixed custom out of respect to the Members from any State having an election due to the necessity of their being in their States on those days, an agreement has been made that if there are any roll calls on Tuesday, with the permission of the House, which has never been denied, they will be postponed to Wednesday next.

The Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

The program as to Thursday and Friday is undetermined at the present time, and if there is anything for those days, I will announce it to the House just as soon as possible.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, is there any news that the gentleman has for us regarding the reported visit of General MacArthur on Thursday or Friday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is in a most difficult position to answer that inquiry; but from information received, feels that it will be satisfactorily solved.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I will not press the matter any further.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, conference reports, if any, may be brought up at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I intended to ask that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with, but I promised the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that I would not make the request in his absence. I note that the gentleman is not in the Chamber, and in keeping with my promise to him I will make the request some other time.

## UNITED STATES v. EDWARD A. RUMELY

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 17, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Edward A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena .

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. EDWARD A. RUMELY, No. 1789–50

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO HON. HENDERSON LANHAM:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 13th day of April A. D. 1951.

HARRY M. HULL,
*Clerk.*
By PAUL A. ROSEN,
*Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 17, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Edward A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. EDWARD A. RUMELY, No. 1789–50

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO HON. CLYDE DOYLE:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 13th day of April A. D. 1951.

HARRY M. HULL,
*Clerk.*
By W. MILESTEAD,
*Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 17, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against Edward A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. EDWARD A. RUMELY, No. 1789–50

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO HON. CARL ALBERT:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Tuesday, April 17, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 13th day of April A. D. 1951.

HARRY M. HULL,
*Clerk.*
By W. MILESTEAD,
*Deputy Clerk.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 194) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representatives CARL ALBERT, HENDERSON LANHAM, and CLYDE DOYLE, Members of this House, have been served with subpenas to appear as witnesses before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m., on the 17th day of April 1951, in the case of the *United States* v. *Edward A. Rumely*, Criminal Docket No. 1789–50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That Representatives CARL ALBERT, HENDERSON LANHAM, and CLYDE DOYLE are authorized to appear in response to the subpenas of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *Edward A. Rumely* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued Apr. 18, 1951
For actions of Apr. 17, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 69

CONTENTS

Appropriations.4,12,21,37,38
Buildings and grounds....9
Copper imports.....11
Defense production.....34
Dispersal.....9
Education.....26
Electrification...20,31,33
Electrification, rural.5,33
Export controls.....1
Farm program.....28
Foreign affairs, aid.....
.....15,22,29
Foreign affairs.....35
Fruits and vegetables.27,30
Grain.....15,16,29
Health.....14
Labor, farm.....39
Lands.....2,10,24
Latin America.....6
Livestock and meat.....14
Loans.....24
Military training.....8
Monopolies.....3
Nominations.....13
Personnel.....23
Prices, control.....32
Property management.....7
Reports.....14
Research.....2,10
R.F.C.....19
Soil conservation.....17
Taxation.....30
Trade, foreign..1,11,18,27
Transportation....13,20,31

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed export-control continuation measure. Rep. Tackett criticized public power projects, but defended REA cooperatives. H. passed and S. acted on bills to transfer Morgan Horse Farm to Vt. College. Sen. Byrd submitted measure to provide for consolidated appropriation bill. Senate made dispersal bill unfinished business and sent military training bill to conference. Sen. Ellender inserted his recent farm speech.

HOUSE

1. EXPORT CONTROL. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 197, to continue export-control authority through June 1953 (pp. 4106).

2. RESEARCH LANDS. Passed as reported H. R. 1149, to authorize transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of a tract of land formerly used by the Remount Service (pp. 4096-7).

3. MONOPOLIES. Passed without amendment H. R. 2401, to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act (pp. 4094-5).

4. LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 3709. Completed general debate. The bill is to be read for amendment today. (pp. 4114-24.)

5. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Tackett, Ark., criticized Rep. Rankin's recent remarks about privately owned utility companies and objected to various public-power projects. However, he defended REA cooperatives and said they were not publicly owned. (pp. 4124-7.)

6. LATIN AMERICA. Several members spoke in commemoration of Pan-American Day (pp. 4107-14).

7. PROPERTY MANAGEMENT. Received from the Budget Bureau a report on the reassignment and transfer of property within executive agencies where two appropriations are involved in the action; to Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee (p. 4128).

SENATE

8. MILITARY TRAINING. Conferees were appointed on S. 1, the military-training, sel-

ective-service bill (p. 4044). The text of the bill as passed the House is printed in the Record (pp. 4039-44). House conferees were appointed April 13.

9. BUILDINGS DISPERSAL. S. 213, to provide for dispersal and decentralization of Government agencies, was made the unfinished business (pp. 4045, 4077).

10. RESEARCH LANDS. By a 50-25 vote, agreed to a motion by Sen. Flanders to table a motion by Sen. Morse to reconsider the vote by which S. 271, to transfer a tract of USDA land to the Vermont Agricultural College, had been passed by the Senate. H. R. 1149, a similar bill which had been passed by the House, was ordered to lie on the table for further Senate action. (pp. 4065-77.)

11. COPPER IMPORTS. The Finance Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3336 (S. Rept. 223)(p. 4048). The "Daily Digest" states: "The amended bill would provide for suspending import duty on copper until February 15, 1953, or at the end of the present national emergency, whichever is earlier, with proviso that if the price falls below 24 cents for a month, the Tariff Commission shall advise the President, who shall terminate suspension." (p. D298.)

12. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the request of the House for the return of this bill to it for correction of an error which occurred during the engrossing process (p. 4039).

13. NOMINATIONS. Confirmed the nominations of Richard D. Searles to be Under Secretary of the Interior and Delos Wilson Rentzel to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation (p. 4092).

14. REPORTS. Received the report of this Department on the foot-and-mouth disease campaign in Mexico for the month of Feb., 1951; and the annual report of the Public Health Service, fiscal year 1950 (p. 4045).

15. INDIA AID. Received petitions from the Koinonia Foundation and other citizens favoring the shipment of grain to India (p. 4047).

16. GRAIN. Received a Ruhamah Baptist Church (Bantoul, Kans.) resolution favoring diversion of all grains and fruits now used in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages to the production of food products (p. 4047).

17. SOIL CONSERVATION. Received resolutions of the Okla. Ass'n. of Soil Conservationists favoring various soil conservation measures in Okla. (p. 4048).

18. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Butler, Nebr., submitted an amendment he intends to propose to H. R. 1612, the trade-agreements extension bill (p. 4050); to Foreign Relations Committee.

19. R.F.C. The Banking and Currency Committee agreed to hold hearings on all pending RFC bills, beginning April 24 (p. D298).

Sen. Byrd inserted his statement and a New York Times editorial suggesting that the reorganization of RFC does not preclude action on bills to provide for abolishing the corporation (p. 4061).

20. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Thye spoke in favor of this project (pp. 4089-90).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

21. APPROPRIATIONS. S. Con. Res. 27, by Sen. Byrd (for himself and 47 other Senators), to provide for a consolidated appropriation bill; to Rules and Admin-

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 17, 1951
Ordered to be printed with the amendment of the House of Representatives

# AN ACT

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

~~TITLE I~~

~~SECTION 1. That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:~~

~~(a) Section 1 of such Act is amended to read as follows:~~

~~"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'.~~

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

"(c) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

"(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect

the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is repealed.

(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen".

(d) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate Armed Forces."

(e) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects (including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard)."

~~(f) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least four months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."~~

~~(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:~~

~~"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary~~

of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.

(h) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such Act is repealed.

(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to service on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with rgeulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and

shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(j) The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E-1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an

allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(k) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.

(l) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-four".

(m) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed six months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of four months but not in excess of six months which may be designated in such resolution;

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security

Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than four months.

"(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall, subject to the direc-

tion of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

(n) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons

who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not

attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the following: "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed seventy-five thousand persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than ten years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance

with regulations prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon lead-

ers' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to completed a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury

with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting in clause (1) of the second sentence after the word "persons", where it appears the second time, the

following: (other than wives alone)", and (2) by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof the words "wives or".

(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Subsection (j) of section 6 of such Act is amended

(1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction", and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction".

(u) Section 7 of such Act is repealed.

(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in

the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".

(x) Section 16 of such Act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(j) the terms 'active training and service' shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of four months (or not to exceed six months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(y) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission

and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by Departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated Departments and agencies."

(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four".

(aa) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end of title I the following new section:

"SEC. 22. It shall be the duty of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the provisions of this title not later than the fourth year following the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act and each year thereafter, taking into consideration the then existing international situation and giving due regard to United States commitments to the United Nations. Upon the completion of such reviews, the committees shall report to their respective Houses and shall make such recommendations with respect to modification of this title as they may deem desirable."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64

Stat. 379), is hereby amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat 828); is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".

SEC 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"SEC 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed

a total of four million persons at any time during the period of suspension described in the first section of this Act."

SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".

## TITLE II

SEC. 21. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out the words "until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed two thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in

~~the Regular Army for periods of not less than five years of not to exceed twenty-five thousand".~~

~~(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955".~~

*That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:*

*(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'."*

*(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act are amended to read as follows:*

*"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen or national of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of eighteen years and six months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: Provided, That any such person who has not attained the age of eighteen years and six months shall, as*

*soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of eighteen years and six months: Provided further, That the provisions of this subsection shall be held to be applicable to any alien admitted for a temporary period (other than an alien exempt from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) who has remained in the United States for a period in excess of one year; any alien admitted for a temporary period who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States.*"

*(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is hereby amended to read:* "*The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereafter provided (including*

*but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act."*

*(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: Provided, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six in January 1945."*

*(e) No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.*

*(f) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the*

*provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the six-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone): Provided, That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining any person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title in violation of the provisions of this paragraph."*

*(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-six consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States*

*Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."*

*(h) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the regular army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: Provided, That notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.*

*"(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: Provided, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: Provided further, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: And pro-*

*vided further, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.*

*"(3) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.*

*"(4) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of eighteen, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.*

*"(5) Any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardians be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the*

*Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).*

*"(6) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."*

*(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:*

*"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of six years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally*

*qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be con-*

*strued to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force."*

*(j) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.*

*(k) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six".*

*(l) Said paragraph is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "No physician or dentist who is engaged in full-time employment as such at any hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection while so engaged after he has attained the thirtieth anniversary of the date of his birth."*

*(m) Section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:*

*"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically*

*utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.*

*"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—*

*"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-six months which may be designated in such resolution; or*

*"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,*

*the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under section 4 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter*

*estabished for initial military training for a period of six months: Provided, That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of nineteen years during the period of such deferment.*

*"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, of which not more than three shall be members of the same political party, and three of whom shall be civilians; of the remaining two members one shall be an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, the other shall be a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a reserve component. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed,*

*in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be estabished a National Security Training Corps.*

*"(4) The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be two years. The term of office of the remaining three members of the Commission shall be for three, four, and five years, respectively. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member, shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. Members of the Commission, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.*

*"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. Subject to the direction of the President, and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Com-*

*mission shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies, standards, and directives of the Commission.*

*"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.*

*"(7) The Commission shall, not later than six months following its appointment and confirmation, submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to—*

*"(i) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, which program shall include (A) the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps, and (B) measures for utilizing the existing plants and facilities of schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable in providing initial military training (along with academic training where appropriate) for members of the National Security Training Corps;*

*"(ii) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;*

*"(iii) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;*

*"(iv) such other policies and standards as may be estabished under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and*

*"(v) recommendations with respect to disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.*

*"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—*

*"(1) the legislative recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law: Provided, That such recommendations shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services, and both committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of forty-five calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to their respective Houses: Provided further, That any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged and may be called up by any Member of either*

*House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged; and*

*"(2) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.*

*"(9) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding six months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding six months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense,*

*and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.*

*"(10) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: Provided, however, That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.*

*"(11) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."*

*(n) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ": And provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of*

*persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President: And provided further, That until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—*

*(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and*

*(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."*

*(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".*

*(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the*

*words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".*

*(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".*

*(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attaches of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries*

*who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted."*

*(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:*

*"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treas-*

*ury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less han two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.*

*"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regula-*

*tions as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.*

*"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."*

*(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is*

*found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: Provided, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: Provided further, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of*

*persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, re-*

*search, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by any agency or department of the Federal Government."*

*(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.*

*"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruc-*

*tion, whichever is the earlier: Provided, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."*

*(t) Section 7 of said Act is hereby repealed.*

*(u) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".*

*(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position*

*be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".*

*(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".*

*(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.*

*"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable*

*conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.*

*"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."*

*(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board".*

*(x) Section 10 of said Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one*

*appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President."; and*

*(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:*

*"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."*

*(y) Section 17 of said Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.*

*"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training*

*carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.*

*"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than six months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.*

*"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist."*

*(z) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of ninety days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of*

*twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of twelve or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of thirty days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.*

*"The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from active duty (1) of members of the inactive and volunteer reserves whose occupation, employment, or other activity is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, and (2) of members of the inactive and volunteer reserves whose deferment is advisable by reason of the fact that other persons are dependent upon them for support. To the maximum extent practicable deferments of such members shall be on the same basis as deferments under section 6 (h) of this title.*

*"The President is authorized to create and establish in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, one or more civilian reserve*

*deferment appeal boards (not within the Selective Service System). Each such board shall consist of five citizens of the United States who are not members of the Armed Forces, and who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such boards shall function in the same manner and have the same powers, and the members of such board shall receive the same compensation, as in the case of appeal boards within the Selective Service System.*

*"Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve may, if his claim for deferment is denied at the time he is ordered into the active military or naval service of the United States pursuant to the first paragraph of this section, appeal to the civilian reserve deferment appeal board for the area within which he resides, and such board shall hear and determine his claim for deferment in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the second paragraph of this section. The decisions of such boards shall be final, except that any such decision adverse to the appellant reservist shall be subject to modification or change by the highest reviewing body of the service concerned having authority to hear and determine questions or claims with respect*

*to the deferment from active duty of members of the inactive and volunteer reserve components of such service."*

*SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the Eighty-first Congress, second session), is hereby amended by striking out the words "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "July 1, 1952" and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."*

*(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".*

*SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act, except members of the reserve components.*

*SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it*

*shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder."*

*SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.*

*SEC. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the regulations authorized hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more*

*than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.*

*SEC. 7. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".*

Passed the House of Representatives with an amendment April 13, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk.*

Passed the Senate March 9, 1951.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
*Secretary.*

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# S. 1

# AN ACT

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 17, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendment of the House of Representatives

Please return to
DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
Office of Budget and Finance

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1951 No. 69

# Senate

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in knowledge of whom standeth our life: From the tumult of an angry world we seek the sanctuary of Thy presence, not that we may escape from the world, but that we may turn to the perplexing maze of its tragic problems, with strong spirits and quiet minds.

Help us to recognize truth and to welcome revelation from whatever quarter they arise. Strip us of our boastful illusions. Open our eyes to the evils among us that we condemn in others. As the winds blow harder may our roots strike deeper. Whatever outward things these dangerous days take from us, by Thy grace may they make us inwardly more adequate and wise, dependable and strong. May we so guard the treasures of our freedom, bought with a great cost, that we will not allow the fight for freedom to destroy the freedom for which we fight, nor the inner national unity with which we must face the tyrants who seek our destruction. Fit us to faithfully protect the Republic from outward aggression and from inner selfishness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 13, 1951, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, requested the Senate to return to the House the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, for the purpose of making a correction.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted on its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who died in active service, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—RETURN TO HOUSE OF BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, will be returned to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request.

## AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO LT. THOMAS J. HUDNER, JR.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on April 13 the Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded to Lt. (jg) Thomas J. Hudner, Jr., United States Navy, for his bravery in attempting to rescue a fellow naval aviator whose plane had crashed in enemy territory in North Korea.

Lieutenant Hudner is a citizen of Fall River, Mass., and it therefore affords me particular pleasure in asking unanimous consent that the official text of his citation for the Medal of Honor be printed on the first page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I know that Members of the Senate will experience great pride in reading this citation. Lieutenant Hudner's action was indeed a magnificent act of courage and bravery which inspires all who know about it. Heroism such as his is the rock on which our Nation's existence rests. Unselfishness such as his symbolizes all that is finest and best in human nature.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to: Lt. (jg) Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr., United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as a pilot in Fighter Squadron 32, attached to the U. S. S. *Leyte*, while attempting to rescue a squadron mate whose plane, struck down by antiaircraft fire and trailing smoke, was forced down behind enemy lines in the Chosin Reservoir Area of Korea on December 4, 1950. Quickly maneuvering to circle the downed pilot and protect him from enemy troops infesting the area, Lieutenant (jg) Hudner risked his life to save the injured flier who was trapped alive in the burning wreckage. Fully aware of the extreme danger in landing on the rough mountainous terrain, and the scant hope of escape or survival in subzero temperature, he put his plane down skillfully in a deliberate wheels-up landing in the presence of enemy troops. With his bare hands, he packed the fuselage with snow to keep the flames away from the pilot and struggled to pull him free. Unsuccessful in this, he returned to his crashed aircraft and radioed other airborne planes, requesting that a helicopter be dispatched with an ax and fire extinguisher. He then remained on the spot despite the continuing danger from enemy action and, with the assistance of the rescue pilot, renewed a desperate but unavailing battle against time, cold, and flames. Lieutenant (jg) Hudner's exceptionally valiant and selfless devotion to a shipmate sustain and enhance the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendment and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

*Resolved*, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utiliza-

tion of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act.'"

"(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen or national of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided,* That any such person who has not attained the age of 18 years and 6 months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months: *Provided further,* That the provisions of this subsection shall be held to be applicable to any alien admitted for a temporary period (other than an alien exempt from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) who has remained in the United States for a period in excess of 1 year; any alien admitted for a temporary period who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States.'

"(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is hereby amended to read: 'The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereafter provided (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act.'

"(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: 'No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided,* That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945.'

"(e) No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.

"(f) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, following his induction, be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than 4 months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this 4 months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone): *Provided,* That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining any person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title in violation of the provisions of this paragraph.'

"(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: '(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of 26 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title.'

"(h) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided,* That notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"'(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided,* That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further,* That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further,* That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"'(3) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"'(4) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of 18, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.

"'(5) Any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardians be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"'(6) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.'

"(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of 6 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air Nation Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force.'

"(j) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

"(k) Paragraph (1) of subsection (l) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking

out the word 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'twenty-six.'

"(l) Said paragraph is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence, as follows: 'No physician or dentist who is engaged in full-time employment as such at any hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection while so engaged after he has attained the thirtieth anniversary of the date of his birth.'

"(m) Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection, as follows:

"'(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"'(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"'(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 26 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"'(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated, the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under section 4 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of 6 months: *Provided,* That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of 19 years during the period of such deferment.

"'(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, of which not more than three shall be members of the same political party, and three of whom shall be civilians; of the remaining two members one shall be an active or retired member of a Regular component of the Armed Forces, the other shall be a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a Reserve component. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

"'((4) The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be 2 years. The term of office of the remaining three members of the Commission shall be for 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member, shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. Members of the Commission, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"'(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. Subject to the direction of the President, and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies, standards, and directives of the Commission.

"'(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"'(7) The Commission shall, not later than 6 months following its appointment and confirmation, submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to—

"'(i) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which program shall include (A) the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps, and (B) measures for utilizing the existing plants and facilities of schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable in providing initial military training (along with academic training where appropriate) for members of the National Security Training Corps;

"'(ii) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

"'(iii) a code of conduct together with penalties for violation thereof;

"'(iv) such other policies and standards as may be established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and

"'(v) recommendations with respect to disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

"'(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

"'(1) the legislative recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law: *Provided,* That such recommendations shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services, and both committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to their respective Houses: *Provided further,* That any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged and may be called up by any Member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged; and

"'(2) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"'(9) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding 6 months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding 6 months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

"'(10) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: *Provided, however,* That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E-1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"'(11) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.'

"(n) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: ': *And provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President: *And provided further,* That until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"'(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19 unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of 19 to enable

such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"'(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of 19, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as 90 days older, (ii) has not attained the age of 19, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction.'

"(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out 'the effective date of this title,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 1, 1951.'

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words '6 months' a comma and the words 'prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction.'

"(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after 'subsection (b)' a comma and the following: 'paragraph (1) of this subsection.'

"(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted.'

"(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed 1 year.

"'(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"'(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.'

"(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided,* That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further,* That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) or any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by any agency or department of the Federal Government.'

"(s) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"'(2) Any person who hile satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided,* That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of sections 6 (1) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.'

"(t) Section 7 of said act is hereby repealed.

"(u) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not for than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"'(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"'(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within 30 days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated.'

"(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words 'or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board.'

"(x) Section 10 of said act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: 'There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President'; and

"(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"'(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this act; and the number of deferments granted under this act and the basis for such deferments.'

"(y) Section 17 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"'(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than 6 months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist.'

"(z) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by sriking out 'July 9, 1951,' inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953,' and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: 'Any member of the inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for a period of 90 days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of twelve or more months of acvtive duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

"'The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from active duty (1) of members of the inactive and volunteer reserves whose occupation, employment, or other activity is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, and (2) of members of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves whose deferment is advisable by reason of the fact that other persons are dependent upon them for support. To the maximum extent practicable deferments of such members shall be on the same basis as deferments under section 6 (h) of this title.

"'The President is authorized to create and establish in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, one or more civilian Reserve deferment appeal boards (not within the Selective Service System). Each such board shall consist of five citizens of the United States who are not members of the Armed Forces, and who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such boards shall function in the same manner and have the same powers, and the members of such board shall receive the same compensation, as in the case of appeal boards within the Selective Service System.

"'Any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve may, if his claim for deferment is denied at the time he is ordered into the active military or naval service of the United States pursuant to the first paragraph of this section, appeal to the civilian Reserve deferment appeal board for the area within which he resides, and such board shall hear and determine his claim for deferment in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the second paragraph of this section. The decisions of such boards shall be final, except that any such decisions adverse to the appellant reservist shall be subject to modification or change by the highest reviewing body of the service concerned having authority to hear and determine questions or claims with respect to the deferment from active duty of members of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserve components of such service.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 2[illegible], 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the 81st Cong., 2d sess.) is hereby amended by striking out the words 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'July 1, 1952' and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: 'No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act.'

"(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953.'

"SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act, except members of the Reserve components.

"SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 26, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.'

"SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the regulations authorized hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

"SEC. 7. This title may be cited as the '1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.'"

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House; agree to the request by the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Subsequently, on motion of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Senate bill 1, the universal military training bill, was ordered to be printed with the amendment of the House of Representatives numbered.

## MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon, during the session of the Senate.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Inasmuch as the Senate meets following an adjournment, automatically morning business will be transacted, unless it is waived.

## JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO HEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR—ORDER FOR RECESS ON THURSDAY

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that by unanimous consent request of Representative MCCORMACK the House yesterday took action whereby the House agreed to recess on Thursday next, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving the General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur in a joint meeting of the House and Senate. Senate Concurrent Resolution 24 submitted by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would automatically come up after the completion of the morning business. I should not want to make a similar request unless it was agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I have always cooperated with him, as he knows. When he submitted the resolution he had not told me that he would submit it or ask me to join with him. I have at all times wanted to cooperate with him and to proceed in a manner in which he desires to proceed. I should like to know what his pleasure is in this regard.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the majority leader whether he cares to take up the subject at this time?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I thought we might as well take it up now. I may be called off the floor later in the day.

Mr. WHERRY. It is perfectly agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution would come before the Senate automatically at the end of the morning hour. By unanimous consent it may be taken up at this time. The Secretary will read the resolution.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, submitted by Mr. WHERRY on April 11, as modified, was read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That General of the Army Douglas MacArthur be hereby invited to present his views and recommendations for policies and courses in Korea and Asia generally to a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. This invitation shall be extended forthwith to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in a jointly signed communication, and that the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives make the arrangements necessary for the convening of such a joint meeting to be held at the convenience of General of the Army MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the current resolution. However, I desire to say for the RECORD, in the presence of the distinguished majority leader, that I appreciate very much his cooperation in expediting the handling of the resolution. Inasmuch as the House has taken action by way of an invitation to the Senate, I think it would be proper to comply with the invitation of the House. In fact, the action taken by the House of Representatives, contemplating a joint meeting of the two Houses to receive Gen. Douglas MacArthur follows the established custom. The junior Senator from Nebraska suggests that the majority leader of the Senate ask unanimous consent for the Senate to join the House of Representatives in receiving Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Under such procedure, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate would extend an invitation to General MacArthur to appear before the joint meeting of Congress. If the procedure is agreeable to the majority leader, the minority leader will ask unanimous consent that the Senate Concurrent Resolution 24 be postponed indefinitely, since its purpose would be fully accomplished by the action of the House of Representatives and by the unanimous-consent request of the majority leader of the Senate. If it is agreeable to the majority leader to proceed under a unanimous-consent agreement to accept the invitation of the House, I have no objection. I thank him for his cooperation in accomplishing the very purpose of my resolution.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I am very happy, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, to make the unanimous-consent request. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on next Thursday, it recess and proceed to a joint meeting with the House, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at the invitation of the House of Representatives, in order to hear General MacArthur; and that the Senate reconvene at the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I may be called from the floor during the day, and I should like to have one other matter disposed of.

Mr. WHERRY. May I say a word about the resolution?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish again to say that I deeply appreciate the majority leader's fine spirit of cooperation in accomplishing the purposes of the resolution. I am wondering whether the majority leader knows for a certainty the exact time which has been set for the reception to General MacArthur. I understood from the Speaker of the House that the time would be stated in the invitation, and that the hour had been fixed for 12:30 p. m. I am wondering whether it is correct. Such an announcement would serve a very good purpose at this time because I know several Senators are very much interested in it.

Mr. MCFARLAND. The only information I have on the subject is what I have read in newspapers. I would not want to say that the newspaper accounts are accurate in that respect. I shall be glad to announce the specific information when it is available.

## DROPPING THE PILOT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Dropping the Pilot" published in the Omaha World-Herald of April 12, 1951. It is an excellent editorial, and I hope all Senators will read it. It is written by the distinguished editorial writer, Mr. Harvey Newbranch, who wrote the editorial entitled "God Hates a Coward." He is one of the outstanding editors of the United States. The subject of the editorial is in line with the resolution and our discussion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### DROPPING THE PILOT

This is a sad and infinitely disturbing day for Americans with red blood in their veins, intensely worried over the national security.

President Truman brought the day upon them—and upon himself.

And an overwhelming wave of popular anger and disgust sweeps the land from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Distressing and alarming though it may be, Americans today are not in harmony with their own Government in its half-way and faint-hearted war effort.

When the President decided we were not really at war with China, that our quarter-million soldiers in the Asian sector must not use every recourse to defeat Chinese and Korean Communist aggressors, that they must fight and die without a definite objective, he made his first fatal mistake.

When he ordered the commander in Asia, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, to keep his mouth shut except in support of that "idiotic" policy—we quote Senator TAFT—he made the culminating mistake. It is the old story of blunder piled on top of blunder.

MacArthur is not that kind of a soldier. He is not that kind of a man, that kind of an American. He knows how serious is the situation in the Orient, the danger of its Communist control, and the menace that would bring to the heart of both the United

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 22, 1951
For actions of May 21, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 90

CONTENTS

Agriculture appropriations.....4,16
Appropriations....1,4,12,16
Buildings and grounds.....1
C.C.C.....1
Civil defense.....1
Claims.....1,26
Committees.....6
Defense production.....1
Education.....1,11
Electrification.....5,22
Employment.....1
Expenditures.....23
Foreign affairs, aid.1,14,21
Forests and forestry.....1
Grain.....21
Health.....19
Information.....1
Insect control.....1
Labor, farm.....19
Lands.....8
Law, revision.....9
Livestock and meat.....13,18
Loans.....26
Military training.....7
Personnel.....1,20
Prices, control.....18
Public works.....10
Small business.....24
Soil conservation.....17
Strategic materials.....1
Taxation.....11,15
Territories and possessions.....3
Trade, foreign.....1,2,25
Transportation.....5,22
TVA.....5

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. Senate debated trade-agreements bill.

## SENATE

1. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3587, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement (pp. 5636-43, 5652-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.

As finally passed, the bill includes the following provisions: Forest development roads and trails, $3,300,000; CCC administrative-expense limitation, increase of $2,750,000; expenses of defense production, $27,331,895, with a provision that "transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporation as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realine its regular programs"; Tongass forest highways, Alaska, $3,500,000; international information and educational activities, State Department, $9,533,939; surveys and school construction in critical defense areas, $50,000,000; Bureau of Employees' Compensation fund, $3,000,000; reactivation of industrial plants for strategic and critical materials, provision to make available $12,000,000 additional; provision that GSA appropriations for 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and improvements to public buildings under GSA control; engineering and economic investigations for Niagara River remedial works, $450,000, to be transferred from Army flood-control funds; international children's welfare work under the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, $5,750,000; Federal Civil Defense Administration, various items; provision (modified) to prohibit assistance to countries which ship military commodities in contravention of U. S. Security Council policy; various judgments and claims items; and the general provision prohibiting employment of members of organizations which assert the right of Federal employees to strike against the Government. (The forest-pest item of $345,000 was eliminated by the conferees.)

2. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Began debate on H. R. 1612, to continue the period during which the President may enter into reciprocal trade agreements (pp. 5617, 5619-36).

3. STATEHOOD. Sen. Butler, Nebr. (for himself and others), submitted minority views on S. 49, to provide for Hawaii statehood, and S. 50, to provide for Alaska statehood (pp. 5616-7).

4. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, H. R. 3973, was referred to the Appropriations Committee (p. 5617).

5. TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY; ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Humphrey commended the TVA record and recommended approval of the St. Lawrence project (pp. 5647-9).

6. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Sen. Robertson was transferred from the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee to the Appropriations Committee; Sen. Moody was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee and the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee; Sen. Bennett was taken from the Banking and Currency Committee; and Sen. McCarthy was taken from the Appropriations Committee (pp. 5615-6).

## HOUSE

7. MILITARY TRAINING. Conferees on S. 1, the military-training, selective-service bill, reached agreement on some of the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill as follows: Set the ceiling for our total armed forces at 5 million; agreed that the age for selective-service registration shall be 18, and before a registrant reaches 18½ he shall be classified and can be inducted for training at any time after 18½, provided all persons eligible in each draft board above 19 shall have been called before calling those below 19; fixed July 1, 1955 as the cut-off date for selective service; accepted the House amendments on physical standards and mental tests; agreed to allow local boards to defer conscientious objectors if engaged in defense work; and agreed to suspend until July 1, 1954, the present limitation on enlistment of women in the armed services. (p. D426.)

8. LANDS. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 35, to authorize USDA to transfer a tract of land originally acquired by the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corp. to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for livestock and agricultural expositions (p. 5660). This measure will now be sent to the President.

Passed as reported H. R. 1632, to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases (pp. 5659-60).

Passed as reported S. 108, to amend the Enabling Act for Arizona relating to the terms of leases for State-owned lands, so as to permit the State to allow oil and gas leases to run after the primary term of not more than 20 years; reserve a royalty to the State from such leases; and extend the exemption from restrictions applying to agricultural and grazing lands to include commercial and home site leases (p. 5658).

9. LAW REVISION. Passed as reported H. R. 3899, to make various changes in certain titles of the U. S. Code (pp. 5663-70). The committee report states that "the principal purpose of the bill is to make a few improvements of a minor character in certain titles of the United States Code, which titles have been previously enacted into law, in the interest of clarity, uniformity, and accuracy, and to incorporate in some of these titles, where they properly belong, the provisions of separate legislation and of Reorganization Plans which affect such titles."

reenacting the act in order to carry out the Nation's mobilization program.

## CONSUMERS' PRICE INDEX

*Committee on Education and Labor:* Steed subcommittee resumed hearings in connection with its investigation of the Consumers' Price Index, as prepared by the U. S. Department of Labor. George W. Taylor, Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, testified today, along with George D. Riley, national legislative representative, AFL. Subcommittee recessed until Thursday morning.

At a hearing on the same subject last Friday morning the group heard testimony from Isador Lubin, U. S. representative to the Economic and Social Council; Solomon Barkin, research director, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, who continued his statement which was left unfinished at Wednesday's session; Russ Nixon, Washington representative, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union of America; and Albert Pezzati, of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

## OKANOGAN PROJECT, WASHINGTON

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:* Approved a resolution concerning expenditure of rehabilitation and betterment funds on the Okanogan irrigation district, Okanogan project, State of Washington.

## WATER RESOURCES

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:* Engle Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation resumed discussion of the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, meeting with Melvin Scheidt, engineer economist, and Floyd Peterson, Chief of the Civil Works Branch, both of the Bureau of the Budget. These witnesses had met with the subcommittee on the same subject last Friday. Recessed until tomorrow morning.

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Resumed public hearings for consideration of H. R. 3669 and 3755, and 30 other bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937. Dorrance C. Bronson, actuary, Brotherhood of Railway Engineers, testified today, followed by Clifford D. O'Brien, counsel of the same organization, who did not finish his testimony today, and will resume at tomorrow morning's session.

At Friday's meeting on the same legislation, the committee heard the views of Representative Smith of Virginia and Shafer, both of whom have introduced bills on this subject. Lester P. Schoene, counsel, Railway Labor Executives Association, Washington, D. C., concluded his statement of May 17, and J. P. Shields, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Cleveland, Ohio, also testified.

## IMMIGRATION

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Walter Subcommittee No. 1 approved for reporting to the full committee 10 private immigration bills of the House, and reported adversely on 2 others. Also approved S. Con. Res. 26, relating to suspension of certain deportation proceedings.

## MOBILIZATION PROGRAM

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Celler Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power opened hearings to consider various aspects of the mobilization program and had as its witnesses Col. William G. Knight, Chief, Motive Power Unit, Transportation and Equipment Division, NPA; and E. R. Wisner and James P. Morrison, of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. Recessed until Wednesday.

## COMMUNISM

*Committee on Un-American Activities:* At last Friday's hearings regarding the investigation of communistic activities in Hollywood's movie industry, the committee again heard Roy Brewer, international representative of the International Association of Theatrical and Stage Employees, AFL, who testified regarding the generally unsuccessful attempts by Communist groups to take over the unions in Hollywood's film industry. Committee adjourned until tomorrow (Tuesday) when it will hear José Ferrer, 1950 academy award winner, in an executive meeting.

## REVENUE REVISION

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Announced the following tentative actions after further consideration of the 1951 tax bill:

1. *War losses.*—Deferred without prejudice action on a proposal to include in income the fair market value of property, for which a war loss deduction has been claimed, but which has been recovered, only to the extent of the tax deduction which the taxpayer has taken for the war loss in previous years, with respect to the particular property.

2. *Foreign branches of domestic corporations.*—Deferred without prejudice action on a proposal to defer tax on the earnings of such branches until they are returned to the United States.

3. *Taxation of Federal civilian and military personnel in possessions.*—Decided to consider in a separate bill a provision to amend the Revenue Act of 1950, so as to make the income tax applicable to these employees for taxable years after December 31, 1950, instead of December 31, 1949.

4. *Coin-operated amusement devices.*—Rejected a proposal to exempt from excise tax penny-operated amusement devices.

5. *Educational organizations.*—Decided to exempt from tax for years prior to 1951 income derived by an educational organization from feeder corporations where the educational organization normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of pupils or students in attendance at a place where its activities are regularly carried on.

6. *Effective date for increase in individual income tax.*—September 1, 1951.

7. *Effective date for increase in corporation tax.*—January 1, 1951.

8. *Photographic equipment and apparatus.*—Revised the base of this tax to exclude all apparatus and equipment, except cameras and camera lenses commonly used by amateurs, and to exclude film of types likely to be used for business purposes. (This decision exempts from tax "business cost" items, and was contained in the revenue bill of 1950 as it was passed by the House.)

Adjourned until tomorrow morning.

## *Joint Committee Meetings*

### UMT

*Conferees* on S. 1, the universal military training and service bill, met again in executive session on Friday, May 18, to continue to work out the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill. The following agreements were reached: 5 million to be the ceiling for our total armed forces; that the age for date of registration shall be 18, and before a registrant reaches 18½ he shall be classified and can be inducted for training at any time after 18½ subject to provisions of the bill, provided all persons eligible in each draft board above 19 shall have been called before calling those below 19; that 18 shall be the age for UMT purposes (but no further agreement on UMT provisions was reached); that inductees, enlistees, or reservists must have at least 4 months' training before they can be sent to a permanent land installation outside of continental U. S.; and that July 1, 1955, shall be cut-off date for selective service; the Senate conferees accepted the House amendments on physical standards for inductees, accepting a reduction in mental tests of 10 points, which is equivalent to 65 on GC tests; in the case of conscientious objectors, it was agreed to allow the local boards to defer such persons if they were engaged in civilian work which contributes to the national defense; and House conferees accepted the Senate amendment to suspend until July 1, 1954, the present limitation on enlistment of women in the armed services. Conferees adjourned subject to call.

### THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

*Conferees* on Friday, May 18, in executive session, reached agreement to file conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of H. R. 3587, third supplemental appropriations for 1951. As approved, it would appropriate $364,932,477, which is $66,195,000 under Senate-passed version, $108,232,891 under House-passed version, and $531,183,816 under budget estimates.

## BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

### New Laws

(*For last listing of Public Laws, see Digest, p. D396*)

S. 998, to facilitate the financing of defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions and to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940. Signed May 15, 1951 (P. L. 30).

H. R. 3291, to amend section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act regarding referees' continuance of service until his successor is appointed. Signed May 16, 1951 (P. L. 31).

H. R. 3292, to amend section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act regarding place of holding first meeting of creditors. Signed May 16, 1951 (P. L. 32).

H. J. Res. 197, to provide for the continuation of authority for regulation of exports. Signed May 16, 1951 (P. L. 33).

H. R. 2654, extending time for filing refund of additional estate tax of veterans who died during World War II. Signed May 17, 1951 (P. L. 34).

H. R. 3196, to amend section 153b of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special returns required from trusts claiming charitable, etc., deductions under section 162a of such code). Signed May 17, 1951 (P. L. 35).

H. R. 321, use of dividends to pay premiums on national service life insurance. Signed May 18, 1951 (P. L. 36).

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 22

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

### Senate

*Committee on Appropriations,* subcommittee, on H. R. 3880, independent offices, executive, 2 p. m., room F–82, Capitol; full committee, executive, on H. R. 3842, fourth supplemental appropriations, 10:30 a. m., room F–37, Capitol; Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, executive, on Southeastern Power Administration, 2 p. m., room F–39, Capitol.

*Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations,* executive, on Far East situation, with General Bradley, 10 a. m., 212 Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Banking and Currency,* on S. 1397, to amend Defense Production Act, 10:30 a. m., 301 Senate Office Building; hearings on RFC legislation, 10 a. m., 312 Senate Office Building.

*Committee on the Judiciary,* subcommittee, on H. R. 745, private bill, 10:30 a. m., 424 Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,* Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, to hear Eric Johnston on wage stabilization in defense mobilization, 10:30 a. m., old Supreme Court chamber, Capitol.

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,* executive, on calendar, 10:30 a. m., 135 Senate Office Building.

### House

*Committee on Agriculture,* on H. J. Res. 60, to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States, executive, 10 a. m., 1310 New House Office Building.

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued June 1, 1951
For actions of May 31, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 96

CONTENTS

Adjourned.....14
Administrative procedure.16
Alcohol.....20
Animal industry.....8,11
Appropriations.....3,27
Defense production.....4,10
Education.....29
Emergency controls....12,28
Fats and oils.....15
Foreign affairs, aid.....25
Import control.....15
Inflation.....26
Labor, farm.....9,22
Lands.....23
reclamation.....2
Legal procedures.....19
Livestock and meat.8,11,21
Military training.....1
Organization, executive..5
Personnel.....17,27
Prices, control.....8,21
support.....7
Rice.....15
Selective service.....1
Taxation.....13,30
Trade, foreign.....6,15
Transportation.....18
Water utilization.....24

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses received conference report on military-training and selective service bill. Senate debated Arizona reclamation project. House received conference report on trade-agreements bill. Rep. Keating criticized cost of price supports and inserted Under Secretary McCormick's letter. Rep. Rogers criticized beef-price order. Rep. Andresen introduced bill to continue import controls on fats, oils, and rice.

## SENATE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Both Houses received the conference report on S. 1, the military training and selective service bill (pp. 6129, 6153-61). The report was discussed in the Senate, but action was postponed until today (pp.6129-51).

The revised bill includes provisions as follows: Reduces the draft age from 19 years to 18½ years, but provides that no person shall be inducted below age 19 so long as eligible persons between 19 and 25 are available to a particular local board. Extends the authority to induct men into the armed forces for 4 years, until July 1, 1955. Provides for deferment of high school students until they graduate or become 20. Permits college students to be deferred until they complete their academic year. Authorizes the President to provide for deferment of persons whose activity in study, research, veterinary, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. Provides for a National Security Training Commission to exercise general supervision over a National Security Training Corps for basic military training; requires the Commission, within 4 months, to submit legislative recommendations including a broad outline of such training; prohibits inductions for the Corps until Congress has considered these recommendations; and provides for training of inductees for 6 months.

2. RECLAMATION. Continued debate on S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project (pp. 6116-29).

3. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Sen. Johnston submitted amendments which he intends to propose to this bill, H. R. 3973, but the nature of the proposals was not indicated (p. 6114).

4. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Sen. Maybank recommended several amendments to S. 1397, the defense production bill, to modify the authority for tax-amortization certificates in several respects (p. 6115).

5. REORGANIZATION. The Reorganization Subcommittee of the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee discussed S. 1134, regarding management in the executive branch; S. 1136, to delegate various D. C. matters to GSA; S. 1146, to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; and S. 1147, to transfer the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the State Department. The "Daily Digest" states: "With a view to reporting the above bills, without the necessity of holding hearings, several amendments were suggested to the bills, which will be taken up for discussion by the subcommittee at a later date." (p. D458.)

HOUSE

6. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Received the conference report on H. R. 1612, to continue but modify the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements (pp. 6152-3, 6174) (H. Rept. 537).

7. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Keating inserted and discussed his letter to the Department requesting information on the price-support program and Under Secretary McCormick's reply. Rep. Keating criticized the cost of the price-support program and the "inadequacy of information" available in the Department as to how many farmers and producers actually received payments from the Government under the program.(pp. 6162-3.)

8. LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY. Rep. Rogers, Tex., discussed the operation of the cattle industry, criticized the beef-price order, and claimed the only answer to inflation is production (pp. 6169-72).

9. FARM LABOR. Rep. Jones, Mo., and Rep. Johnson, Calif., spoke in favor of the importation of farm workers from Mexico (pp. 6161-2, 6164).

10. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Rep. Phillips, Calif., spoke in favor of a short extension of the present Defense Production Act and said new legislation should provide curbs on credit expansion and a simplified system of allocations to channel raw materials into war production as required (pp. 6163-4).

11. ANIMAL DISEASES. Received from this Department a proposed bill to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; to Agriculture Committee (p. 6174).

12. EMERGENCY CONTROLS. Rep. Gossett, Tex., critictized Price Director DiSalle's proposal to license all businesses (p. 6161).

13. TAXATION. Rep. Patman, Tex., inserted a Library of Congress statement discussing the proposed amendment to the Constitution to limit taxes under Federal laws to 25 percent on incomes, gifts, and inheritances (pp. 6164-9).

14. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 4 (p. 6174). Rep. Mansfield, Mont., announced the program for next week as follows: Mon., Consent Calendar; Tues., Private Calendar; Wed., D. C. appropriation bill; and Thurs., conference report on selective-service and military training bill (p. 6162).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. IMPORT CONTROLS. H. R. 4297, by Rep. Andresen, Minn., to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exer-

The project report, which is based on prices as of July 1, 1947, shows the total cost of the project, after eliminating Bluff Dam, to be $708,780,000 (H. Doc. No. 136, p. 200). The Bureau's present estimate of total cost, based on January 1, 1951, prices is $788,265,000, showing an increase of 11 percent. (Table I, statement of Bureau Engineer Coe before House committee March 1, 1951.)

The project report, after eliminating the item for Bluff Dam, shows annual operation and maintenance costs as $4,610,000 (H. Doc. 136, p. 209). The present estimate of the same cost is exactly the same figure, $4,610,000 (table II, Coe statement).

The error is plain. It is common knowledge that costs of labor and material used in operation and maintenance of such projects has substantially increased since July 1, 1947. Data recently submitted to the House committee show that on large water and power operations of a character similar in many respects to the central Arizona project, such as those of Imperial irrigation district, metropolitan water district and the water and power departments of city of Los Angeles, labor and material costs for operation and maintenance have increased since July 1, 1947, at various rates running from 17½ to 25 percent.

Assuming that the proper rate for the central Arizona project should be only 15 percent of the Bureau's estimated $4,610,000 a year, the Bureau has underestimated operation and maintenance costs by $691,500 a year, or $51,862,500 in 75 years. The project revenues will fail to pay out in 75 years by that amount. By the same token, irrigation revenues will fail to cover irrigation operation, maintenance and replacement reserve by $330,200 a year, or over 10 percent.

Three major errors have been shown in the Bureau's estimates. The project costs will not be liquidated from project revenues in 75 years by the following amounts:

(a) Error in Bridge Canyon power production, $91,138,875.

(b) Error in water deliveries and payments for water, $53,000,000.

(c) Error in operation and maintenance costs, $51,862,500. Someone other than the irrigators must help pay, annually, irrigation operation, maintenance and replacement reserve.

Total errors: $196,001,375.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say in conclusion that this is not a controversy between California and Arizona in connection with which there is any unfriendliness; at least, there is no unfriendliness on our part. This is a conflict between three of the lower-basin States; at least, the bulk of their area lies entirely within the lower basin. They are the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California. Two of those States—Nevada and California—see eye to eye on the situation. The State of Arizona has a different point of view. I am not quarreling because of the fact that Arizona has a different point of view. I would expect Arizona to hold out for its rights if it honestly believed it had such rights, and I attribute to Arizona that honest difference of opinion. On the other side of the controversy, the States of Nevada and California should at least be accorded the same recognition of having an honest difference of opinion.

This is a very basic matter; it is one which deeply concerns the people of all three of these States. Nevada and California have tried to negotiate this matter, but the State of Arizona has refused. Nevada and California have offered to arbitrate, but the State of Arizona has refused.

When there is a difference of opinion and a difference between sovereign States of the Union, the only way by which the matter can be settled is to have it passed upon by a court of competent jurisdiction, which in this case is the Supreme Court of the United States.

Since 1947, to my own personal knowledge since I have been a Member of the Senate, we have offered several resolutions which would have brought this matter before the Supreme Court. We were willing to agree to a time limitation in that connection, namely, that we would do so within 6 months. Had Arizona not obstructed those resolutions, which were presented by California and Nevada, we would by this time have had either (a) an adjudication of this great question before the Supreme Court of the United States, or (b) a definite determination that it was not a justiciable issue unless certain things were done. I submit that by now we would be far along with this matter if it had not been for the stand taken by the State of Arizona on this point.

Mr. President, we respect Arizona and her needs. I have been in Arizona, and I admire her people. I recognize that Arizona has a tremendous problem, as to all the other Western States, for water is their lifeblood.

Mr. President, in the 6 years that I have been in the Senate I have tried to approach all questions on a constructive basis. I say to my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, that I would be much happier if on the floor of the Senate today I could be supporting the efforts of Arizona and could be helping her get the things she needs, as I have supported time and time again, in the Appropriations Committee, the needs of Arizona and the needs of other States of the Union. However, I cannot do so on the basis of the pending bill, because, I say again—and the RECORD amply demonstrates it—this is not a sound or an economic project, and in connection with this project it is proposed to take water which is in dispute between three sovereign States of this Union.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California are rather amusing to me, for he has stated that Arizona has attempted to block something, whereas, as a matter of fact, we have tried three times to have this question settled in court. I wish the people of California had been as earnest in attempting to have it settled as the Senator from California has suggested they have been.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Byrd | Douglas |
| Bennett | Cain | Duff |
| Benton | Case | Dworshak |
| Brewster | Chavez | Ellender |
| Bricker | Clements | Ferguson |
| Bridges | Connally | Frear |
| Butler, Md. | Cordon | Fulbright |
| Butler, Nebr. | Dirksen | George |
| Gillette | Kilgore | O'Mahoney |
| Green | Knowland | Pastore |
| Hayden | Lehman | Robertson |
| Hendrickson | Lodge | Russell |
| Hennings | Magnuson | Saltonstall |
| Hickenlooper | Malone | Schoeppel |
| Hill | Maybank | Smith, N. J. |
| Holland | McCarran | Smith, N. C. |
| Humphrey | McCarthy | Sparkman |
| Hunt | McFarland | Stennis |
| Ives | McKellar | Taft |
| Jenner | McMahon | Tobey |
| Johnson, Colo. | Millikin | Watkins |
| Johnson, Tex. | Moody | Welker |
| Johnston, S. C. | Morse | Wherry |
| Kefauver | Mundt | Wiley |
| Kem | Nixon | Young |
| Kerr | O'Conor | |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, beginning June 6.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk the report of the conference committee on Senate bill 1, the military manpower bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the report.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 6153–6161.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have in my hand what I am told is the only copy of the report which is available on the minority side. Looking at it very quickly, I see that it contains 15 pages of italics which purportedly constitute the new manpower draft bill or universal military training bill.

In the introduction which the clerk has read, there is no statement which

permits of a comparison between the bill which was passed by the House and that which was passed by the Senate. I recognize the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the members of that committee can, undoubtedly, answer questions which any Member of the Senate might be disposed to ask this afternoon with reference to the report, but I do not know how any Member of the Senate can intelligently ask questions as to the contents of the report or the changes which have been made in the version passed by either the House or the Senate, without having some opportunity to see it in print or to have a specific comparison between the provisions of the bill as passed and the report which is here presented in the nature of a substitute.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am very reluctant to agree that the report may be taken up at this time.

I recognize that a new Member of the Senate raising an objection at this time and under these circumstances is not regarded as conforming to the customary procedure, but I submit, Mr. President, that the report deals with a bill which purports to establish the standards for the extension of the Selective Service Act and another bill to establish some sort of a program of universal military training. The latter is a measure which is a great departure from past history and past traditions, and it seems to me that the Members of the Senate, if they want to justify the reputation of the Senate as being the last stronghold of democracy and as being a great deliberative body, should have an opportunity to see the report in print and to know what it involves.

Therefore, Mr. President, unless some persuasive reason can be given for proceeding with the report at this time, and not waiting until tomorrow, when printed copies of the report will be available, I shall feel constrained to object.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can well understand how the distinguished Senator from South Dakota feels. I have always endeavored to uphold the deliberative characteristics of this body. In my opinion, that is one of the distinguishing marks of the Senate which sets it apart from any other parliamentary body in the world of which I have any knowledge.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that there is no rule of the Senate which requires that any report be made as to the comparable language of various bills. The House of Representatives has such a rule, but the Senate does not, and I have never seen in the Senate any conference report which endeavored to do that. The conference report does not contain any feature which was not in either the House or the Senate bill, but it does represent a compromise.

If the Senator from South Dakota desires to insist on his objection, I shall not move the consideration of the report. The Senator knows, of course, that in the Senate a motion to proceed to the consideration of a conference report is not debatable. I would not have one Member of this body denied the privilege of insisting upon his right to see a printed copy of the report. If the Senator desires that consideration of the report go over until tomorrow, I shall certainly be happy to agree to that.

I should like to say to the Senator that the reason why there are no printed copies of the report available is that yesterday was a holiday, and the Government Printing Office was not in operation last evening as it is on every other week night when there is no holiday.

I have been rather occupied with some other matters in the past few days. I have felt like a juggler who stands on a one-wheeled bicycle with a ball in one hand, a hoop in the other hand, and another hoop on his foot. I have not been able to keep up with all the details, and I did not know until today that copies of the report were not available. I do not think the report does violence to any provision of the Senate bill, although the Senate conferees were compelled to yield a great deal more of the provisions of the Senate bill than the Senator from Georgia liked to surrender.

If the Senator objects, I shall not move to proceed to the consideration of the report at this time, but will let it go over until tomorrow, and ask the distinguished majority leader to hold a session tomorrow afternoon. I had hoped that we might proceed to the consideration of the report this afternoon, because certain hearings are in progress. I had hoped that we would have all day tomorrow to proceed with the hearings, which have been running along for several weeks, and from all indications, will continue for some time in the future. There are two rather important committees of the Senate which are thus unable to deal with legislative matters, and I was anxious to save every possible minute. But we can let the consideration of the report go over until tomorrow. I should prefer to do that rather than have any Senator feel that he has not had an ample opportunity to see the report in printed form and to read it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have attended some of the hearings presided over by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and he is doing a fine job. His conduct of the hearings reflects credit on him and adds to the reputation of the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. At the same time, however, it has seemed to me that in view of the far-reaching scope of the report, the Senator from Georgia and the Senate itself would be happier if the consideration of the report were to go over until tomorrow. The Senator from South Dakota does not like to put himself in the position of actually objecting. He would much rather have the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services defer consideration of the report in view of what he himself has said, that he did not know until a few moments ago that copies of the report were not available to Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry, but I did not make that statement. I said I did not know until this morning that printed copies were not available. I learned that fact about 8:45 or 9 o'clock this morning. But inasmuch as the report as now presented contains such slight modifications of the bill which the Senate had passed by an overwhelming vote, I did feel that the Senate might be willing to conclude consideration of it today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Georgia for being willing to postpone consideration of the conference report. It is true there is no rule requiring a printed report. It is also true that the Senate itself has adopted a rule, which has not been agreed to by the House of Representatives, requiring the submission of a joint statement by the conferees to accompany a conference report, signed by the managers on the part of the Senate as well as by the managers on the part of the House. The Senate has thus indicated its view, I think, that there should be such a statement submitted before action on a conference report is considered. I understand that the House of Representatives is not going to meet seriously until the 6th or 7th of June any way, so there will be no real delay occasioned by the Senate's postponing consideration of the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not at all persuaded, Mr. President, by the statement of the Senator from Ohio that because the Senate has adopted a rule which has not been considered in the House, we should adopt the policy he has indicated of filing a statement to accompany the report. That is not persuasive to me. But if any Senator wants the report to go over until tomorrow, on the ground that he has not had an opportunity to read the bill as reported by the conferees, that is persuasive. In view of the statement which has been made, I shall be happy to yield the floor, with the report pending, and tomorrow, as soon as I can obtain the floor, I shall proceed to discuss the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I had hoped that the Senator from Georgia would not yield the floor. I can well understand the view of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]; in fact, I am inclined to share that view. I think it would be wise for the Members of the Senate to have before them printed copies before they come to vote on the conference report. I do not think the Senator from South Dakota should have entertained the least bit of hesitancy in raising the point he has raised.

I should like to make a suggestion to my friend from Georgia, but before doing so I wish to say that in my opinion the greatest service rendered in the Senate of the United States at this session has been that of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] in the great leadership they have demonstrated in carrying the military manpower bill through the Senate and through conference.

Mr. President, I happen to be one who believes that this bill deals with the most important question before the country at the present time, and there should

be the earliest and most expeditious consideration of the conference report. I say that as one who did not agree with the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas in regard to various features of the bill. I am very happy to find that in conference they came nearer to agreeing with me than they did on the floor of the Senate. That, however, is beside the point.

What I desired to say was that they have done a great job for the Senate. I think we should take early action on the report. I think it would help the Senate if the Senator from Georgia would take advantage of the opportunity this afternoon, even though we are not going to vote on the conference report, to give the Senate an explanation of it, so that it can be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tonight and be available to the Members of the Senate tomorrow for their study of the bill along with the report before we come to the floor of the Senate. I think it would be very helpful to us if the Senator would proceed at this time to make the explanation of the report he was planning to make so it will be in the RECORD when we come to vote tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have been asked at what time we would take up the conference report tomorrow. Regardless of whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia makes his explanation this afternoon or tomorrow, it is my hope we can take up the conference report immediately after the Senate convenes tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon. I make that announcement now so that Senators will know at what time to be on the floor for the conference report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I wish to say in conclusion that I deeply appreciate the courtesy shown by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I think it reflects credit on him and on the Members of this body.

I may suggest that it might be helpful if unanimous consent were obtained, if it is necessary that such consent be obtained, to have the report appear in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was just prepared to make such a request when I deferred to Senators who asked me to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the report will appear in the RECORD as a matter of course.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I, too, want to join with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in thanking the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for his courtesy and consideration in deferring consideration of the conference report for two reasons: First, the bill as it was originally introduced, as Senate bill 1, by special consideration of Members of the Senate, was never considered by the committee.

A substitute for that bill was considered. The substitute was submitted by Mrs. Rosenberg and General Marshall.

The bill was of an entirely different character from the Russell-Malone Senate bill 1, but the Senate bill No. 1 was attached to it. When the junior Senator from Nevada found that the latter bill had been substituted for the original Russell-Malone Senate bill No. 1, he immediately appeared before the committee and called attention to that situation, and that he disagreed with its provisions.

The universal military training provisions of the Russell-Malone S. 1 were a definite part of the bill and which was joined in by other Senators.

That is now the reason why I consider it very appropriate that consideration of the matter be put over until tomorrow, until all Senators may understand that the universal military training feature has been entirely separated from the bill itself, and that it is no longer a part of the legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my statement before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee.

There being no objections, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator MALONE. Universal military training versus universal military service: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, since the hearings are closing today, that I am disturbed by the change in the principle between the original Russell-Malone bill introduced as S. 1 and the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute. Mr. Chairman, since I was one of the sponsors of the universal military training bill, and since the substitute known as the universal military service bill, that has not even a remote resemblance to the original bill, I am compelled to appear in opposition to it.

Changes trained citizens' reserve to a professional army: The substitute completely changes the principle of the proposed military training from a trained citizens' reserve army under the UMT to a professional army under a universal military service bill.

The Defense Department conscription plan changes a civilian Reserve training policy of 4 to 6 months, or whatever the committee may have finally established, providing for alternate educational programs in colleges, academies, or officer training school, or whatever scientific training might have been chosen or to be selected, to a 27 months' continuous active service followed by 69 months Inactive Reserve duty or a total of 8 years' obligation for the entire service. The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute for the Russell-Malone bill apparently has the blessing of the State Department.

May train army in any nation any place: The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute provides for 27 months' continuous service, and that the President may send them anywhere to any nation outside of the United States for training or fighting at his discretion without consulting Congress further.

Senator JOHNSON. Training in the United States, but service can be anywhere.

Senator MALONE. I understand that nothing in the bill prohibits the President from sending the inducted troops to train or fight anywhere at any time without further approval of Congress.

Destroys civilian training units: Then automatically he enters the Reserve for approximately 6 years, after his 27 months' service. The changes destroy the National Guard and class A Organized Reserve; certainly it would tend to destroy the National Guard. The original bill would have preserved the civilian training units.

No recruits will be available to National Guard and Organized Reserve for 27 months. The civilian components will shrink to almost nothing in that time.

Practically all Reserves except Army Reselves and one-third the National Guard have already been called to duty.

We will have a regular armed force of 3½ millions with no Organized Reserves from June 30, 1952, and thereafter. This big professional army will be too small to scare or fight Russia but it will denude our labor market and our colleges and cost billions we do not have.

The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute professional defense force will contain an estimated 1,400,000 ground troops. These cost $5,000 per year per man.

Present cost of National Guard men and class A Reserves is $601 per year per man.

The trained civilian army method: If all eligibles are inducted for Army training as proposed by the Defense Department bill and on completion of training one-half are chosen by lot or selection board for duty in the National Guard and Organized Reserves, the following results will obtain:

*June 30, 1952*

| | Regular Army infantry | Civilian components |
|---|---|---|
| Number | 1,000,000 | 400,000 |
| Cost | $5,000,000,000 | $240,000,000 |

Saving $1,760,000,000 over cost of 1,400,000 regulars.

Four hundred thousand men would have been sent home to families, jobs, and schools and for duty in the Organized Reserves.

This process can be continued until the Reserve force in being is one, two, or three million, whatever Congress thinks the threat requires.

These men will be stationed all over the United States where they will be immediately available in the event of air-borne raid or atom bombing.

Thus, we can build more long-range defensive strength against communism for less money and we can keep a large proportion of young Americans at home, on the job, and in school.

The people confused. The country is entirely confused about the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute while still retaining S. 1. My recent mail indicates the people believe that the substitute upon which the hearings have been held is the original Russell-Malone American Legion or veterans' bill, which several of us joined in introducing.

This is the third time I have joined in the introduction of the universal military training bill, but I find now the hearings are not being held on the UMT bill that was originally introduced at all. The hearings are being held on the substitute UMS bill which, while retaining the S. 1 designation, changes the entire policy and procedure and character of the Army.

The completely different principle established by the substitute UMS bill can be changed by this committee following the hearings and, of course, they can report the original bill to the Senate floor if they so desire, and I am hopeful that they will do just that.

Senator JOHNSON. The Chair would like to interject that any misapprehension the people have been laboring under is not due to anything the committee did or failed to do. We had 10 days of hearings before we had a hearing on any bill. We had hearings on the general manpower problem. At the end of that 10-day period the Department of Defense finally, at the urging of the chairman

of this committee, brought forth a bill, at which time it was announced on the floor of the Senate, and in the committee, that this bill would be introduced by request. We have taken testimony on that bill, introduced by request, since that time.

It is true that the American Legion and the veterans' organizations have come here and testified on this bill, introduced as an amendment by request, and have embraced it and endorsed it, but we have never left the impression or never intended to or never wanted to convey the information to the country that we were holding hearings on the original S. 1.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you, the chairman, had never had any idea of any misrepresentation; but I will call to the attention of the chairman that the Russell-Malone universal military training bill was introduced on the first day bills were accepted on the Senate floor, and was before this committee from the beginning before any hearings were started, but the Marshall-Rosenberg bill was immediately substituted and no hearings were ever held on the Russell-Malone bill.

Not in accord with the substitute: Mr. Chairman, I considered it important to clarify the matter from my own personal standpoint, and to say that I am not in accord with the bill upon which hearings are now being held.

The committee of course may, if it so desires, revert to the original Russell-Malone universal military training bill, which the veterans of this Nation have supported in principle for 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, since the principle of S. 1, which I joined in introducing, has been changed from a trained citizens' reserve army to a professional army status, and that 18-year-old boys are to be inducted for 27 months' actual service plus 69 months' Reserve status, instead of a 4 to 6 months' training period, and then left at home until actually needed, I felt constrained to appear in opposition to it.

The bill under consideration by the subcommittee is not the Russell-Malone universal military training bill represented in S. 1, but it is the Marshall-Rosenberg bill supported by the State Department.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you a lot, sir.

Senator MALONE. Thank you very much.

Senator JOHNSON. The next witness is Mr. David Whatley, an attorney of Bethesda, Md. The committee will be glad to hear from you. Afterward we expect to go into executive session.

Mr. MALONE. Under the bill approved by the conference report a committee is to be appointed by the President to further consider universal military training at a later date.

So it is entirely different than the Russell-Malone bill introduced in the first instance, which was the legislation sponsored by the veterans' organizations for 25 years; and although certain provisions they favored such as an effective National Guard and Reserve have been put back in the bill in a left-handed way, well, sort of like stuffing rags between the dry staves of a rain barrel, they are not very effective, and could be disregarded.

So, Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in the request which was made for 1 day's delay of the report, and to which the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has agreed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to take a minute to make an observation respecting the point just raised as to whether there is a rule which requires a conference report to be accompanied by a statement to be signed jointly by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate. The Senate adopted a concurrent resolution, providing for such a rule on April 11; I believe that was the date. I took deep interest in that concurrent resolution. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia that it is not an effective rule by reason of the fact that the House has not adopted it. Yet I feel that I should not let this opportunity pass without calling attention to the importance of the House agreeing to the concurrent resolution. I am not speaking of its importance particularly with respect to this particular bill.

An analysis of the conference report was handed me, and I was agreeable to vote on it this afternoon, because, as the report will reveal, I am satisfied now that the bill is a much better bill than it was when it left the Senate. So I am not complaining about the bill itself or about the action of the conferees.

In view of the stellar work done by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], as was pointed out by the Senator from Oregon, I should like to call their attention—and when I refer to the Senators in this manner, I am not needling them, I am telling them the truth—to the fact that they can be helpful in bringing about action on the part of the House on the concurrent resolution. It is a pretty good thing to have the conference reports as they are brought accompanied by statements jointly signed by the conferees on the part of both Houses. I am fully in accord with the point raised by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on that point. When we have conference reports submitted in that manner, especially reports dealing with bills covering such extensive subjects, there can be no doubt what is in minds of the conferees. Then we can use our own interpretation respecting the signed report on the part of the mangers of both the Senate and the House on a bill. The concurrent resolution is a valuable one. I hope the House can be persuaded to adopted it so that we may have a rule in both Houses which will give us the benefit of the interpretation on the part of the managers of both the House and the Senate respecting such important pieces of legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that my friend from Nebraska is slightly contradictory in his two statements. He first stated that we had been so successful in conference that the bill was much more to his liking; and he asked us to use the same persuasive powers which proved ineffective in the conference, in securing the adoption of the concurrent resolution by the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe that the Senator has been defeated. I think he has been successful in securing a worthwhile bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am afraid my friend was a bit sarcastic when he asked us to use the same powers which had been so ineffectual in preserving all of the Senate bill, although I can assure him that the Senate conferees strove valiantly to do so. I am afraid we would not get very far with the concurrent resolution. So I suggest to my friend that he approach someone who has more influence with the House, and in that way bring about adoption of the concurrent resolution which, I may say, incidentally, is very desirable.

Mr. WHERRY. The last statement really counteracts everything the Senator has said. I still wish to let my statement stand. I know the Senator. As a conferee he suits me. I think he could get the resolution adopted in the House if he applied a little heat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement, in writing and signed by at least a majority of the managers on the part of each House, explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee.

SEC. 2. The foregoing section shall be a rule of each House, respectively, and shall supersede any other rule thereof but only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such other rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Oregon and other Senators for the very complimentary remarks which they have made with respect to the efforts of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the subcomimttee which conducted the hearings and wrote the bill, and to me as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to obtain a truly effective military manpower bill. We have striven earnestly in our efforts to obtain such a bill.

In my opinion the Senate bill was the farthest step forward that had ever been taken by either branch of the Congress in the establishment of a dependable, long-range military program for this Nation.

It provided for the needs of the hour in continuing the operation of the Selective Service Act.

It provided for the long-range defense plans of the Nation, through a universal military training program.

The conference agreement on this bill, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, is a significant advance in our long search for a program for a permanent and economical utilization of the manpower of the United States. I believe that this report is basically sound and merits the complete endorsement of both Houses of Congress.

The Senate conferees were not able to sustain all of the more desirable features of the Senate bill. We were com-

pelled to agree to a compromise which omits some features of the bill as it originally passed the Senate on March 9. However, in my judgment the conference agreement which has been reported today retains the major features of the Senate bill without receding on any points which are of vital importance to the operation of a military manpower act.

There were a number of points of difference between the Senate bill and the House amendment by way of a substitute. They proved rather difficult to resolve. We met in conference on a number of occasions. I would not undertake to estimate the number of hours devoted to the conference, but we had complete and full discussion of all the points of disagreement.

I must say in passing that I believe the difficulties in resolving the differences between the two bodies were more apparent than real. Basically the bills sought the same objective, even though we undertook to travel different routes to arrive at that objective.

There were approximately 20 points of difference between the two bills at the outset. Some were very important. Others were relatively trivial. I shall discuss very briefly what we regard as the more important differences.

CONTINUED LIABILITY FOR THOSE DEFERRED

There was an issue on the continued liability for induction of persons who had been deferred from service or training. The provision in the House substitute provided that an individual who had been deferred for occupational reasons should retain his liability for service until he attained the age of 35 years. The Senate bill contained no such provision, but it appeared to us that the House amendment was obviously reasonable in principle, and therefore it was adopted by the conferees.

The House version of the bill contained a provision on the cutting back of the physical and mental standards of acceptability. Under the terms of this item the physical and mental standards of acceptability for persons inducted through selective service would be cut back to the standards which prevailed in 1945. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision, it being the feeling of the Senate conferees that such a cut-back should not be undertaken until all services were meeting their personnel requirements through selective service rather than the present system of selective service for the Army and enlistment in other components. A satisfactory compromise was reached by requiring physical standards to be cut back to the 1945 level. Indeed, that provision has been in effect for some time. We reduced the mental requirements from a classification cut-off score of 70 to the equivalent of 65. The House provision would have reduced it to 60.

With reference to conscientious objectors——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he proceeds to a new topic?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Since the Senator from Georgia has mentioned the physical and mental standards, I am wondering if he can tell us whether the conference agreement does anything to freeze into law the practice or policy announced by the Director of Selective Service, General Hershey, of instituting examinations whereby young men who attain a certain mark may be assured of deferment. Those who have written me on that subject feel that that is an unfortunate step.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that there is a considerable depth of feeling on that subject, as reflected in my own mail. There is nothing in this bill which makes such educational deferments mandatory. In fact, the bill very carefully leaves with the local draft boards the decision as to deferment; and the examinations to which the Senator has referred are in no wise mandatory upon local draft boards.

Mr. CASE. So the report, if adopted and finally enacted into law, will not fasten upon the country the discrimination which many people feel is implicit in saying, "If you pass a special mental test with a score of 70 you can have your service deferred."

Mr. RUSSELL. The test to which I referred has nothing whatever to do with the so-called college examinations to which the Senator refers. I was referring merely to the minimum standard of mental acceptability which applies to those who are drafted, without regard to any deferment for purpose of college attendance.

Mr. CASE. They are the basic minimum mental qualifications?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Does the bill do anything with reference to freezing into practice or law the policy of granting deferments to students?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it does not. I understood the Senator's question was not directed to the provision which I was discussing.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With reference to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, does the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services have any information as to how the local draft boards would administer the proposed provision with reference to the deferment of college students? I have had a great many letters from draft boards asking whether there will be a measuring stick used throughout the country, or whether the local draft boards would be permitted to make their own rulings.

Mr. RUSSELL. The findings of the National Selective Service System based on such examinations are in no way binding on local draft boards. They serve merely for informational purposes. The local draft boards in the last analysis will still have to pass on the question of deferment.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the national selective-service board have some sort of measuring stock for its use?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no such thing as the national selective-service board.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean the administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Selective Service System is going ahead with the examinations. However, the pending bill would make it perfectly clear that any report which might be made as the result of such examinations would be merely informative to the draft board, and would in no way be binding or conclusive on any local boards.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the administration of the Selective Service Act by local draft boards is the proper way of handling it.

Mr. RUSSELL. So do I.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe such determinations should be made on the local level.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. How would it operate at the local level? If the question is left for determination to each draft board, how is a draft board going to arrive at deferments?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be left to each individual draft board. The problems in the various jurisdictions are different.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator think it would be much more difficult to administer?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never favored having any kind of mass examinations held throughout the country and making the results of the examinations binding on local draft boards. I am very strongly opposed to it. I believe that in the last analysis we must depend on the local draft boards to deal with the problem. Of course, there will be some errors committed in some jurisdictions, but in the last analysis that is the best way to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are such examinations given now? Are they given at the local level?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer the question. There has been no specific act passed authorizing such examinations.

Mr. WHERRY. I notice that young students are taking examinations. Will such examinations be given at the grass roots, or will the students be brought to some place to take the examinations? Does the Senator have any information on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if it is agreeable I should like to yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who can supply the information on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit me, the Director of Selective Service has announced, as the Senator from Nebraska will recall, that Selective Service System would give such tests. That announcement was made while the bill was pending. Representative KILDAY, of Texas, offered an amendment to the bill when it was being considered in the House, which was adopted. I know it will interest the Senator from Nebraska, in the light of what he has said, and if the chairman will permit me to do so, I shall read the amendment:

No local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service

System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research—

I skip a little—

solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government.

The purpose of the amendment was to make it abundantly clear that Congress did not intend to have the local draft board guided by any of the tests on a mandatory basis. If a local draft board decides that it wants to take the results into consideration in making various evaluations, it can of course voluntarily do so.

Mr. WHERRY. It may use the information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have gone as far as we can go to protect the local draft boards in the administration of the law.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I believe it is a good provision.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is the Senator from Maryland correct in understanding that the limitation on the number of persons to be deferred by reason of being in college has been eliminated?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to read further. In doing so I shall touch on the point he has brought up. I will deal with it in a moment, if the Senator will be so kind as to indulge me.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The Senate bill provided that conscientious objectors who are opposed to military service in any form should be required to do work of national importance under civilian control. In other words, Mr. President, the Senate bill contained the same provision which was in effect for conscientious objectors during World War II.

The House amendment continued the procedure provided in the existing law—I refer to the 1948 act, which has been once extended—that is, that conscientious objectors simply would be deferred. Both Houses receded from their original positions and adopted a plan whereby conscientious objectors who are opposed to military service in any form may be required by their local boards to perform for a period equal to the prescribed period of induction such civilian work contributing to the national health, safety, or interest, as the local board may deem to be appropriate. In the event the individual fails to comply, he is subject to prosecution under the penalty section of the act.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS

The Senate bill amended the Lodge Act so as to increase the number of aliens who may be enlisted in the Regular Army from a total of 2,500 to a figure of 25,000 per annum for 5 years. In other words, it would have been possible to enlist a total of 125,000 aliens, who of necessity would have been screened by the processes provided in the Lodge bill.

The House amendment contained no provision for the enlistment of aliens in our armed services.

The conference agreement authorizes the enlistment of not to exceed 12,500 aliens by June 30, 1955. The provisions of the existing law requiring concurrence by the Secretary of State and the Bureau of Immigration in the screening of these individuals remains in effect. These provisions are not disturbed by the conference agreement.

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate bill suspended until July 31, 1954, the existing 2-percent limitation on women in the Regular components of the Armed Forces. The House amendment contained no similar provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language in the form in which it was passed by this body on March 9. In other words, we suspend until 1954 any limitation on the enlistment of women in the Regular components of the armed services.

PERIOD OF INACTION

As to the period of induction, the Senate version of the bill provided for an induction period of 24 months. The House amendment specified a period of 26 months. Here, again, the House receded, and the conference agreement adopts the Senate version, namely, 24 months.

MANPOWER CEILING

As to the ceiling strength of the Armed Forces, the Senate version of the bill contained a provision which imposed a ceiling of 4,000,000 on the aggregate active-duty strength of the Armed Forces, such ceiling to remain in effect only during the period during which the authorized strength of the Armed Forces is suspended. The House substitute contained no comparable provision; in the bill as passed by the House there was no manpower ceiling whatever. This point proved to be a very difficult one upon which to reach an agreement. However, the conferees on the part of the House have accepted the principle of a manpower ceiling, and the conference report establishes the figure at 5,000,000, instead of the figure contained in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I am particularly pleased that the principle of a ceiling, which was adopted by the Senate, has been retained in the conference report. Needless to say, I would have preferred a lower ceiling; but I wish to say that I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and all the other Senate conferees are entitled to a word of commendation on this point, because in the debate on the floor of the Senate the Senators who subsequently were appointed to be the Senate conferees were not in favor of a ceiling; and the fact that the bill as passed by the House did not contain provision for a ceiling would have made it very easy, as I think those of us who have been on conference committees know very well, for the conferees on the part of the Senate to have compromised on that particular point.

When conferees do what the conferees on the part of the Senate have done in this respect, in placing in the conference report a provision embodying a principle which has been adopted by the Senate, even though as individual Senators on the floor of the Senate they did not vote for it, certainly they are entitled to have favorable note taken of their action on the floor of the Senate; and I do so now.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I consider it to be particularly good for the country that this check is being maintained by Congress on the military. Even though the ceiling is 5,000,000, nevertheless it is a check, and it establishes in the history of our military legislation the very important point that, after all, the military must look to the Congress for checks upon the size of the military; and when they need more men they have an obligation to come to Congress and show the need.

Let me say in passing that, in my opinion, it also demonstrates that the argument of one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made by means of a letter which was read on the floor of the Senate during the closing hours of the debate, as time has gone by has proved not to be a very important argument, as I contended at the time. I refer, of course, to General Collins' argument in his letter of March 7, when he said:

In the short range, the Army would be adversely affected as to combat effectiveness and morale.

He was speaking against a statutory ceiling. Then he said:

For want of authority to go overstrength from time to time—a condition which cannot be accurately predicted because of battle conditions in Korea and fluctuations in current international tensions, our present plans for rotation of personnel in Korea might be completely upset.

As the Senator from Georgia knows, I did not support that argument at the time. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I knew that General Collins had already testified before the committee as to their plans for rotation under a military manpower proposal of 3,462,000, which they themselves were requesting, whereas all we were asking for was a ceiling of 4,000,000, finally; and they have gone ahead with their rotation program with an armed forces strength which today has reached only 2,600,000.

So I am glad time has proved what I thought was the obvious fallacy of the argument of General Collins, as set forth in his letter; and I hope this experience will teach the Joint Chiefs of Staff that when they throw into the debate on the floor of the Senate, in the eleventh hour, letters which they hope will influence the vote on the issue then pending, they must be a little more accurate than General Collins was in his letter.

Again I wish to say that I thank the Senator from Georgia and the Senator

from Texas for making the fight for the Senate in the conference committee, and seeing to it that the principle of a ceiling is maintained in the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at this time I shall not debate the merits of the ceiling in the manpower bill. When the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon was pending, I stated that I thought it would be most unfortunate to have a ceiling provided in the manpower bill. That was my thought at the time when I made the statement, and I believe it to be accurate now. I did not believe it was wise to insert provision for a ceiling, and thus serve notice to the entire world as to how far we were going.

Four of the five conferees on the part of the Senate—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—voted against the ceiling, and I think three of us spoke against it on the floor of the Senate. However, Mr. President, I have always tried to be very careful in handling in conference an issue on which I have been defeated in a fight on the floor of the Senate; under such circumstances I always fight just a little harder in the committee of conference because I realize that at that juncture I am an agent and a representative of the Senate itself, and I feel bound to insist upon the position taken by a majority of my colleagues in the Senate, even though it does not represent my own view.

Of course, this was an issue which required considerable debate in the committee of conference, where is was discussed at great length. The House did not desire to have provision made for any ceiling. Four of the five conferees on the part of the Senate did not desire to have provision made for a ceiling, but they pressed as hard as they knew how for a ceiling because they were the agents of the Senate. That issue certainly had been debated thoroughly and voted on in four or five different ways in the Senate. There could be no doubt about the position of the Senate on it.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Wyoming, who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNT. As I interpret the conference report, I am led to believe that, regardless of the fact that the President may authorize the deferment of 75,000 students who are engaged in the study of medicine, dentistry, or any of the allied specialties, if the local draft boards do not see fit to defer such students, they will not be deferred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming is undoubtedly correct; that is what the law provides at the present time. That is my understanding of this measure—namely, that we must depend upon the judgment and the patriotism of the members of the local draft boards.

Mr. President, if I had an opportunity to do so, I should like to pay tribute to those who serve on the local boards. If there is any thankless job in any community, it is the job of serving on the local selective-service board. Those who serve on those boards realize that there is no way on earth by which they can enforce the law with any degree of satisfaction to all of their neighbors. No compensation is paid to the members of the local draft boards. They do not even receive commissions which they can frame and hang on their walls. Although at times the members of the draft boards make errors, I think they are, in the main, distinguished citizens who are trying to serve their country.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he feels it is simply impossible for every local draft board throughout the United States to keep itself well informed on the medical, dental, and other scientific needs of the Nation? I am of the opinion that in deleting from the bill the requirement that 75,000 of such students shall be deferred, we shall be seriously injuring—perhaps indirectly—the health of the Nation, and as a result we may find ourselves in the same situation in which we were following World War II, and in which we are now, namely, we shall be faced with a tremendous shortage of physicians and dentists.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is entirely possible. I think the members of the local draft boards are kept fairly well informed by the various instructions and advice which come to them from the national headquarters. The Senator from Wyoming may know of instances where the local draft boards have not been kept well informed regarding deferment criteria. However, so far as I am advised as to conditions within my own State, I do not believe that is the case. The shortage to which the Senator from Wyoming refers is not, in my judgment, brought about by drafting the men into the service; it has been due to the lack of sufficient facilities for the education of dentists and physicians.

Mr. HUNT. That was not so, Mr. President, immediately following World War II, when we were graduating only 200 or 300 from our schools, within the first few years following the war, simply because the pre-medic and pre-dental student had been inducted into the service instead of being allowed to complete his education. We are today suffering from that procedure, and in case of a major war, if we followed the same procedure again the situation would be even worse, following a third world war, than it is at the present time, following World War II.

Mr. RUSSELL. That could be, Mr. President. It is a matter on which the Senator from Wyoming is perhaps as well informed as any man in Washington, D. C., certainly as well informed as any Member of the Senate, and I would defer to his judgment.

The Senate conferees argued vigorously in behalf of the 75,000 provision, of course, but the House conferees simply would not agree to any such project. If I recall correctly, they would not even discuss it with us after the first 5 or 10 minutes. We were left to talk it out on our own.

Mr. HUNT. I appreciate the position taken by the Senate conferees. I am greatly disappointed that they were not successful in their effort. I shall not attempt to have the Senate disapprove the conference report on this point, but I reiterate that I think we are making a very bad mistake.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I stated before, I attach great weight to the comment and opinions of the Senator from Wyoming on this issue. I do so on any issue, but particularly on this one, because he has made quite an intensive study of it. I hope that what he apprehends will not come to pass. But I am sure that no one desires that there shall be a dearth of physicians and dentists, and if it appears that the bill as now presented does not work satisfactorily or is likely to prove crippling in supplying physicians, dentists, and other scientific specialists who are essential to the maintenance of the American people and of the national interests, we can introduce a separate bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not take offense at my interruption.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all. The Senator from Oregon has made a great contribution in shaping the bill. A number of his views which did not prevail in the committee or on the floor of the Senate were supported so vigorously by the conferees on the part of the House that they appear in the final report, even though they were not adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I should be less than human if I did not say that I am very much pleased to note that the conference report comes nearer to carrying out the so-called Morse amendments to the bill than was the case when the bill passed the Senate. I am glad that in several particulars the principles of my amendments are now a part of the bill.

What I rose to say was that the one thing I seek to do is to be helpful in developing the legislative history of the bill for future reference. Consideration of the handling of the specialist students, or the need of specialists in the Military Establishment, referred to by the Senator from Wyoming, causes me to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is not true that there is nothing in the bill as now presented which would prevent the Military Establishment working out with the colleges a special training course for military draftees along the lines of the V–12 program of World War II and other similar programs, if the military should want to do it. In other words, there is nothing in this bill which says that there cannot be established a special service for the training of specialists who may be needed by the military establishments in cooperation with the col-

leges, if the colleges and the military can only get together. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing whatever in the bill which would prevent any such action on the part of the military, if they had the authority.

Mr. MORSE. I may say, then, for future reference, and in the interest of the legislative history, that when the so-called deferment program for the 75,000 students was before the Armed Services Committee, there were a great many reservations in the minds of some of us as to whether that was the appropriate way to handle it. Some of us felt that it would be better to work out what we referred to as a program resulting in a marriage between the colleges and the military for special courses which would give the needed training while the young men were in uniform. I have been thinking over the problem in the months which have passed since the committee hearings, and I say now that I am not at all disturbed by the fact that the conference report does not carry the provisions of the Senate bill in this regard. To the contrary, the conference bill presents to the Military Establishment and to the colleges a great opportunity to come forward with a joint training program for the training of specialists, whether they be physicians, dentists, physicists, biochemists, engineers, or whatnot, whereby young men will receive training, in accordance with their merits, while in uniform, and will then give their military service over and above that. What the bill offers now is an opportunity, when the Military Establishment and the colleges get together on this subject for future legislation, which I think will really strengthen our whole military manpower program.

In closing, I desire to say that I hope the college presidents will face this question a little more realistically than they have done to date, because as I have come to study the attitude and the proposals of the college presidents, I have reached the conclusion that, by and large, they have missed the boat on the whole matter of special training for the specialists needed in the Military Establishment. It seems to me they have been too anxious to develop a program which did not require what I have called the direct marriage relationship between the colleges and the Military Establishment. I think they will have to come to it now, and I hope they will now get their heads together, and bring forth a program which will meet that which the Senator from Wyoming has in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his contribution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, a member of the conference committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In furtherance of what the Senator from Wyoming has said, am I not correct in saying that the so-called Holloway plan, as concerns the Navy, is still in existence, and is not affected by this bill in any way? The Army has named a certain number of colleges, I do not know how many, as officers' training schools, and they are not in any way affected by the bill so far as concerns specialist training in medicine, biology, chemistry, and so on. Those programs are not programs of the military so much as they are programs which will be carried forward by the scientific groups where they are needed. They are not specifically military programs, and the young men will not be in uniform. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any plan at this time to establish any V–12 classes in medical training, but there is nothing in this bill to prevent its being done. Such a provision was not in conference between the two Houses. I think it would be fair to say that the basic assumption of the bill is that there will be deferments by local draft boards of a sufficient number of men to fill the requirements of the civilian population in the sciences.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] after which I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. HOLLAND. As a predicate to my questions, I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that I compliment him and his associates warmly upon their work in connection with this difficult conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say likewise that, on this particular feature, it seems to me that the conference report is an improvement over the Senate version.

The Senator will recall that when the bill was debated on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Florida had grave doubts as to the wisdom of the provision in the Senate bill which would have required not for deferment before induction but for the giving of opportunities to not more than 75,000 of the men of each year's selection, after they had completed their basic training, and upon their having subjected themselves to a uniform examination, to be chosen by a national commission to become students in schools which turn out physicians, dentists, scientists, engineers, or even to become students in those various courses which are called the humanities. The Senator from Florida felt that program was exceedingly objectionable from several points of view. Is it now correct to say that the local boards are continued in the full jurisdiction which they had during World War II to defer before induction young men of premedical or predental training or of aptitudes in various important scientific fields so that they secure college training in those particular specialized fields?

Mr. RUSSELL. I well remember the fears expressed by the Senator from Florida when the bill was under consideration. In answer to his question, I wish to say that, in my opinion, the conference bill, if anything, strengthens the power of the local draft boards to decide upon the deferments to which the Senator refers. It contains language covering the authority of the local draft boards which was not contained in the law in effect during the war period.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. If I may be permitted to observe, I think that system will much more nearly assure fair geographic distribution of the students and also fair racial distribution of the students, it being my observation that particularly with reference to students of the Negro race, unless they are allowed to compete with members of their own race alone, they are very apt to be denied, in many cases, the opportunity to go to either medical or dental schools. The Senator will recall the interesting figures upon that subject which were developed by the Library of Congress sometime ago.

Mr. President, I have one more question. Is there anything in this measure which will in any way prohibit the armed services from proceeding with the program under which they now very frequently discharge inductees who have already received basic military training or who have gone beyond that stage, at the time when they are admitted to medical schools or dental schools in which they have had applications pending and for which they have perfected their preliminary work?

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill in nowise affects the regulations under which the discharges referred to by the Senator are made.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to make one more observation, the Senator from Florida feels that this will allow in a perfect way the continuation of a cooperative and understanding handling of individual cases between the armed services and the faculties of various institutions of learning who have heretofore worked together congenially in this field. I feel that with the very large number of students who have completed their premedical and predental work, amounting, as the Senator knows, to many more than the number who could be admitted in any one year or in several years, there is a tremendous pool to draw from under which either the local boards or the faculties of the schools, in conjunction with the commanders in the Armed Forces, will find a way to give opportunities to the best prepared young men, whether white or Negro, to take the professional or scientific training which they are ambitious to receive.

I commend the Senator from Georgia and his committee upon the program as reported in the conference report.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, and then to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CASE. If the results of the tests are not to be obligatory or mandatory upon the local boards, why should they be given at the expense of the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry, but I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. CASE. If the results of the tests which prospective inductees were taking.

and which more are soon to take, are not to be mandatory upon the local boards, so far as deferment is concerned, why should they be given?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question with authority. I assume the local boards might use the information as a guide, even though it does not constitute a directive. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which would enable the Selective Service to make its acceptance compulsory on the local boards. The Senator knows that long before this bill was passed, while the bill was on the Senate floor, in March, it was announced that the tests were not to be given under any provision contained in the bill. They are being given under general authority of the Selective Service Director to provide deferments deemed essential to the national health, safety, or interest. The Senator from Georgia must absolve himself of any participation in the giving of tests. I did not have anything whatever to do with the giving of the test to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. CASE. It occurs to me that something should be done to correct the impression given to people generally that the tests are going to result in deferments of the prospective inductees who are taking the tests. My correspondence indicates that many take the tests with the expectation that if they reach a mark of 87, or whatever the figure may be, they will be deferred. Furthermore, colleges have been making plans to receive students on the basis of the prospective enrollees they may have as a result of the tests. If there is any way to clarify that situation, I think the press and the country generally should be advised that the tests are not obligatory upon the local boards.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are not obligatory upon the local boards. I would not have my statement understood as saying that the local boards cannot apply them. I think a great many boards will be glad to get the information afforded by the tests, and will undoubtedly use it in arriving at deferments, whether they use it in exactly the order in which the Selective Service intends or not. Perhaps some of the local boards will follow it down to the last suggestion of the Selective Service System. But there is nothing in the bill which makes the acceptance of information gleaned from the requirements or tests which the Selective Service System may offer obligatory upon the local boards. On the contrary, there is a provision which protects the jurisdiction of local boards.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with further reference to educational deferments, in the galley-proof print of the conference report which I have before me it appears, at the bottom of page 11 and top of page 12, that there will be a deferment for prospective inductees who are in high school if they are maintaining a satisfactory course, until the time of their graduation, or until they reach the twentieth anniversary of their birth. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not know that any point had been raised about high school students. The Senate bill contained a provision which mandatorily deferred all high school students until they had graduated or had reached the age of 19 years. The House verision of the bill contained a provision which deferred them until they were graduated or had attained the age of 20 years. Some figures were introduced which showed that only a small percentage failed to graduate by the time they were 19 years of age. We accepted the House provision of 20 years, which is the same as the present law.

Mr. CASE. The next paragraph deals with deferments at a college, university, or similar institution, and a hurried reading of the paragraph suggests to me that the result of the action of the conferees is to say to a person who is in college at the time he receives his call for induction and upon the presentation of those facts to the local board, that he will be deferred until the end of the particular academic year in which the call occurs, but no longer, unless he be deferred by reason of the application of regulations promulgated by the President under the section relating to the National Security Training Corps. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. If he is in college when he receives his orders, he is deferred until the end of the academic year.

Mr. CASE. But no longer.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct; but no longer.

Mr. CASE. Unless he comes in the scientific group.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, or unless he is deferred by the action of the local board.

Mr. CASE. On the basis of some other qualification?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, section 6 (h) of the present law.

Mr. CASE. But he has no mandatory deferment?

Mr. RUSSELL. He has no mandatory deferment other than for the scholastic year in which he is engaged at the time he receives his notice.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apologize to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. I shall now be glad to deal with the matter he raised.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I am very reluctant to interrupt the Senator from Georgia because I know he would like to proceed with his explanation of the measure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to be interrupted by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I raised the point because the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida raised the question in my mind. We have the question of a man who has completed his premedical college education. He has matriculated and been accepted in a medical school. He is also a member of the Active Reserve, and has gotten his orders to report for active duty. Is there anything that would defer that man from active duty in the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing that would make it mandatory that he be deferred, but I should think that a showing that he would be admitted to a recognized medical school, and was qualified for admission, would certainly be most persuasive in securing a delay in his call to active duty.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The case I have cited is an actual one. I feel there should be some provision in the bill to defer a man under such circumstances, and make it mandatory that he be deferred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator again state the conditions?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The man has completed his academic education. He has matriculated and been accepted in an accredited medical school. He is also a member of the Organized Reserve, and as such has been alerted and has now received his orders for active duty. His draft board has deferred him, but he is now on the other horn of the dilemma. He is in the Active Reserve and has been called to duty. Should he not be exempted under this measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly think he should be deferred. I do not know whether he should be exempted, but certainly he should be deferred. I do not believe, I may say, that that is something which properly belongs in this bill. A bill will come to the Senate within a few days dealing with the Reserves. The pending bill concerns itself with the Selective Service System and the universal military training program. We will later have before us legislation dealing with the Reserve components. We hope, if the committee can get down to work on it, that we can present the matter to the Senate at an early date.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. This man went through the ROTC in his college, and was then certified to his unit after graduation, and a month or so ago was alerted, and now he has his actual orders. Meantime he has been matriculated and accepted in an accredited medical school.

Mr. RUSSELL. If he has been accepted in an accredited medical school I think the Army in which he is—it is the Third Army in my State—should have deferred the man and enabled him to go to school, but I know of no law which would give him deferment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that when a man takes an ROTC training in a college he takes it at the expense of the Government, and he agrees to give at least 3 years of service?

Mr. RUSSELL. It depends on the type of ROTC training. Under the Holloway Act, trainees receive, I believe, $50 a month and uniform. In the ROTC units in the Army, in the Air Force and the regular Naval ROTC they receive considerably less.

There is no question about his legal obligation to serve. He has such an obligation. I have known of cases of men who were in the Army, who had enlisted in the Army voluntarily, and were members of a regular component of the Army, but when they were accepted in an accredited medical school, the Army would discharge them and permit them to go

to school. That is the reason why I said I thought under the facts stated it would have been the part of better judgment to have deferred the individual to whom the Senator from Maryland refers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no mandatory provision in any law that provides for what the distinguished Senator from Maryland wants done?

Mr. RUSSELL. None so far as I know.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a question of whether or not the military authorities will defer such a man as a medical student, rather than to permit the military to take him as an active officer. Answering the Senator's question, there is not any manadatory provision that gives the relief the premedical student would like to have at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; there is absolutely no mandatory law that requires such action to be taken. But I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am quite sure such action has been taken. Deferments have been granted in some cases.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not want the Senator from Georgia to get the impression that the Army has turned down this particular man. It has not. His case is now pending. I wondered if there was anything in the proposed legislation that would protect him in this situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing whatever in the proposed legislation that would affect him in the slightest degree. But if the man's record is as the Senator has stated, my judgment is that the Army will defer him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to labor the point respecting the deferment of college students or those who are to be given technical training. When the conference report is taken up tomorrow we will thoroughly discuss that question, I imagine. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that, for the life of me, I cannot see why the Selective Service requires the examination to which reference has been made, or gives it, if it is unnecessary or will not be made use of by the draft boards. I cannot understand yet why that is done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated on the floor of the Senate that there is nothing obligatory or mandatory on the local draft boards with respect to the examinations referred to. But the draft boards may, if they wish, use the information thereby obtained, as a basis for deferment.

Mr. WHERRY. Have the local draft boards asked that these examinations be given? Why does the Selective Service take the initiative and give the examinations without any request on the part of the draft boards? Of course, I can see how it would be informative to a draft board that wants to defer a student, possibly, on application. I wondered if the Senator could help me by having that point clarified either today or tomorrow. I do not understand why the examination should be given.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume it is because the Director of Selective Service thought that the information thus obtained would be helpful to the draft boards. He might have thought that this bill would emerge from Congress in such form that it would be mandatory upon the draft boards to accept these findings. The regulation was issued by the Director of Selective Service, as I recall, while this bill was pending in the Senate. When it went to the House, in order to prevent these tests from being obligatory on the local draft boards the amendment was adopted on the floor of the House in the language read by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to protect the draft boards from compulsory regulation that they abide by the examination results.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Where did the Director of Selective Service get the idea that it become obligatory?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry I cannot answer that question. I do not know whether he thinks it might become obligatory. I was giving what I thought might be a reason. I do not know what prompted the Director of Selective Service to issue the call for the examination. I have not seen him since he appeared as a witness before the Johnson subcommittee, which was several weeks before the examination order was issued. I am quite sure that the Senator from Nebraska, if he were to call the Director of Selective Service, would be given some of the reasons which prompted him to take such action.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the conference bill which permits the giving of these examinations and provides exemptions for certain individuals who pass the examinations?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I read the provision which prevents the Director of Selective Service from making it mandatory on the local boards. I will read it again.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it will not be necessary for the Senator to do that. I should like to know whether it is discretionary, not whether it is mandatory; whether the Director can give the examinations and then say that those in the upper grades shall be exempt and go to college, or that those below a certain mark shall go into the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is anything in the bill which would prohibit an examination from being held, but there is a provision which prevents the Director of Selective Service from requiring that the draft boards accept the results of such examinations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then one draft board may accept them and another draft board may reject them?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is so. We have that situation today. Some draft boards are more generous with educational deferments to college men than others.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there now in the bill anything which permits the giving of the examination?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the bill which would either permit or prohibit the giving of the examination. It does not concern itself with the giving of these examinations. It merely deals with the effect which such examinations might have on the local draft board.

Let me again read the language:

> Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research—

And so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that if we shall adopt the conference report, in the light of the knowledge we have as to the examinations being given and the intention of the administration to exempt from military service those attaining the upper grades, we will approve such a system, and that it will be carried into effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only does the Senator from Georgia not feel that way, but he thinks that would be a most farfetched construction. This provision was written into the bill on the floor of the House, and the argument was used that it was to prevent the very thing to which the Senator from Michigan refers.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that the opinion of the Senator from Georgia will be given great weight in interpreting what may be an ambiguity in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not consider it to be ambiguous. I think it is about as specific as it could be made, that no person shall be postponed or deferred by reason of his activity, study, or research. I continue quoting where I left off a moment ago—

> solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government.

This amendment was written to prevent these examinations from being obligatory on the local board; and I think it does so as clearly as the English language could do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then does the Senator feel that the adoption of the conference report would not be a confirmation of the proposed plan?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am confident it would not.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate having the Senator's remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not the case that one of the arguments for the provision written in in the House and confirmed by the conference committee is that the problems of the Selective Service boards vary so greatly from one community to another that in one com-

munity they might have need for every man of a certain age and of good physical qualifications to meet their quota, while in another community—even in the adjoining county or area—there might be a completely different problem, requiring the local draft boards to exercise a different descretion, depending on the specific nature of the problem which they had to meet?

Mr. RUSSELL. That could have been the reason, because that condition certainly prevails. There are great variations among the different draft boards.

Moreover, I think there was a feeling that, after all, the people who live in a man's home community, who associate with him every day and who know him, are much better qualified to pass upon the question of his deferment than someone who arrives at the result by a test given on a national basis.

The Senator from Florida and I are adherents of a group which has been threatened with extinction, namely, the Jeffersonian Democrats. Of course, we believe in the largest possible measure of local home rule and self-government in the local communities of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the program incorporated in the conference report guarantees just that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

AGE OF INDUCTION

Mr. RUSSELL. As to the induction age, the age of induction for service in the Armed Forces and for training in the National Security Training Corps was one of the major points at issue. The Senate bill had an induction age of 18 years, with, of course, the provision with which all Senators are familiar, that it would be necessary to exhaust the pool of those above 19 before coming down to 18 years 9 months, 18 years 6 months, and so forth. The House amendment placed the age at 18½ years. The compromise agreement authorizes induction for service in the Armed Forces to begin at 18½, and induction for training in the National Security Training Corps—the so-called UMT—at the age of 18.

RESERVE SERVICE

As to the total period of service liability, under the Senate bill an individual was liable for an aggregate of 8 years of service. This aggregate included both active duty service of 24 months and time spent as a member of a Reserve component.

Under the House amendment the aggregate period was 6 years. The House receded on this point, and the conference agreement establishes the aggregate service period—that is, active duty plus Reserve service—at 8 years.

AUTHORIZED PERIOD OF ACTIVE DUTY FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS

As to the active duty of reservists, the Senate bill authorized the call to active duty of reservists for the normal induction period of 24 months. The House amendment provided that such individuals could be ordered to active duty for not to exceed 21 months, regardless of the normal induction period imposed upon all other individuals. The House receded on this point, and the conference agreement authorizes members of the Reserve components to be ordered to active duty for a period of not to exceed 24 months. The authority to order the Reserve components to active duty terminates July 1, 1953.

As to the cut-off date on selective service——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to bring out at this time, in connection with the point with regard to the Reserves, the question of calling up Reserves who have had more than a year's service in World War II, or would he prefer not to discuss it at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very glad to discuss it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does that subject come at a later point in the Senator's statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I had intended to deal with it at a later point, but I shall be glad to deal with it now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Whatever the Senator desires.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the same question. What the Senator has been referring to is the Reserve unit itself, as a unit.

Mr. RUSSELL. In effect, yes; not the volunteer or the inactive Reserves.

Mr. TAFT. The inactive reserves are different. Can the Senator tell us exactly the line between the active and inactive Reserves?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to undertake to do so now.

There is a very substantial difference between inactive or volunteer reservists and the active reservists, who are normally assigned to units. The great difference is that the inactive or volunteer reservists receive no compensation whatever. The active reservists normally receive compensation based upon their attending training for a certain number of hours each month. I may say that in some cases the training is frequently book work. In addition, they receive certain credits toward retirement, whereas the inactive reservist does not normally receive the same credit toward retirement unless associated with a volunteer unit. The difference is that the inactive reservists normally get no pay and no credit toward retirement. The active reservists receive some compensation and credit toward retirement. That is the difference between them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does a man who enlists become an inactive reservist, or is he in a different category?

Mr. RUSSELL. His enlistment would have nothing whatever to do with it. As a matter of fact, most of the men entered the Reserves when they came out of the service, at the time they were released from active duty. Many of the services urged that the men go into the inactive Reserves, and thousands of them did so.

Mr. FERGUSON. A reservist is entirely different from a man who voluntarily enlists and does not go through Selective Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. A person could well become a volunteer reservist without first being inducted through selective service. If he is in any branch of the service, whether he is a volunteer or comes in through selective service, he may later become an inactive or volunteer reservist when released from active duty.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator answers those questions, will he include in the answer a statement as to whether or not a person who has enlisted and has been in the service, let us say for a period of 3 years, will be able voluntarily to leave the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean to sever his connection with the Reserve unit?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, after 3 years. Let us say that his term of 3 years expires in July of this year, and that he went in voluntarily. Would this bill keep him in longer, or could he voluntarily withdraw?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the terms of this bill when a person who has served 3 years under a voluntary enlistment comes out of the active service he is automatically placed in a reserve status for a period of 5 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then he may be taken back as a reservist?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but only in the event his recall is authorized by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A man who enlisted for a 3-year period prior to a certain date—I forget the exact date——

Mr. RUSSELL. Prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Prior to the passage of this act. If my memory serves me correctly, when he comes out he is free from any reserve duty, is he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. He is free?

Mr. RUSSELL. He has no further obligation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does that apply to all grades?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. To officers, as well as to enlisted men?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it applies to all grades and ranks.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. As the Senator is aware, when the Korean War broke out, there was considerable difficulty caused by the calling up of reservists who were on the inactive list before calling up those who were on the active list or members of organized units.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Does the bill establish any priority of call in such situations which may arise hereafter?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it does not. There are separate bills pending in the two committees which deal with the establishment of a permanent Reserve system, which contain priorities. The only priorities which the pending bill establishes is with reference to the release of inactive or voluntary reservists

who are on active duty today. It would give them prior release from duty. I can turn to that provision now if the Senator would prefer me to do so. I have not yet reached it in order.

Mr. CASE. I would prefer to have the Senator from Georgia proceed in his own way.

Mr. RUSSELL. The final major point of disagreement, or at least one of the major points of disagreement—and perhaps the word "conflict" is a better word to use—between the two versions was the House provision for arbitrarily returning members of the inactive or voluntary Reserve who qualify as World War II veterans under the 1948 act to their homes at the completion of 12 months of service.

The Senate, and more particularly the Senate conferees, recognized that many injustices have been done to thousands of our reservists, who saw long tours of duty during World War II since the recall program began in July 1950.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services has repeatedly insisted to the Chiefs of Staff and to the secretaries of the several services, as well as to the Secretary of Defense, that the services should formulate a program for the release of these inactive reservists which would alleviate such inequities at the earliest possible moment. Each of the services formulated a program for the release of such reservists. The programs went into effect within the past 30 days, I believe. The particulars of the program have been released to the public. The great bulk of the voluntary or inactive enlisted reservists who saw duty during World War II, who desire to return to civilian life will be returned to their homes or will be released according to a definite and clear-cut return program.

I think I should interpolate at this point that there are some small groups of men who are in critical specialties who are not being released under this program. However, they are relatively few in number.

Insofar as the Army and Air Force are concerned, the returns will be completed within a year after entry on active duty. Those two great branches of service, that is, the enlisted inactive and volunteer reserves will be released within 12 months. The Navy will release its inactive volunteer reservists as soon after 12 months as trained replacements are available.

Mr. TAFT. Is that 12 months after the passage of the act?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is 12 months from the time they were called to duty after June 25, 1950. None of the reservists was called back until late in July. As a practical matter, it would run from some time in late July.

Under the conference agreement a limit or deadline of 17 months is established. After the passage of that time all inactive or voluntary reservists must be returned to their homes. Of course, we make it perfectly clear by the language of this bill that this 17-month maximum period is not intended to be used as an excuse for retaining the men, but that it is to apply to those who have not yet been returned in accordance with this program, which, as I have said, is 12 months in the case of the Army and Air Force, and as soon after 12 months as the replacement is provided in the case of the Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. The 17-month period applies to the few specialists to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. If the Secretary of one of the armed services finds that any individual—I can conceive of a man who is an interpreter, for example—is essential to the maintenance of the combat effectiveness of the service to which the individual belongs, he could hold him.

Mr. FERGUSON. For how long a period?

Mr. RUSSELL. For a period of up to 21 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. So there is, first, the 12 months, then the 17 months, and then the 21 months for the specialists who are retained by orders of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. If a finding is made that such a man is essential to the maintenance of the combat effectiveness of the Army, Air Force, or Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be up to 21 months, then?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator has made his point clear, but I am not certain he has done so. Therefore, I should like to ask him whether it is not correct to say that there is nothing in the bill which deals with the programs of the Army and the Navy with respect to the 12-month period. It is a program. The conference report only refers to the 17 months, although there is a program with respect to enlistees under which they would be released after a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I tried to make it clear that a program had been formulated in the Department of Defense, which was due to the insistence of the Committee on Armed Services as much as to any other individual factor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the 12-month provision apply only to enlistees, and not to officers?

Mr. RUSSELL. It applies only to enlistees. The 17-month period applies to all. Take, for example, the Air Force. They had to call up many pilots who were reservists. They had specialized training in the flying of airplines. If they had to release those officer pilots, it would have been disastrous. The Air Force was trying to increase its strength from 500,000 men to more than a million. It is essential that the Air Force has trained pilots. However, within 17 months they must release the officers. The 12 months applies to enlistees in the Air Force.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could it be possible that it would be 24 months, instead of 21 months, for the so-called specialists?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be 24 months for those who would be called up hereafter. Under the existing law, it is 21 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. Those who came in afterward would have to serve 24 months?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; they could be kept in serve for 24 months if they were essential to the maintenance of the combat effectiveness of the service, whether it be the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. It is a drastic finding, I may say.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Secretary of Defense would have to make such a finding?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Secretary of each component service. It would be the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand. I thank the Senator.

CUT-OFF DATE FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as to the cut-off date on selective service, the bill as passed by the Senate contained no expiration date for selective service, whereas the House amendment provided that inductions into the Armed Forces through selective service could not be made after July 1, 1954. This issue proved to be a rather controversial one; it was the subject of long discussion. Finally the conferees agreed to the House amendment, so as to cut off inductions under the Selective Service Act on July 1, 1955, rather than July 1, 1954, as provided in the original House substitute.

PROGRAM FOR TRAINING 75,000 STUDENTS ANNUALLY FOR 3 YEARS

As to the provision for the deferment of 75,000 students, the bill as passed by the Senate contained a provision for selecting from among persons who had completed their basic training, 75,000 students during the next 3 years, and these students were to have the remainder of their military service obligation suspended until they had completed their studies or research. The House substitute did not contain a similar provision. The conferees on the part of the Senate were unable to secure any form of compromise on this program, and the conference report entirely eliminates the provision.

PROVISIONS FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Although the bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as passed by the House are in complete agreement on the desirability of accepting a permanent program of universal military training, yet the measures for the implementation of such a program varied considerably as between the House and the Senate versions of the bill. The basic difference lay in the fact that the bill as passed by the Senate gave universal military training an unqualified green light as of the date of the enactment of the bill. Although the Senate was clearly aware of the fact that some implementing legislation would be necessary, the bill as passed by the Senate did not prohibit the program from getting under way until such provision had in fact been enacted.

On the other hand, the House amendment, although solidly supporting the philosophy of universal military train-

ing, required that a second look be taken at the proposition by the Congress before any inductions could be made into the National Security Training Corps.

This basic point of disagreement between the Senate provision, which adopted universal military training now, and the House provision, which required that a second look be taken, was the rock upon which the conferees almost suffered a catastrophe; we nearly foundered on that rock.

As chairman of the committee of conference, it therefore gives me great pleasure to report that this issue has finally been resolved. The conference report in no way withdraws congressional endorsement of universal military training; however, it does recognize what we have always clearly understood, namely, that some additional implementing legislation will be necessary before the program can actually begin. Some of this legislation must be put on the statute books before any inductions are made into the National Security Training Corps, to receive this training.

The conference agreement provides for establishment of the National Security Training Commission and outlines its responsibilities and duties. Particular care has been taken to assure that the Commission, although establishing the policies and standards which govern the National Security Training Corps, does not write the detailed military program. The military program is made the responsibility of those who are best qualified to prepare it, namely, the Department of Defense and the three military services.

The agreement provides that within 4 months after the Commission has been confirmed by the Senate, the Commission must submit to the Congress its legislative recommendations which will govern the policies, standards, code of conduct, death and disability benefits, and other essential elements of such a program. These legislative recommendations must be acted upon by the respective committees within 45 days and must be reported to the two Houses. After they are reported, they go on the calendar as measures of the highest privilege which may be called up at any time on the motion of any single Member of either House.

The conference agreement does not prohibit the universal military training program from getting under way until all of these legislative recommendations shall have been enacted. It does provide that it cannot get under way until two of the recommendations—the code of conduct and measures outlining death and disability benefits for trainees—are adopted by the Congress. Inductions cannot be made until these measures, and any portion of the other measures, have been enacted into law.

A final condition precedent to the making of inductions would be the finding that the period of service for persons under age 19 could be either reduced or eliminated. Of course, it would be necessary that this be done before the program could be effective.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia has finished discussing the universal-military-training item, I should like to ask a question of him, if he will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia would wish to discuss this matter more in detail. Is it not true that in connection with the legislative requirements of the code of conduct, the safety measures, and other measures, a concept of the entire policy and plan is that the military training in and of itself will not necessarily be subject to legislative recommendations. Do I make my point clear?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is essential that the training program be made the subject of legislative recommendations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; just the opposite is the case.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The theory is that under the broad outline which the Commission will have to submit within 4 months of its appointment, the military part of the program will be under the military, and, we hope, will not be subjected to specific congressional recommendations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the intent of the committee of conference—and I may say I do not think the Senate was alone in that respect, although we differed as to the kind of language necessary to secure the desired result—was that the civilian commission should have broad, overall supervision of the national training program, but that the military aspects of the program should be under the military. That was what we sought to achieve by the language adopted in the conference report.

In other words, this is a program of military training, and we do not desire to see it become, some kind of indoctrination center for certain ideas or philosophies or a natural-education program or something in the nature of a great works-projects program. We wish to see to it that the military features of this training are military and are under the control of the military, without interfering with the general overall supervision by the civilian commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is the concept of the Senator from Georgia, is it not—as it is mine—that the legislative recommendations and the legislative acts coming from them should not, we hope, prescribe and define the military training?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think it would be most unfortunate for the Congress to undertake to write military training details. We have neither the background nor the knowledge which would enable us to prescribe for military training. In the past Congress has never sought to write out a course of military training for the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, or any other branch of the Armed Services; and I see no reason why we should depart from the precedents in that respect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The theory of having the Commission set forth the broad outline is to have it inform Congress as to what is planned in the form of training, so that it can establish a legal code of conduct and can provide various safety measures and all the other protective features which go with establishing a new corps. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language is "a broad outline for a program deemed by the Commission, and approved by the Secretary of Defense, to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provisions of this act shall be of a military nature; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to grant to the Commission the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps." I think that makes it very clear what our purpose was. Of course, we cannot bind this Congress, not to speak of any subsequent Congresses. If they were to undertake to enter the field of writing a military program, I assume that they could do it, but in my opinion it would be a very foolish step.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I was trying to bring out in conjunction with the Senator from Georgia was the fact that we hoped the military would care for the military training, and that it would not be interfered with by the civilian members, nor by the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I got the sense of the conference, it was that each member of the conference, from both Houses, was of opinion that the military should have control of the military training aspects of this program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, will the Commission, which is to be composed in part of military members and in part of civilians, have the right to determine the length of period of training?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. It is written out in the law. It is 6 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is prescribed in the law, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is, and it is 6 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the Commission will not have either the time or the actual mode of training under their jurisdiction. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. They will not have, as to the military details.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say it must all be military training, not civilian?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that it goes quite that far, but I certainly gave it that construction. It does not say there cannot be any civilian training, because there is a rather thin line of demarcation there.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is, if it is desired to train a man how to string a telephone wire for the Signal Corps, for example, or to give a young man training so he will be a valuable reservist in communications in the event of the outbreak of war, that would be civilian training; but the bill makes it perfectly clear that the training shall be basic military training in its nature.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore the military alone would determine what the training should be, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, as to the military training.

Mr. FERGUSON. If there were to be other kinds of training, could the Commission as well as the military determine what the other kind of training would be?

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me read the language to the Senator. I shall read the language to the Senator from Michigan:

The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. The Commission shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of the members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

Here is the important sentence:

The military department or departments so designated to carry out such military training shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Will the status of privilege which the Senator has said this bill provides for the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee prevent the consideration of amendments at that time?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. As a matter of fact, the bill specifically authorizes amendments to any part of it.

Mr. CASE. Could the affirmative action be in the nature of a concurrent resolution, or would it require a regular bill to be passed by both Houses and signed by the President?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be in the nature of a law or an act.

Mr. President, the conferees feel that the adoption of this report by both Houses and its approval by the President of the United States will not only provide for our temporary needs through the selective service, for a training and service program, but it will make it impossible for the armed services to initiate their long-range planning for universal military training, and to begin developing immediately the detailed techniques which it will require.

We have provided a system for an orderly phasing in of universal military training rather than for an arbitrary initiation of the program at some future time after a complete demobilization of our present active-duty forces.

Additionally, the features most essential to the successful operation of the program—a sound code of conduct and equitable death and disability benefits—must be enacted by the Congress before inductions may commence.

Mr. President, in presenting this report in behalf of the Senate conferees and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I wish to submit that this program will enable us not only to meet the present requirements of a large active-duty force but to build an adequate and well-trained reserve over the coming years. For events have all too clearly reemphasized, since the onset of the Korean episode, that our military security is irrevocably meshed with a program for the systematic building of a reserve of trained manpower.

At the present time, while we have several million reservists, we have no real Reserve program; and the lack of such a program has resulted in the hardships of which we have heard so frequently. Here were the services, looking for reservists; they would reach into some community, where there might be two reservists living across the street from each other. One might have a wife and two children; the other might be unmarried. The Departments did not even have sufficient information to tell where the greater hardship lay, and, from the cases which have been brought to my attention, it seemed that their capacity for selecting the worst hardship cases was considerable, to say the least. We must establish in this country a real Reserve program. We must do it for the reason that a real and complete Reserve program will enable us in time of emergency to avoid multiplication of the hardship cases of those called to service. We must do it, Mr. President, if we would not disrupt the civilian economy of the United States.

This Nation cannot indefinitely carry the burden of maintaining an Armed Force of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 men on active duty, with all the costs thus incurred. We cannot do it by resorting to a large short-term civilian establishment having a rapid rotation, or by undertaking to create a large permanent professional army the members of which will follow the science of warfare as life careers. We must follow the thought which was in the contemplation of the first President of the United States, George Washington, who envisioned a system of trained Reserves rather than the maintenance at all times of a large Regular Military Establishment.

The plan which we have offered is not as direct and positive a solution of the problem as was the original Senate bill, or as I should like to see it, but I believe, Mr. President, that the plan we have suggested is sound and workable. It affords Congress an opportunity to see the nature of the code of conduct which will be put into effect, and provision will be made for benefits for men in the universal military training before any inductions are made.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I share the regret of the Senator from Georgia that the program as reported by the conference for universal military training is not as direct, definite, and certain as was provided for in the Senate bill, but if I correctly understand, the conference measure does definitely lay a predicate for a universal military training program, and with that conviction underlying, I should like to ask this question of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee:

Is it correct to say that, under the conference report, whenever the state of our national preparedness is such in relation to our international situation that the selectees, when called to service, will not be needed more than 6 months, then universal military training shall come into existence under this program which is established under the conference report?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is generally a fair statement of the effect of the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it further correct to say that the time limitation upon the machinery which was described so ably by the Senator and which is included in the conference report with the purpose of bringing back to the Congress specific measures on the code of conduct and with respect to death and disability benefits, is such that that machinery will certainly function so quickly as to have ready a completed program for universal military training before the time will be reached when the selectees need not serve more than 6 months?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly think that is the case. If we have any degree of good luck at all there is no reason why much of the machinery for this system should not be well along before the end of this session of the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. I greatly appreciate that expression on the part of the distinguished Senator, and I should like to ask one more question on an unrelated portion of the militay-manpower program. Perhaps I missed it, but I did not hear the Senator comment on that part of the Senate bill which related to the National Guard of the several States. Are we to understand that there is no change in the conference report from the provisions of the Senate bill relating to the National Guard?

Mr. RUSSELL. None whatever. Every protection thrown around the National Guard by the original Senate bill is retained in the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the conference report establish an age limit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it 18 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose a young man has not finished high school at that age; does he wait until he finishes high school?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. He is deferred.

Mr. FERGUSON. Until he finishes high school?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, or until he reaches the age of 20 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. So he cannot remain in high school longer than age 20 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think most boys ought to be able to finish high school by that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I wondered if there was a loophole there.

Mr. RUSSELL. We give them every opportunity to finish high school before they are called into service.

Mr. President, I hope that on tomorrow the report will be agreed to by the Senate and that it will then meet with favorable action on the part of the House of Representatives. I think, as I have stated, that it provides not only for the present emergency, but for a long-range military program. It will save money; but, more than that, in my opinion, it will save the lives of American youth. It will avoid again placing them in a position where it will be necessary to induct me immediately, taking them from their homes without proper training, and exposing them to enemy fire on some far-flung battlefront. It will put us in a posture of defense so that the whole world will know that we have a reserve program that will enable us within a few days—not a few months or a few years—to assemble an armed force able to function efficiently for the protection of our liberties and the discharge of our obligations as free people.

It has been said by many distinguished Americans, one of the most recent being Gen. Douglas MacArthur, that if we had had universal military training in this country it is altogether possible that World War I and World War II might have been avoided. We offer the report, Mr. President, in the hope that its adoption will avoid world war III or any other great catastrophe that might cause the whole world to be again on fire; but should these disasters come upon us, we feel that because of this program we will be better prepared to cope with them. It will save not only money, but American lives, will impose on us only a burden we are able to bear, and will contribute to the day of permanent and lasting peace on erth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to yield the floor. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is there not one more thing? If the universal military training measure becomes effective, will it avoid the sending back into service of men who served in a pevious war, thus taking them away from their families because we do not have sufficient number of trained youth?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would unless we were engaged in a world war of such proportions that it would be necessary to summon every bit of our manpower. It would certainly prevent it in such a situation as we have today.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would depend upon the size of the military force, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I have said, that we must have a force necessary to assure us victory.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to compliment the Senator from Georgia upon his excellent explanation of the conference report, and I particularly commend him for what he has had to say about universal military training. I think it is time the people of the United States realize that if we are going to have a lasting peace, we must have proper preparedness, with conditions as they are today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator, and I associate myself completely with his statement. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will lie on the table.

## DEDUCTIONS TO BE DRAWN FROM HEARINGS ON THE REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MacARTHUR

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the matter of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee which are currently under way has been discussed on the floor by a few Senators, I feel compelled to give certain views of my own, in brief summary, as to the correctness and reasonableness of deductions that can be drawn from the hearings to date. I do so at this time because apparently at least one phase of the hearings has been substantially concluded, namely, the military position and the military explanation of the administration in connection with the relief of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I think the record in broad measure should be brought up to date. I shall not attempt to document each and every occurrence by quotations from the record. That would necessitate the presentation of an interminable instrument. But I shall attempt to review what in my judgment has happened up to this time, and what the reasonable conclusions from the evidence should be.

Mr. President, for the past 5 weeks I have devoted most of my time in attendance at all the hearings of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, sitting jointly, relative to the summary recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the foreign policy of the United States in Korea and the Far East. I was tremendously impressed by General MacArthur's address to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. My opinion as to the soundness of the general's views was further strengthened by his 8 days of testimony before the committee. The record clearly shows that General MacArthur testified without any rancor toward anyone; that he was fully responsive to all questions; that he separated fact from opinion, and that he presented professional military views for attaining sound objectives in Korea which inspire me with confidence.

Senators from both sides of the aisle had unlimited opportunity to interrogate General MacArthur. In no instance was there any confusion in the information received as a result of such interrogation. There was no "policy vacuum" in General MacArthur's testimony.

Since the testimony of General MacArthur the administration has produced its official family of military stars—General Marshall, Secretary of Defense; General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Joint Chiefs of Staff themselves, General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army; General Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and Admiral Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations. And unless other reasons develop, it appears as though the military testimony of the administration is at an end.

I desire to recall for the RECORD that I moved, at the close of General Bradley's testimony, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff be requested to indicate in writing where they might disagree with the evidence given by their superiors. I anticipated that there would be no substantial disagreement in any major field by the Joint Chiefs of Staff with their superior, the Chairman, or with their superior, the Secretary of Defense, and I thought that repetitious testimony by the three Joint Chiefs of Staff, merely going over and restating what their superiors had already laid down as a line of testimony, would be a waste of the committee's time and of the Senate's time, and that we might well canvass it by trying to ascertain where their disagreement occurred, and questioning them on that point.

My motion was voted down by the committee, but I submit to any candid observer that the record of the past week and a half sustains my position. I believe that the Joint Chiefs, by their own statements and definitions as to the circumstances surrounding this affair, have been placed in an untenable position. I believe their testimony has been confused and confusing.

It is my conviction that when the Secretary of State takes the stand tomorrow, as I understand he will, we shall begin to get at the heart of the matter, and at the political maneuvers surrounding Asiatic policy.

Lest we allow the testimony of the past 20 days, however, through sheer weight to becloud the issue, I believe it essential at this time concisely to state those things which have been proved thus far.

First. The question: Why was General MacArthur recalled, or as some say, Why was he fired?

(A) According to the official military testimony, after the President had indicated an intent to relieve MacArthur, the Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded that General MacArthur was not in sympathy with the decisions to try to limit the conflict in Korea. This would make it difficult for him to carry out the Joint Chiefs of Staff's objectives. It was necessary

to have a commander more responsive to control from Washington.

It is to be noted, significantly, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not concluded in this manner prior to the time they learned that the President desired to relieve General MacArthur, and prior to April 5, 1951.

Apparently, then, MacArthur had violated something, some military instruction, directive or policy, but the Joint Chiefs have never been able in their testimony to agree fully as to just what, if any, violations clearly warranted the recall of MacArthur.

Moreover, someone unknown had to point out the military significance of this violation to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, because before April 5 the Joint Chiefs, by their universal testimony, never considered that there had been violations of any significance by General MacArthur which would warrant a consideration of his dismissal.

They have also universally testified that after the April 5 General MacArthur committed no acts which, in their opinion, would warrant his dismissal from a military standpoint. As I have tried to point out, and as others have tried to point out in the hearings, if their position is tenable or supportable, then they might well be accused of not performing their full function if conditions existed before the 5th of April which, in their opinion, would have warranted his relief, and they did not so recommend before the 5th of April. They all testified that they never considered the matter of his relief prior to the 5th of April. They made no recommendations prior to the 5th of April. They only concurred after the political heads of the Government had determined that MacArthur's political head was coming off as well as his military head.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it ever possible to determine where the original suggestion came from that the Joint Chiefs should consider this matter?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. That is one of the mysteries which often occurs. Men in important positions quite often can remember everything that seems to sustain their position, but often they are unable to remember matters which might not contribute to sustaining their position. In this case his memory failed General Bradley as to who made the very important telephone call to him on the 5th of April that General MacArthur was going to be relieved. It occurred to me that the proposed recall of General MacArthur would be a very important thing in our whole international and global policy. I presume that in the press of other business it slipped the witness' mind as to who had made this mysterious call. Perhaps it is explainable. Nevertheless, he is unable to recall who put in the call on this very important matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was it shown what department called General Bradley?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. The general cannot even remember what department called him; whether it came from the White House, from the Chief of Staff of the Army, or other source. He said the other day it might have come over the ticker.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator explain what is meant by "the ticker" so the RECORD will be clear? The Senator does not mean the UP, the AP, or the International News Service, does he?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know. The record is silent on that point. The record shows that it might have come over the ticker. Perhaps the committee was a little careless in not asking what kind of a ticker it was, but that is the way the record stands. I do not know whether it was a commercial newspaper teletype machine or otherwise. But the general's memory is faulty on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator have a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a further question along that line.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am wondering why the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would take it up with the respective members of the Chiefs of Staff organization if such a message came over a news ticker. How would that put in motion the stating of the proposal to the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that it is mysterious to me. I shall have to confess that perhaps there was some dereliction in not pursuing that question to its ultimate. However, we did pursue it with the general to the point of fatigue, I should say, in attempting to stimulate his memory by asking if it were this person or that person. The general could not remember. He could not remember whether it came from this department or that; and the record is left that he has an absence of memory as to that particular occasion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. At the time he originally brought up this question, in reply to a question as to when he first heard the suggestion as to the possible relief of General MacArthur, he stated that it came by telephone call.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It came from someone—someone he could not remember—over the telephone. That was his best memory at first. Later he said it might have come over the ticker.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was the next day, I think.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am a little confused on the matter myself.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe that the mention of the ticker was the next day. Does it seem probable that General Bradley would have summoned the Joint Chiefs of Staff into conference immediately, as he did, within 1 hour after the telephone call, or whatever it was which brought it to his attention, to consider whether or not they would concur in the relief of MacArthur, unless the call had come from a highly responsible authority? Is it conceivable that General Bradley would have plucked it out of the air, either from the ticker or from a casual telephone call? Is it conceivable that he would have called the Joint Chiefs of Staff together unless the call were from a highly responsible authority, presumably superior to him in the Government?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, it is inconceivable that General Bradley would have acted on an unsupported rumor reported by some person downtown in a casual telephone call to the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is inconceivable, is it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think reason would dictate—although I cannot state what the fact is, except that there is a lack of memory—that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would not call the Joint Chiefs of Staff together on the basis of an unsupported telephone call, the origin of which he cannot now remember, 2 or 3 months later.

Mr. BREWSTER. If it had been the President of the United States who had called him, does the Senator think there would have been any question that he would have recalled it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe he was asked if it was the White House or the President, and I believe he said that he could not recall.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question. I have a tentative understanding with the majority leader that I will not delay the recess of the Senate for a long time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not expect to detain the Senator. I merely wish to clarify the RECORD.

Does not the RECORD clearly show that after General Bradley testified on the first day when the question was taken up that he had received a telephone call but he did not remember who had called him, either that afternoon or the following day the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was closely questioned as to whether or not it was a fact that a log was kept of all telephone calls into the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and he stated, "That is correct, with the exception of the telephone calls which come from the White House. Of those no records are kept."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct, according to my memory. However, as to the statement that no logs of calls were kept with respect to the calls which come from the White House, I should want to check the RECORD to be sure whether or not General Bradley included in the same category calls from his superior, the Secretary of Defense. My memory is not clear on that point. I remember the statement about the White House. In that respect, the Senator from California is correct. In all other cases a log is kept of the calls, showing from whom they come.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment provides that the authority of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements is extended for 2 years from June 12, 1951, instead of 3 years, as provided by the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment deletes the prohibition contained in the House bill against participation by members, officers, and employees of the Tariff Commission in the making of decisions with respect to the proposed terms of any foreign trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement. The House recedes.

Amendment 3: This amendment is clerical. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: The House bill would have required the President within 90 days to withdraw or prevent the application of reduced tariffs or other concessions contained in any future trade agreement to imports from Communist areas of the world. The Senate amendment requires that such action be taken with respect to concessions made in past, as well as future, trade agreements, and requires that action be taken "as soon as practicable." Under the Senate amendment, the President would also have discretion merely to suspend, as well as to withdraw or prevent the application of, concessions. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: The House bill provided a procedure under which, upon the request of the President, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party, the Tariff Commission would make an investigation to determine whether any article upon which a concession had been granted in a trade agreement containing an escape clause is being imported under such relatively increased quantities, or under such conditions as to cause and threaten serious injury to a domestic industry, or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article. The Senate amendment requires that an escape clause be included in all future trade agreements, and directs the President as soon as practicable to insert an escape clause in all existing trade agreements. In this latter respect, the President is required to report to the Congress on the action taken by him. Under the Senate amendment the escape clause procedure can be initiated upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either House of Congress, or upon resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate, or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, upon application of any interested party, or by the Tariff Commission upon its own motion.

Under the House bill the investigation of the Tariff Commission was to determine whether an article is being imported under such relatively increased quantities, or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry, or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article.

The Senate amendment made it the responsibility of the Tariff Commission to make an investigation and report thereon within 1 year after application under the escape clause to determine whether an article is being imported into the United States in such relatively increased quantities (compared to a representative period prior to the concession) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. The House recedes with an amendment making it the responsibility of the Tariff Commission to determine whether any product upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

The Senate amendment also clarifies and spells out in greater detail the procedure to be followed by the Tariff Commission and the President in conducting an investigation and in taking recommended action.

Amendment No. 6: Section 8 of the House bill provided that no trade agreement concession should apply with respect to any agricultural commodity for which price support is available to producers in the United States, unless the domestic price of the imported article exceeds the price support level. In lieu of this provision, the Senate amendment prevents any trade agreement from being applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and requires the Tariff Commission and the President to act within 20 calendar days after report by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President and the Tariff Commission that a condition exists with respect to a perishable agricultural commodity requiring emergency treatment. The Tariff Commission is required to make an immediate investigation under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or under the escape clause procedure of this bill, but the President may take immediate action without awaiting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the maximum limitation upon the investigation and report of the Tariff Commission and the decision of the President at 25 days, with the understanding that it is not intended that action be delayed for this length of time, but that action be taken as expeditiously as practicable.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment, for which there was no corresponding provision in the House bill, restores the right of the domestic producer to appeal to a customs court if he feels that he is being injured by the incorrect classification of an imported article. This right had been terminated by the Trade Agreement Act of 1934 with respect to products covered in trade agreements. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment makes clear that enactment of the bill is not to be construed as approval or disapproval by the Congress of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This amendment adds a new section providing relief for the domestic fur industry by imposing a quota of 25 percent of the domestic production during the preceding year upon imports of mink, silver fox, and muskrat furs and skins, respectively. The House recedes with an amendment under which the President is required as soon as practicable to take such measures as may be necessary to prevent the importation of ermine, fox, kolinsky, marten, mink, muskrat, and weasel furs and skins, dressed or undressed, which are the product of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or of Communist China.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

## EXTENSION OF DRAFT AND UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following conference report on the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 535)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. The Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(a) Section 1 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Universal Military Training and Service Act."'

"(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active-duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand. The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year.'

"(c) Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.'

"(d) Section 4 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided*, That each registrant shall be immediately liable for classification and examination, and shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be so classified and examined, both physically and mentally, in order to de-

termine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces: *Provided further,* That any male alien who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceeding one year (other than an alien exempted from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States, except that any such alien shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces.

"'At such time as the period of active service in the Armed Forces required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title, and except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States who is required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, and every male alien admitted for permanent residence who is required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided,* That any male alien who is required to register under the provisions of this title and who has not reached the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceeding one year shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps except that any such alien shall be relieved from such training under this title if, prior to his induction into the National Security Training Corps he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: *Provided further,* That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of 19 years during the period of such deferment. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter provided such number of persons as may be required to further the purposes of this title.

"'No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or shall be inducted for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided,* That the minimum standards for physical acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945: *Provided further,* That the passing requirement for the Armed Forces Qualification Test shall be fixed at a percentile score of 10 points.

"'No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations for such persons as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury to be essential to the public and personal health.

"'The persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps or the United States Coast Guard, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

"'Every person inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to the authority of this subsection after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall, following his induction, be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no such person shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, appointed, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone), until he has had the equivalent of at least four months of basic training: *Provided,* That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining in violation of the provisions of this paragraph any person inducted into, or enlisted, appointed or ordered to active duty in, the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title.

"'No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

"'No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.'

"(e) Section 4 (b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title.'

"(f) Section 4 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the regular army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"'(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided,* That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further,* That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further,* That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"'(3) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"'(4) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"'(5) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, at such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.'

"(g) Section 4 (d) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word 'hereafter', where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words 'and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to

the Universal Military Training and Service Act', and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) Each person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component, for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force.'

"(h) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.

"(i) Paragraph (1) of section 4 (i) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word 'subsections' the following: '6 (g),' and (2) by striking out 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-four'.

"(j) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"'(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"'(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"'(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated, the period of active service in the Armed Forces of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of active service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for registration under this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of six months.

"'(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

"'(4) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be five years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of two years, one at the end of three years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of five years, after the date of enactment of this paragraph; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Members of the Commission, other than active members of the Regular components of the Armed Forces, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"'(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. The Commission shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission. The military department or departments so designated to carry out such military training shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps.

"'(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"'(7) Not later than four months following confirmation of the members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to—

"'(A) a broad outline for a program deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provisions of this Act shall be of a military nature, but nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to grant to the Commission the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;

"'(B) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

"'(C) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;

"'(D) measures deemed necessary to implement the policies and standards established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and

"'(E) disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted to or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

All legislative recommendations submitted under this paragraph shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services of the two Houses, and each of such committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in this paragraph are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to its House: *Provided*, That any bill or resolution reported with respect to such recommendations shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged.

"'(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

"'(A) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof, and measures providing for disability and death benefits have been enacted into law; and

"'(B) such other legislative recommendations as are provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been considered and such recommendations or any portion thereof shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law; and

"'(C) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth aniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"'(9) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the pre-

ceding six months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding six months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

"'(10) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: *Provided, however,* That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"'(11) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.'

"(k) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *And provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President: *And provided further,* That—

"'(1) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"'(2) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction.'

"(l) Section 6 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attaches of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President who are not citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted.'

"(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out 'the effective date of this title,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 1, 1951,'.

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words 'six months' a comma and the words 'prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction,'.

"(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'subsection (b)' a comma and the following: 'paragraph (1) of this subsection,'.

"(n) Section 6 (d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidates training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons, except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service, shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"'(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"'(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.'

"(o) Section 6 (h) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an Office (other than an Office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided,* That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further,* That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone, except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States or undergoing training in the National Security Training Corps shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office

of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government.'

"(p) Section 6 (i) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) (1) Any person who is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"'(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided,* That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of such Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.'

"(q) Section 6 (j) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words 'be deferred' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'in lieu of such induction, be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title', and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words 'he shall be deferred' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'he shall in lieu of such induction be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title'.

"(r) Section 7 of such Act is repealed.

"(s) Section 9 (g) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"'(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"'(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated.'

"(t) Section 13 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Nothing in sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. title 5, sec. 99), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections, or as a member of the National Selective Service Appeal Board.'

"(u) Section 10 of such Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: 'There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States and within each territory and possession of the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President.'; and (2) by adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"'(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments.'

"(v) Section 16 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out the word 'and' and inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following words: 'and Guam'.

"(w) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"'(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1955, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist.'

"(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'July 9, 1951,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953,', (2) by striking out 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-four', and (3) by adding the following at the end thereof: 'Unless he is sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned, any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon completion of 17 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress: *Provided,* That the foregoing shall not apply to any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve ordered to active duty whose rating or specialty is found by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be critical and whose release to inactive duty prior to the period for which he was ordered to active duty would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953' and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: 'No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act.'

"(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953'.

"SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"'That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2, title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.

"'SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of five million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this Act.'

"SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for an category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

"SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations as he may deem to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association who knowingly violates the regulations which may be made hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

"SEC. 7. This title may be cited as the '1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.'

"TITLE II

"SEC. 21. The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army,' approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by (1) striking out the words 'until June 30, 1953' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'until June 30, 1955', and (2) striking out the words 'two thousand five hundred' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'twelve thousand five hundred'."

And the House agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
By R. B. R.
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

DRAFTING OF MEN FOR SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

*1. Termination of authority to draft men into the Armed Forces*

The authority to induct men into the Armed Forces has been extended for 4 years, to terminate on July 1, 1955.

The House amendment extended the authority to induct men into the Armed Forces until July 1, 1954. The Senate bill contained no termination date on this authority.

*2. Period of service*

The period of service for persons inducted into the Armed Forces will be 24 months, an increase of 3 months over the present period of service.

The House amendment provided for a period of service of 26 months; the Senate bill provided for a period of service of 24 months. The House managers accepted the Senate version.

*3. Registration*

All male citizens of the United States and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States between the ages of 18 and 26 are required to register. Classification for induction purposes will take place as soon as practicable following registration. Technical changes were required in connection with the registration section to make it coincide with the new provisions applicable to aliens. The Senate managers accepted the House language with respect to classifying male registrants for induction purposes as soon as practicable following registration.

*4. Draft age*

The draft age has been reduced from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months for all male citizens of the United States and all other male persons admitted to the United States for permanent residence. All other persons who remain in the United States in a status other than that of permanent residents for a period exceeding 1 year, except those exempt from registration, shall be liable for training and service. Persons admitted to the United States other than as permanent residents who remain in the United States for more than 1 year may request release from training and service, but such a request will debar them from citizenship.

No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces below the age of 19 by any local board so long as there are available within that local board eligible males between the ages of 19 through 25.

The Senate bill would have permitted the induction of men at the age of 18 provided there were not available within local boards men between the ages of 19 through 25. The Senate managers accepted the age for induction into the Armed Forces contained in the House amendment.

*5. Reduction of physical and mental standards*

The physical standards for induction will be those that prevailed in January of 1945; the mental standards will be established on the basis of a percentile score of 10 which corresponds to the previously used General Classification Test of 65. The new mental standards are a reduction of 3 from the present percentile score of 13 and corresponds to a reduction of 5 points from the previous standard of 70 heretofore established by law as a minimum General Classification Test score for induction.

The House amendment reduced the physical and mental standards to those that prevailed in January of 1945, which would have resulted in a General Classification Test score of approximately 40. The Senate bill contained no similar language. The agreement reached by the conferees should result in the reclassification for induction purposes of approximately 150,000 men who have heretofore been, or would shortly be, classified as IV–F.

*6. Ceiling on the Armed Forces*

Until July 31, 1954, the active duty strength of the Armed Forces shall not exceed more than 5,000,000 persons at any one time.

The House bill contained no limitation on the size of the Armed Forces. The Senate bill contained a 4,000,000-man ceiling.

*7. Total obligated service*

All persons entering the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps after the proposed legislation is enacted will be required to serve a total obligated period of service of 8 years. This requirement applies to all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces, or inducted into the National Security Training Corps. The total period of obligated service includes active duty, training duty in the National Security Training Corps, and active or inactive service in the reserve components.

The House amendment provided for a total obligated period of 6 years retroactive to persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed since June 25, 1950.

The Senate bill required a total obligated service of 8 years for all persons appointed, enlisted, or inducted after the proposed legislation was enacted. The House accepted the Senate provision.

*8. Active duty for reservists*

All reservists and retired personnel now or hereafter ordered to active duty may be required to serve 24 months. The authority of the President to order reservists and retired personnel to active duty is extended until July 1, 1953.

The House amendment limited the period of service to 21 months. The Senate bill contained the language set forth in the conference report. The House managers accepted the Senate provision.

*9. Release of reservists*

Unless sooner released under regulations prescribed by the respective Secretaries, any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served for a period of 12 months or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, shall, upon application, be released to inactive duty after he has completed 17 months of active duty including the time spent on active duty since June 25, 1950. Such persons shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty, without their consent, for a period in excess of 30 days, except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress. However, reservists found by the military departments concerned to possess a rating or specialty which is critical may be retained for the period for which they are ordered to active duty if their release prior to the completion of such period of time would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned.

This provision applies to officers and enlisted personnel.

The House amended provided for the release of veteran reservists ordered to active duty from the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve for those who served 90 days or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or for those who had served 12 months or more between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, after 12 months of active duty since June 25, 1950, upon application. The Senate bill contained no similar language. The language "unless sooner released" contained in the provision agreed

to by the managers is to emphasize and assure that the 17-month period shall not be construed as a minimum period for which such reservists will be held. Present plans call for the release of many thousands of reservists prior to the completion of 17 months of service, and the language of the conference report is not intended to replace any plans for earlier releases.

*10. Deferment of students*

High school students will be deferred until they graduate from high school or attain the age of 20.

College students may be deferred until they complete their academic year but if they are deferred to complete an academic year they may not thereafter be deferred by statute to complete an academic year. No local board may be required to defer any college student based upon a Government-sponsored test score or upon the student's class standing.

This is identical with the House amendment.

*11. Overseas assignment*

Every person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be given a period of not less than 4 months of training and may not be assigned for duty in any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, until after this 4-month period has elapsed. In addition, no other member of the Armed Forces who is enlisted, appointed, inducted, or ordered to active duty shall be assigned to duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, until he has had the equivalent of 4 months of basic training.

The House amendment was confined only to persons inducted into the Armed Forces and required 4 months' training within the United States, its Territories, or possessions. In addition, the House amendment provided that no person inducted into the Armed Forces should be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction.

The Senate bill provided that inductees would be given 4 months' basic training and not be permanently assigned to duty outside the United States during this period, and further provided that no other member of the Armed Forces would be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he had had at least 4 months of basic training.

The House and Senate managers agreed to the provision heretofore described which requires that all persons inducted into the Armed Forces be given 4 months' basic training and that no member of the Armed Forces shall be assigned to duty outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions until such persons have had the equivalent of 4 months' basic training.

*12. Enlistment in the Regular Army*

Men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 24 months and may not have their enlistments involuntarily extended except in time of war or national emergency. The Senate bill contained no comparable language and the Senate managers accepted the House language.

*13. Extension of voluntary enlistments*

The authority to involuntarily extend enlistments in the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces is extended until July 1, 1953. Thus, all enlistments which expire after July 9, 1951, may be extended by the President for 12 months, but no person shall have his enlistment extended more than once. Existing law extends all such enlistments which expire between July 27, 1950, and July 9, 1951.

The House amendment extended this authority until July 1, 1952; the Senate bill until July 1, 1953. The House managers accepted the Senate language.

*14. Aliens*

All aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall be immediately liable for induction into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps under the same conditions applicable to citizens. Aliens admitted to the United States, other than as permanent residents, who remain in the United States for 1 year or more shall be liable for induction unless they request release from service. In the event that such persons request release from service, they will be debarred from citizenship.

With certain technical corrections, the provision in the conference report is that which was contained in the House amendment. There was no comparable language in the Senate bill and the Senate accepted the House language.

*15. Conscientious objectors*

Persons who are found by local boards to be opposed to noncombatant service shall be ordered by their local boards, subject to regulations prescribed by the President, to perform civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest for a period of 24 months. A conscientious objector's refusal to perform such work will subject him to the penalties of the Selective Service Act.

The House amendment merely deferred such persons. The Senate bill required such persons to be assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction.

The House managers objected to this portion of the Senate bill since it contemplated the establishment of national work camps. The language agreed to by the House and Senate conferees will permit the President to prescribe the types of employment to which conscientious objectors may be assigned, but such employment will not be performed through the establishment of, or assignment to, national work camps.

*16. Deferment of certain persons whose occupation is necessary for the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest*

The President is authorized under such regulations and rules as he may prescribe to provide for the deferment from training and service or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

The House amendment gave the President the authority to defer persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors was found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

The Senate bill left unchanged the present law which authorizes such deferments for persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors was found to be necessary for the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The House and Senate managers agreed to the language above-described which includes those persons whose endeavors were named in the House amendment and, in addition, added veterinarians, pharmacists, and chiropodists.

*17. Control over the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in, beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors*

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations as he deems appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in, alcoholic beverages to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near a camp, station, post, or other places primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person who knowingly violates such regulations may be punished by a fine of $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 12 months or punished under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The language agreed upon by the conferees is substantially the language contained in the House amendment. There was no comparable amendment in the Senate bill.

*18. Continued liability for induction of persons now or hereafter deferred*

Persons now or hereafter deferred from induction will remain liable for induction into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps until they attain the age of 35. This language was contained in the House amendment and was accepted by the Senate managers.

There was no comparable language in the Senate bill.

*19. Suspending or terminating inductions into the Armed Forces*

The House amendment provided that the Congress by concurrent resolution could terminate or suspend all inductions into the Armed Forces. The Senate bill contained no comparable language.

The House managers receded from their insistence upon this provision and agreed to eliminate it from the conference report.

*20. 75,000 students*

The Senate bill provided for the selection from among persons who had completed their basic training of 75,000 students during the next 3 years. Such students were to have the remainder of their military obligation suspended until they completed the studies and research for which they were selected and there was authority in the Senate bill to provide for the payment of the cost of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of such persons to the extent they were unable to defray.

The House amendment contained no similar language.

The Senate agreed to recede from their insistence upon this provision and therefore the conference report contains no provision with respect to such students.

*21. Enlistment of aliens*

The Senate bill amended the act of June 30, 1950, in such a way as to permit the enlistment in the Regular Army of 25,000 aliens per year for a period of not less than 5 years.

The act of June 30, 1950, permitted the enlistment in the Regular Army until June 30, 1953, of not more than a total of 2,500 aliens.

The House amendment contained no similar language. The House and Senate managers agreed to the provision which permits the enlistment in the Regular Army, until June 30, 1955, of not more than a total of 12,500 aliens.

*22. Women in the Armed Forces*

Until July 31, 1954, the present 2 percent limitation of the number of women in the Armed Forces will be suspended.

The Senate amended the act of August 3, 1950, so as to suspend the present 2 percent limitation on the number of women that may be in the Armed Forces until July 31, 1954.

The House amendment contained no similar language. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

*23. Authorized strength*

The authorized strength for the Armed Forces is now suspended until July 31, 1954. The conference report, however, fixes the

strength of the Armed Forces at 837,000 for the Army of the United States, 666,832 for the Navy, including the Marine Corps, and 502,000 for the Air Force of the United States. This is substantially a reenactment of existing law (sec. 2, Selective Service Act of 1948) except for the elimination from present law of all references to the number of authorized 1-year enlistees.

The Senate bill repealed outright the present law with respect to the limitation on the authorized strength of the Armed Forces now contained in the Selective Service Act.

The House amendment did not amend the present law with respect to authorized strength now contained in the Selective Service Act. The House and Senate managers agreed to continue the present statutory limitation on the size of the Armed Forces, suspended until July 31, 1954, but eliminated references to the authorized number of 1-year enlistees in view of the fact that the authority for such enlistments will be repealed by the conference report. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment repealed the authority for 1-year enlistments.

*24. Reemployment rights*

The House amendment, among other things, required persons discharged, following military service, to be restored to the same position held at the time of entering service. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The House agreed to accept the Senate language in view of the numerous difficulties involved in attempting to require employers to restore returning service personnel to the same position they held prior to entering the service. Existing law permits returning service personnel to be restored to the same position previously held or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

*25. Communicating with Members of Congress*

The House amendment provided that no member of the Armed Forces would be restricted from communicating with any Member of Congress. The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The Senate accepted the House language.

*26. Authority to induct physicians and dentists*

The House amendment provided that no physician or dentist engaged in full-time employment at a Veterans' Administration hospital would be inducted, under the provisions of law authorizing the induction of physicians and dentists, after such physician or dentist attained his thirtieth birthday.

The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The House receded from its position and agreed to the elimination of the provision from the conference report.

*27. Appeal boards*

The House amendment provided that there would not be less than one selective service appeal board located in the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States. The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The Senate accepted the House provision.

*28. Reserve deferment appeal boards*

The House amendment authorized the President to prescribe rules and regulations for the deferment of members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve, and authorized the President to establish civilian Reserve deferment appeal boards. Members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve whose claim for deferment was denied would have been given the authority to have appealed their case to a civilian deferment appeal board.

The Senate bill contained no comparable language and the House managers agreed to recede from their insistence upon this provision.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

*1. Establishment of Commission and National Security Training Corps*

The conference report provides for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members. Three members shall be civilians and two shall be active or retired members of the regular components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party.

The Chairman of the Commission must be a civilian. At such time as the Commission is appointed, a National Security Training Corps is established.

The Senate bill provided for the establishment of a five-man Commission to be composed of three civilians and two active or retired members of the regular components. The House amendment provided for a five-man commission to which not more than three could be of the same political party. Three members had to be civilians, one member an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, and the remaining member of the Commission a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided for the establishment of a National Security Training Corps at the time the Commission was appointed.

*2. Compensation for Commission*

The conference report provides for a term of years for members of the Commission and provides for a per diem of $50 to be paid to members of the Commission while engaged in the business of the Commission.

This is similar to the House amendment.

There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

*3. General authority of Commission*

The conference report provides that the Commission, subject to the direction of the President, shall exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps and further provides that such training shall be basic military training. It authorizes the Commission to establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the Corps as are necessary to carry out the objectives of the act. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to designate the military departments to carry out the training. The military departments so designated shall carry out the military training in accordance with the policies and standards established by the Commission. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, the military departments shall determine the type or types of military training to be given to the members of the National Security Training Corps.

The House amendment provided that the Commission should direct and control the policies of the National Security Training Corps and further provided that the Commission would issue "directives" to the military departments designated to carry out the military training.

The Senate bill provided that the Commission would, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training of members of the Corps as were necessary to carry out the objectives of the act, and, subject to the direction of the President, would designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. The departments and agencies so designated were to carry out the training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

In view of the fact that the House amendment did not contemplate that the Commission would act as an operating agency, the House managers agreed to the language contained in the conference report which grants to the Commission the authority to exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps.

The House amendment provided that, subject to the direction of the President and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission would designate the military departments to carry out the training. Since basic military training, as such, is a military matter, the House managers agreed to the language contained in the conference report which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to designate the military departments to carry out the training.

*4. Legislative recommendations*

Not later than 4 months following the confirmation of members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to, a broad outline deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provision of the proposed legislation will be of a military nature.

There is a specific provision in the conference report, however, stating that the Commission shall not have the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of training to be given members of the Corps. Thus the legislative recommendations will contain language which will grant the Commission authority to assure that the training carried out shall be of a military nature but the Commission will not submit legislative recommendations prescribing the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps.

In addition, the conference report provides that legislative recommendations with respect to a code of conduct, disability and death benefits, and other benefits and obligations and measures deemed necessary to implement any policies and standards established by the Commission shall be submitted by the Commission for legislative action.

As contained in the original House amendment the recommendations must be referred to both Committees on Armed Services and both committees, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of Congress following the date on which the recommendations are submitted to the Congress, must report thereon to their respective Houses. As continued in the original House amendment, any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged.

The House amendment provided for the Commission to submit its legislative recommendations not later than 6 months following its confirmation. The House amendment further provided that the legislative recommendations would include a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the obligations of the act, including the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps and measures for utilizing existing schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable. In view of the fact, as previously stated, that the original House amendment did not contemplate that the Commission would act as an operating agency, the House managers receded from their insistence that the Commission recommend to the Congress the types of basic military training to be given members of the Corps as well as a program of initial military training. The Senate bill contained no comparable language.

*5. Induction into the National Security Training Corps*

The conference report provides that no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after (1) a code of conduct has been enacted and measures provided for disability and death benefits have been enacted into law, (2) that the other legislative recommendations submitted by the Commission have been considered and such recommendations or any portion thereof shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law, and (3) the period of service required of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or by the adoption of a concurrent resolution by the Congress.

Thus, the Congress will have an opportunity to consider and amend all of the recommendations submitted by the Commission, and no person can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until this has taken place.

The House amendment provided similar language as contained in the conference report but required that all legislative recommendations be enacted with or without amendments into law. The House managers recognized the fact that the two most important features of a universal military training program involve a code of conduct and the death and disability benefits to be granted to the members of the Corps, along with provisions dealing with the health, safety, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps. Thus, the House managers receded from their insistence upon the House amendment which required action on all legislative recommendations submitted, and agreed to the conference report which requires the enactment into law of a code of conduct and death and disability benefits and the consideration of all of the remaining recommendations submitted, followed by the enactment of any portion determined by the Congress to be desirable. It should be observed that the House amendment also provided that no person should be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until the period of service of persons under the age of 19 had been eliminated. To permit a more orderly initiation of universal military training and the gradual elimination of induction into the Armed Forces, the conference report permits induction into the National Security Training Corps, following the enactment of a code of conduct, death and disability benefits, and the consideration of the remaining recommendations and the enactment of any portion thereof, at such time as the period of service for persons under the age of 19 has been reduced or eliminated.

There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

*6. Pay of members of the National Security Training Corps*

Both the House and Senate bills provided that members of the National Security Training Corps would be paid $30 per month but that their dependents would be entitled to the benefits of the Dependents Assistance Act. This provision is contained in the conference report.

*7. Period of service*

The conference report provides that persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be trained for a period of 6 months. This was contained in the House amendment. The Senate bill provided that persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps would be trained for a period of not less than 4 months. The Senate conferees accepted the House language.

*8. Age of induction*

At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized, all persons thereafter registered who have not been inducted into the Armed Forces and who have not attained their nineteenth birthday shall be liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps. Since men are required to register at the age of 18, this will permit the induction of men into the National Security Training Corps after they have attained their eitghteenth birthday. There will probably be an average period of approximately 3 months elapse between registration, classification, and induction.

The House amendment provided for induction into the National Security Training Corps at the age of 18 years and 6 months. The Senate bill provided for induction into the National Security Training Corps at the age of 18. The House accepted the Senate language in this respect.

*9. Initiating induction into the National Security Training Corps*

Induction into the National Security Training Corps may take place after (1) a code of conduct has been enacted, (2) death and disability benefits for members of the Corps have been enacted, (3) the other legislative recommendations submitted by the Commission have been considered and any portion thereof have been enacted into law, and (4) at such time as the President or the Congress by the adoption of a concurrent resolution has reduced or eliminated the period of service required of persons who have not attained the anniversary of their nineteenth birthday.

Persons who are deferred for any of the reasons provided in the proposed legislation shall not be exempt from their liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps merely because they have passed their nineteenth birthday.

This is comparable to the House amendment except for the addition of the words "or reduced" which, as previously indicated, permits an orderly phasing of universal military training and the reduction or elimination of induction into the Armed Forces for men below the age of 19.

*10. Overseas assignment of members of the National Security Training Corps*

No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps may be assigned for training at any installation outside the continental United States except that residents of the Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.

*11. Terminating inductions into the National Security Training Corps by concurrent resolution*

The House amendment provided that induction into the National Security Training Corps could be terminated by the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution to this effect.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

Since the duration of universal military training will properly be a question for consideration when the Commission submits its recommendations to the Congress, the House managers receded from their insistence on this provision, and it is thus not contained in the conference report.

MISCELLANEOUS

There are other technical changes contained in the conference report which do not affect the substance of the proposed legislation.

Two other minor changes involve the deferment of missionaries who are also physicians and adding Guam to the definition of the words "United States".

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and amazed to see that Price Stabilizer DiSalle, perhaps with administration support, is advocating that all businesses in America be licensed. It would be interesting to know who thought up this scheme and to know what use would be made of such unprecedented plenary power of life and death over American business. Through the Defense Production Act, Congress has sought to restrain inflation. Apparently the Defense Mobilization organization is trying to control everything but inflation.

Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston and Price Stabilizer DiSalle would control all segments of American economy except organized labor. They would place a bridle on all bosses except the labor bosses. Ninety percent of the cost of most of the things we buy is labor cost. Obviously, there is no such thing as controlling inflation and holding down prices by restraints on the 10 percent and no restraints placed on the 90 percent.

Mr. Speaker, unless the Office of Defense Mobilization is going to do an honest, fair, across-the-board job of restraining price and wage increases, then we ought to abolish the whole outfit and let nature take its course.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention at this time to a problem involving a shortage of agricultural labor that will be facing the cotton producers of this Nation, particularly those in the area in which I reside, unless

this Congress takes some action on a bill introduced and approved by the House Committee on Agriculture which will facilitate the procurement of Mexican labor. At the time this bill was introduced it was estimated that in Missouri alone we would need some five to six thousand Mexican laborers to supplement the domestic labor available to help harvest our cotton crop.

Our people in that section of the country have met the request of the Department of Agriculture by planting sufficient acreage to meet the production goals set by Secretary Brannan. In the past we have relied upon this Mexican labor. We had hoped we would have the opportunity to get this labor next fall.

I am particularly familiar with the situation in the Tenth Missouri District which in the past has produced cotton crops exceeding a half million bales, and in the adjoining First District of Arkansas, which is so ably represented by my good friend the Hon. E. C. "Took" GATHINGS, who has been one of the leaders in sponsoring and supporting this legislation.

I have a report in the form of a letter from the division of employment, State of Missouri, which has conducted a survey. They say that in my district alone we will need approximately 10,000 Mexican laborers if we are to harvest the cotton crop which has been planted. We are facing a serious problem there and I certainly hope that the Committee on Rules will grant a rule on this bill very shortly.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the acting majority leader what the program will be for the coming week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the program for the week of June 4 will be as follows:

On Monday bills on the Consent Calendar will be called and House Concurrent Resolution 57, a resolution expressing friendship of the American people for the people of the world, will be brought up under suspension of the rules.

On that day also, which is District of Columbia day, the bill H. R. 4141, the District of Columbia crime bill, will be brought up for consideration.

On Tuesday, bills on the Private Calendar will be called and also the bill H. R. 314, the Booker T. Washington Veterans' Hospital bill, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday the House will consider the District of Columbia appropriation bill of 1952.

On Thursday the conference report on S. 1, the UMT bill, and H. R. 1179, authorizing research facilities, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Friday is undetermined, and any other program will be announced later.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman advise whether or not it is the intent or purpose to bring up any other conference report next week, such as reciprocal trade, or the India wheat bill, if the confeees come to an agreement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The House will be given due notice as to when additional conference reports will be brought up.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

TAXATION

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have presented to it a tax bill for about $7,000,000,000 of additional revenue. About that same time the President will present a request for further spending in loans and grants to foreign countries for about eight and one-half to nine billion dollars. I rise to ask the question, How in the world can the Congress impose taxes as fast as the Administration can spend? In my insertions in the RECORD today I commend to you an editorial appearing in the Omaha World-Herald and an article from Newsweek by Raymond Moley. It is doubtful if either this tax bill or this alleged aid bill are in the interest of liberty and freedom, in the light of their effect on our domestic economy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an exchange of correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INADEQUACY OF INFORMATION ON PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan has no idea how many farmers or producers actually received payments from the Federal Government under the price-support program covering potatoes, eggs, butter, dried beans, and rice. As a result, he is, of course, not able to say whether most of the funds were paid out to a few large producers or whether they were widely distributed among many small producers. He apparently has no classification to show a breakdown of the number who received, for instance, over $100,000, the number between fifty and one hundred thousand dollars, or the number under $350.

Yet, the realized losses, suffered by the taxpayers and wage earners of this country, under the price-support program for the last two fiscal years and the first 9 months of the present fiscal year, amount to—

| | |
|---|---|
| Potatoes | $321,360,270 |
| Eggs | 102,951,079 |
| Butter | 44,449,535 |
| Dried beans | 9,715,897 |
| Rice | 1,157,506 |

This amounts to a total on these five commodities of the staggering sum of $479,634,287.

This inadequacy of information was revealed through a recent exchange of correspondence with the Secretary. Attached hereto is a copy of my letter and the reply from Under Secretary McCormick.

With the huge statistical staff maintained in the Agriculture Department, it amazes me that the basic information which I requested cannot be made available. I can think of nothing more important both for legislators and the general public to know about the price-support program than the number of those who are receiving benefits and how widely spread those benefits are.

I hope that other Members of Congres will join with me in urging that appropriate steps be taken to make available this essential information about where and to whom these large sums are paid, which have to be extracted from pay envelopes, Federal sales taxes, and other sources of revenue. This is fundamental information which we should certainly have before us when we contemplate further action to impose still greater tax burdens on our people.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., Apil 30, 1951.*

The Honorable CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
*The Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It would be appreciated if you would furnish me a tabulation showing the information listed below with reference to the following 10 commodities: (1) Oranges, (2) prunes, (3) soybeans, (4) dried beans, (5) green beans, (6) rice, (7) eggs, (8) Irish potatoes, (9) sweetpotatoes, (10) butterfat.

How much money was spent to support the price of each of the above in 1949? In 1950? Either fiscal or calendar year would be satisfactory, whichever way your records are kept.

How many farmers or producers actually received payments for each of the above commodities under the price-support program?

I am not familiar with the manner in which you keep your records indicating how many of the producers of each of the above items received sums of varying amounts. In whatever manner would be most convenient, I would like to be furnished with the information as to how many of these producers of each item fall into the various classifications which you maintain showing the size of the payments.

I would be grateful if I might have this information at your earliest convenience.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

---

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, May 14, 1951.*

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. KEATING: This refers to your letter of April 30, 1951, in which you request information concerning the amounts of money which have been spent in supporting the price of certain commodities during 1949 and 1950. In this regard, we offer the following explanation of the material herewith enclosed.

The price-support operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation are conducted by means of loans on, the negotiation of agreements for the purchase of, or the direct purchase of agricultural commodities at announced support levels. The amount loaned or the price paid in purchasing the com-

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued June 4, 1951
For actions of June 1, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 97

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....3
Appropriations.....7,8
Buildings and grounds.....8
C.C.C.....8
Civil defense.....8
Claims.....8
Crop insurance.....4
Defense production.....8
Education.....8
Electrification.....7
Foreign affairs, aid....2,6
Forests and forestry....8
Information.....8
Military training.....1
Personnel.....5,8
Strategic materials.....8

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on military-training bill. Sen. Butler, Nebr., criticized foreign-aid program.

## SENATE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1, the military training and service bill (pp. 6179-82).

2. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Butler, Nebr., criticized the President's recently submitted foreign-aid program (pp. 6182-4).

3. RECESSED until Mon., June 4 (p. 6184).

## HOUSE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Mon., June 4.

## ITEMS IN APPENDIX

4. CROP INSURANCE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Elliott, Ala., commending the crop insurance program and favoring its expansion, and including a Progressive Farmer editorial, "Crop Insurance: Our Next Great Forward Step" (pp. A3367-8).

5. PERSONNEL. Sen. Johnston inserted his recent address at a Bureau of Animal Industry dinner discussing the increase in Federal employment since June 1950 (p. A3361).

6. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Kilgore inserted Griffin Bancroft's recent radio speech discussing and commending the point-4 program to provide aid to economically underdeveloped areas of the world (p. A3368).

## BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

7. FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951. H. R. 3842, which provides funds for the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission and includes a provision for $3,672,000 for additional construction at Bonneville Dam to increase the output of electric power. Approved May 31, 1950 (Public Law 43, 82nd Cong.).

8. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951. H. R. 3587, which includes the following items: Forest development roads and trails, $3,300,000; CCC administrative-expense limitation, increase of $2,750,000; expenses of defense production, $27,331,895, with a provision that "transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporation as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realine its regular programs"; Tongass forest highways Alaska, $3,500,000; international information and educational activities, State Department, $9,533,939; surveys and school construction in critical defense areas $50,000,000; Bureau of Employees' Compensation fund, $3,000,000; reactivation of industrial plants for strategic and critical materials, provision to make available $12,000,000 additional; provision that GSA appropriations for 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and improvements to public buildings under GSA control; engineering and economic investigations for Niagara River remedial works, $450,000, to be transferred from Army flood-control funds; international children's welfare work under the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, $5,750,000; Federal Civil Defense Administration, various items; various judgments and claims items; provision to prohibit assistance to countries which ship military commodities in contravention of U. S. Security Council policy; and the general provision prohibiting employment of members of organizations which assert the right of Federal employees to strike against the Government. Approved June 2, 1951.

oOo

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for June 4: S. Agriculture, farm-tenant and disaster loans (ex.); S. Appropriations, Interior, State-Justice-Commerce, and Labor-Federal Security appropriations (ex.); S. Banking and Currency, Defense Production Act amendments; H. Banking and Currency, Defense Production Act amendments; H. Education and Labor, wage stabilization. For June 6 and 7, Select Committee to Investigate Use of Chemicals in Food Products, resume hearings on stilbestrol.

oOo

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105 Adm.

- oOo -

82D CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 535

# UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

May 31, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

## CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 1]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

### *TITLE I*

*SECTION 1. The Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended as follows:*

*(a) Section 1 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'."*

*(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active-duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand.*

*The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year."*

*(c) Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder."*

*(d) Section 4 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States: Provided, That each registrant shall be immediately liable for classification and examination, and shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be so classified and examined, both physically and mentally, in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces: Provided further, That any male alien who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceeding one year (other than an alien exempted from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States, except that any such alien shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces.*

*"At such time as the period of active service in the Armed Forces required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title, and except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States who is required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, and every male alien admitted for permanent residence who is*

*required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps: Provided, That any male alien who is required to register under the provisions of this title and who has not reached the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceeding one year shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps except that any such alien shall be relieved from such training under this title if, prior to his induction into the National Security Training Corps he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: Provided further, That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of 19 years during the period of such deferment. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter provided such number of persons as may be required to further the purposes of this title.*

*"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or shall be inducted for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: Provided, That the minimum standards for physical acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945: Provided further, That the passing requirement for the Armed Forces Qualification Test shall be fixed at a percentile score of 10 points.*

*"No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations for such persons as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury to be essential to the public and personal health.*

*"The persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps or the United States Coast Guard, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.*

*"Every person inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to the authority of this subsection after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall, following his*

*induction, be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no such person shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, appointed, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone), until he has had the equivalent of at least four months of basic training: Provided, That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining in violation of the provisions of this paragraph any person inducted into, or enlisted, appointed, or ordered to active duty in, the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title.*

*"No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.*

*"No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."*

*(e) Section 4 (b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."*

*(f) Section 4 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(c) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the regular army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: Provided, That, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.*

*"(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: Provided, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: Provided further, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: And provided further, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induc-*

*tion under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.*

*"(3) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.*

*"(4) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).*

*"(5) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, at such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."*

*(g) Section 4 (d) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:*

*"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component, for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall*

*be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force."*

*(h) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.*

*(i) Paragraph (1) of section 4 (i) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "subsections" the following: "6 (g)," and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four".*

*(j) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:*

*"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.*

*"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—*

*"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or*

*"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated, the period of active service in the Armed Forces of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of active service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for registration under this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of six months.*

*"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judically noted. At such time as the Commission shall be*

*appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.*

*"(4) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be five years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of two years, one at the end of three years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of five years, after the date of enactment of this paragraph; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Members of the Commission, other than active members of the Regular components of the Armed Forces, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.*

*"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. The Commission shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission. The military department or departments so designated to carry out such military training shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps.*

*"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.*

*"(7) Not later than four months following confirmation of the members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to—*

*"(A) a broad outline for a program deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provisions of this Act shall be of a military nature, but nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to grant to the Commission the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;*

*"(B) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;*

*"(C) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;*

*"(D) measures deemed necessary to implement the policies and standards established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and*

"(E) disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted to or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

All legislative recommendations submitted under this paragraph shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services of the two Houses, and each of such committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in this paragraph are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to its House: Provided, That any bill or resolution reported with respect to such recommendations shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged.

"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

"(A) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof, and measures providing for disability and death benefits have been enacted into law; and

"(B) such other legislative recommendations as are provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been considered and such recommendations or any portion thereof shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law; and

"(C) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(9) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding **six** months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding six months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

"(10) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: Provided, however, That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"(11) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(k) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": And provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President: And provided further, That—

"(1) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(2) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(l) Section 6 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attaches of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President who are not citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted."

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Section 6 (d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons, except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service, shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(o) Section 6 (h) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an Office (other than an Office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental,

*veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: Provided, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: Provided further, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone, except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States or undergoing training in the National Security Training Corps shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government."*

*(p) Section 6 (i) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(i) (1) Any person who is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning shall,*

*upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.*

*"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: Provided, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of such Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."*

*(q) Section 6 (j) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title", and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title".*

*(r) Section 7 of such Act is repealed.*

*(s) Section 9 (g) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.*

*"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness),*

*whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.*

*"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application or reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."*

*(t) Section 13 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"(a) Nothing in sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. title 5, sec. 99), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections, or as a member of the National Selective Service Appeal Board."*

*(u) Section 10 of such Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States and within each territory and possession of the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President."; and (2) by adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:*

*"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."*

*(v) Section 16 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out the word "and" and inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following words: "and Guam".*

*(w) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:*

*"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.*

*"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission*

*shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.*

*"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1955, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist."*

*(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four", and (3) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Unless he is sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned, any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon completion of 17 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress: Provided, That the foregoing shall not apply to any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve ordered to active duty whose rating or specialty is found by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be critical and whose release to inactive duty prior to the period for which he was ordered to active duty would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned."*

*SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pusuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act."*

*(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953".*

*SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:*

*"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2, title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954.*

*"SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of five million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this Act."*

*SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.*

*SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.*

*SEC. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations as he may deem to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association who knowingly violates the regulations which may be made hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.*

*SEC. 7. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".*

## *TITLE II*

*SEC. 21. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by (1) striking out the words "until June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1955", and (2) striking out the words "two thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twelve thousand five hundred".*

And the House agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
By R. B. R.
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

### DRAFTING OF MEN FOR SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

*1. Termination of authority to draft men into the Armed Forces*

The authority to induct men into the Armed Forces has been extended for 4 years, to terminate on July 1, 1955.

The House amendment extended the authority to induct men into the Armed Forces until July 1, 1954. The Senate bill contained no termination date on this authority.

*2. Period of service*

The period of service for persons inducted into the Armed Forces will be 24 months, an increase of 3 months over the present period of service.

The House amendment provided for a period of service of 26 months; The Senate bill provided for a period of service of 24 months. The House managers accepted the Senate version.

*3. Registration*

All male citizens of the United States and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States between the ages of 18 and 26 are required to register. Classification for induction purposes will take place as soon as practicable following registration. Technical changes were required in connection with the registration section to make it coincide with the new provisions applicable to aliens. The Senate managers accepted the House language with respect to classifying male registrants for induction purposes as soon as practicable following registration.

*4. Draft age*

The draft age has been reduced from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months for all male citizens of the United States and all other male persons admitted to the United States for permanent residence. All other persons who remain in the United States in a status other than that of permanent residents for a period exceeding 1 year, except those exempt from registration, shall be liable for training and service. Persons admitted to the United States other than as permanent residents who remain in the United States for more than 1 year may request release from training and service, but such a request will debar them from citizenship.

No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces below the age of 19 by any local board so long as there are available within that local board eligible males between the ages of 19 through 25.

The Senate bill would have permitted the induction of men at the age of 18 provided there were not available within local boards men between the ages of 19 through 25. The Senate managers accepted the age for induction into the Armed Forces contained in the House amendment.

*5. Reduction of physical and mental standards*

The physical standards for induction will be those that prevailed in January of 1945; the mental standards will be established on the basis of a percentile score of 10 which corresponds to the previously used General Classification Test of 65. The new mental standards are a reduction of 3 from the present percentile score of 13 and corresponds to a reduction of 5 points from the previous standard of 70 heretofore established by law as a minimum General Classification Test score for induction.

The House amendment reduced the physical and mental standards to those that prevailed in January of 1945, which would have resulted in a General Classification Test score of approximately 40. The Senate bill contained no similar language. The agreement reached by the conferees should result in the reclassification for induction purposes of approximately 150,000 men who have heretofore been, or would shortly be, classified as IV–F.

*6. Ceiling on the Armed Forces*

Until July 31, 1954, the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces shall not exceed more than 5,000,000 persons at any one time.

The House bill contained no limitation on the size of the Armed Forces. The Senate bill contained a 4,000,000-man ceiling.

*7. Total obligated service*

All persons entering the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps after the proposed legislation is enacted will be required to serve a total obligated period of service of 8 years. This requirement applies to all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces, or inducted into the National Security Training Corps. The total period of obligated service includes active duty, training duty in the National Security Training Corps, and active or inactive service in the reserve components.

The House amendment provided for a total obligated period of service of 6 years retroactive to persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed since June 25, 1950.

The Senate bill required a total obligated service of 8 years for all persons appointed, enlisted, or inducted after the proposed legislation was enacted. The House accepted the Senate provision.

*8. Active duty for reservists*

All reservists and retired personnel now or hereafter ordered to active duty may be required to serve 24 months. The authority of the President to order reservists and retired personnel to active duty is extended until July 1, 1953.

The House amendment limited the period of service to 21 months. The Senate bill contained the language set forth in the conference report. The House managers accepted the Senate provision.

*9. Release of reservists*

Unless sooner released under regulations prescribed by the respective Secretaries, any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served for a period of 12 months or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, shall, upon application, be released to inactive duty after he has completed 17 months of active duty including the time spent on active duty since June 25, 1950. Such persons shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty, without their consent, for a period in excess of 30 days, except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress. However, reservists found by the military departments concerned to possess a rating or specialty which is critical may be retained for the period for which they are ordered to active duty if their release prior to the completion of such period of time would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned.

This provision applies to officers and enlisted personnel.

The House amendment provided for the release of veteran reservists ordered to active duty from the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve for those who served 90 days or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or for those who had served 12 months or more between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, after 12 months of active duty since June 25, 1950, upon application. The Senate bill contained no similar language. The language "unless sooner released" contained in the provision agreed to by the managers is to emphasize and assure that the 17-month period shall not be construed as a minimum period for which such reservists will be held. Present plans call for the release of many thousands of reservists prior to the completion of 17 months of service, and the language of the conference report is not intended to replace any plans for earlier releases.

*10. Deferment of students*

High school students will be deferred until they graduate from high school or attain the age of 20.

College students may be deferred until they complete their academic year but if they are deferred to complete an academic year they may not thereafter be deferred by statute to complete an academic year. No local board may be required to defer any college student based upon a Government-sponsored test score or upon the student's class standing.

This is identical with the House amendment.

*11. Overseas assignment*

Every person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be given a period of not less than 4 months of training and may not be assigned for duty in any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, until after this 4-month period has elapsed. In addition, no other member of the Armed Forces who is enlisted, appointed, inducted, or ordered to active duty shall be assigned to duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, until he has had the equivalent of 4 months of basic training.

The House amendment was confined only to persons inducted into the Armed Forces and required 4 months' training within the United

States, its Territories, or possessions. In addition, the House amendment provided that no person inducted into the Armed Forces should be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction.

The Senate bill provided that inductees would be given 4 months' basic training and not be permanently assigned to duty outside the United States during this period, and further provided that no other members of the Armed Forces would be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he had had at least 4 months of basic training.

The House and Senate managers agreed to the provision heretofore described which requires that all persons inducted into the Armed Forces be given 4 months' basic training and that no member of the Armed Forces shall be assigned to duty outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, until such persons have had the equivalent of 4 months' basic training.

*12. Enlistment in the Regular Army*

Men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 24 months and may not have their enlistments involuntarily extended except in time of war or national emergency. The Senate bill contained no comparable language and the Senate managers accepted the House language.

*13. Extension of voluntary enlistments*

The authority to involuntarily extend enlistments in the Regular and Reserve components of the Armed Forces is extended until July 1, 1953. Thus, all enlistments which expire after July 9, 1951, may be extended by the President for 12 months, but no person shall have his enlistment extended more than once. Existing law extends all such enlistments which expire between July 27, 1950, and July 9, 1951.

The House amendment extended this authority until July 1, 1952; the Senate bill until July 1, 1953. The House managers accepted the Senate language.

*14. Aliens*

All aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall be immediately liable for induction into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps under the same conditions applicable to citizens. Aliens admitted to the United States, other than as permanent residents, who remain in the United States for 1 year or more shall be liable for induction unless they request release from service. In the event that such persons request release from service, they will be debarred from citizenship.

With certain technical corrections, the provision in the conference report is that which was contained in the House amendment. There was no comparable language in the Senate bill and the Senate accepted the House language.

*15. Conscientious objectors*

Persons who are found by local boards to be opposed to noncombatant service shall be ordered by their local boards, subject to regulations prescribed by the President, to perform civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or

interest for a period of 24 months. A conscientious objector's refusal to perform such work will subject him to the penalties of the Selective Service Act.

The House amendment merely deferred such persons. The Senate bill required such persons to be assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction.

The House managers objected to this portion of the Senate bill since it contemplated the establishment of national work camps. The language agreed to by the House and Senate conferees will permit the President to prescribe the types of employment to which conscientious objectors may be assigned, but such employment will not be performed through the establishment of, or assignment to, national work camps.

*16. Deferment of certain persons whose occupation is necessary for the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest*

The President is authorized under such regulations and rules as he may prescribe to provide for the deferment from training and service or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

The House amendment gave the President the authority to defer persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors was found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

The Senate bill left unchanged the present law which authorizes such deferments for persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors was found to be necessary for the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The House and Senate managers agreed to the language above described which includes those persons whose endeavors were named in the House amendment and, in addition, added veterinarians, pharmacists, and chiropodists.

*17. Control over the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in, beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors*

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations as he deems appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in, alcoholic beverages to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near a camp, station, post, or other places primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person who knowingly violates such regulations may be punished by a fine of $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 12 months or punished under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The language agreed upon by the conferees is substantially the language contained in the House amendment. There was no comparable amendment in the Senate bill.

*18. Continued liability for induction of persons now or hereafter deferred*

Persons now or hereafter deferred from induction will remain liable for induction into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps until they attain the age of 35. This language was

contained in the House amendment and was accepted by the Senate managers.

There was no comparable language in the Senate bill.

*19. Suspending or terminating inductions into the Armed Forces*

The House amendment provided that the Congress by concurrent resolution could terminate or suspend all inductions into the Armed Forces. The Senate bill contained no comparable language.

The House managers receded from their insistence upon this provision and agreed to eliminate it from the conference report.

*20. Seventy-five thousand students*

The Senate bill provided for the selection from among persons who had completed their basic training of 75,000 students during the next 3 years. Such students were to have the remainder of their military obligation suspended until they completed the studies and research for which they were selected and there was authority in the Senate bill to provide for the payment of the cost of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of such persons to the extent they were unable to defray.

The House amendment contained no similar language.

The Senate agreed to recede from their insistence upon this provision and therefore the conference report contains no provision with respect to such students.

*21. Enlistment of aliens*

The Senate bill amended the act of June 30, 1950, in such a way as to permit the enlistment in the Regular Army of 25,000 aliens per year for a period of not less than 5 years.

The act of June 30, 1950, permitted the enlistment in the Regular Army until June 30, 1953, of not more than a total of 2,500 aliens.

The House amendment contained no similar language. The House and Senate managers agreed to the provision which permits the enlistment in the Regular Army, until June 30, 1955, of not more than a total of 12,500 aliens.

*22. Women in the Armed Forces*

Until July 31, 1954, the present 2-percent limitation of the number of women in the Armed Forces will be suspended.

The Senate amended the act of August 3, 1950, so as to suspend the present 2-percent limitation on the number of women that may be in the Armed Forces until July 31, 1954.

The House amendment contained no similar language. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

*23. Authorized strength*

The authorized strength for the Armed Forces is now suspended until July 31, 1954. The conference report, however, fixes the strength of the Armed Forces at 837,000 for the Army of the United States, 666,832 for the Navy, including the Marine Corps, and 502,000 for the Air Force of the United States. This is substantially a reenactment of existing law (sec. 2, Selective Service Act of 1948) except for the elimination from present law of all references to the number of authorized 1-year enlistees.

The Senate bill repealed outright the present law with respect to the limitation on the authorized strength of the Armed Forces now contained in the Selective Service Act.

The House amendment did not amend the present law with respect to authorized strength now contained in the Selective Service Act. The House and Senate managers agreed to continue the present statutory limitation on the size of the Armed Forces, suspended until July 31, 1954, but eliminated references to the authorized number of 1-year enlistees in view of the fact that the authority for such enlistments will be repealed by the conference report. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment repealed the authority for 1-year enlistments.

*24. Reemployment rights*

The House amendment, among other things, required persons discharged, following military service, to be restored to the same position held at the time of entering service. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The House agreed to accept the Senate language in view of the numerous difficulties involved in attempting to require employers to restore returning service personnel to the same position they held prior to entering the service. Existing law permits returning service personnel to be restored to the same position previously held or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

*25. Communicating with Members of Congress*

The House amendment provided that no member of the Armed Forces would be restricted from communicating with any Member of Congress. The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The Senate accepted the House language.

*26. Authority to induct physicians and dentists*

The House amendment provided that no physician or dentist engaged in full-time employment at a Veterans' Administration hospital would be inducted, under the provisions of law authorizing the induction of physicians and dentists, after such physician or dentist attained his thirtieth birthday.

The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The House receded from its position and agreed to the elimination of the provision from the conference report.

*27. Appeal boards*

The House amendment provided that there would not be less than one selective service appeal board located in the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States. The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The Senate accepted the House provision.

*28. Reserve deferment appeal boards*

The House amendment authorized the President to prescribe rules and regulations for the deferment of members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve, and authorized the President to establish civilian Reserve deferment appeal boards. Members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve whose claim for deferment was denied would have been given the authority to have appealed their case to a civilian deferment appeal board.

The Senate bill contained no comparable language and the House managers agreed to recede from their insistence upon this provision.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

*1. Establishment of Commission and National Security Training Corps*

The conference report provides for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members. Three members shall be civilians and two shall be active or retired members of the regular components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party.

The Chairman of the Commission must be a civilian. At such time as the Commission is appointed, a National Security Training Corps is established.

The Senate bill provided for the establishment of a five-man Commission to be composed of three civilians and two active or retired members of the regular components. The House amendment provided for a five-man commission to which not more than three could be of the same political party. Three members had to be civilians, one member an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, and the remaining member of the Commission a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided for the establishment of a National Security Training Corps at the time the Commission was appointed.

*2. Compensation for Commission*

The conference report provides for a term of years for members of the Commission and provides for a per diem of $50 to be paid to members of the Commission while engaged in the business of the Commission.

This is similar to the House amendment.

There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

*3. General authority of Commission*

The conference report provides that the Commission, subject to the direction of the President, shall exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps and further provides that such training shall be basic military training. It authorizes the Commission to establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the corps as are necessary to carry out the objectives of the act. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to designate the military departments to carry out the training. The military departments so designated shall carry out the military training in accordance with the policies and standards established by the Commission. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, the military departments shall determine the type or types of military training to be given to the members of the National Security Training Corps.

The House amendment provided that the Commission should direct and control the policies of the National Security Training Corps and further provided that the Commission would issue "directives" to the military departments designated to carry out the military training.

The Senate bill provided that the Commission would, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with

respect to the conduct of initial basic training of members of the corps as were necessary to carry out the objectives of the act, and, subject to the direction of the President, would designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. The departments and agencies so designated were to carry out the training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

In view of the fact that the House amendment did not contemplate that the Commission would act as an operating agency, the House managers agreed to the language contained in the conference report which grants to the Commission the authority to exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps.

The House amendment provided that, subject to the direction of the President and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission would designate the military departments to carry out the training. Since basic military training, as such, is a military matter, the House managers agreed to the language contained in the conference report which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to designate the military departments to carry out the training.

*4. Legislative recommendations*

Not later than 4 months following the confirmation of members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to, a broad outline deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provision of the proposed legislation will be of a military nature.

There is a specific provision in the conference report, however, stating that the Commission shall not have the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of training to be given members of the Corps. Thus the legislative recommendations will contain language which will grant the Commission authority to assure that the training carried out shall be of a military nature but the Commission will not submit legislative recommendations prescribing the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps.

In addition, the conference report provides that legislative recommendations with respect to a code of conduct, disability and death benefits, and other benefits and obligations and measures deemed necessary to implement any policies and standards established by the Commission shall be submitted by the Commission for legislative action.

As contained in the original House amendment the recommendations must be referred to both Committees on Armed Services, and both committees, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of Congress following the date on which the recommendations are submitted to the Congress, must report thereon to their respective Houses. As contained in the original House amendment, any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged.

The House amendment provided for the Commission to submit its legislative recommendations not later than 6 months following its confirmation. The House amendment further provided that the legislative recommendations would include a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to

carry out the obligations of the act, including the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps and measures for utilizing existing schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable. In view of the fact, as previously stated, that the original House amendment did not contemplate that the Commission would act as an operating agency, the House managers receded from their insistence that the Commission recommend to the Congress the types of basic military training to be given members of the Corps as well as a program of initial military training. The Senate bill contained no comparable language.

*5. Induction into the National Security Training Corps*

The conference report provides that no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after (1) a code of conduct has been enacted and measures providing for disability and death benefits have been enacted into law, (2) that the other legislative recommendations submitted by the Commission have been considered and such recommendations or any portion thereof shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law, and (3) the period of service required of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or by the adoption of a concurrent resolution by the Congress.

Thus, the Congress will have an opportunity to consider and amend all of the recommendations submitted by the Commission, and no person can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until this has taken place.

The House amendment provided similar language as contained in the conference report but required that all legislative recommendations be enacted with or without amendments into law. The House managers recognized the fact that the two most important features of a universal military training program involve a code of conduct and the death and disability benefits to be granted to the members of the Corps, along with provisions dealing with the health, safety, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps. Thus, the House managers receded from their insistence upon the House amendment which required action on all legislative recommendations submitted, and agreed to the conference report which requires the enactment into law of a code of conduct and death and disability benefits and the consideration of all of the remaining recommendations submitted, followed by the enactment of any portion determined by the Congress to be desirable. It should be observed that the House amendment also provided that no person should be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until the period of service of persons under the age of 19 had been eliminated. To permit a more orderly initiation of universal military training and the gradual elimination of induction into the Armed Forces, the conference report permits induction into the National Security Training Corps, following the enactment of a code of conduct, death and disability benefits, and the consideration of the remaining recommendations and the enactment of any portion thereof, at such time as the period of service for persons under the age of 19 has been reduced or eliminated.

There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

*6. Pay of members of the National Security Training Corps*

Both the House and Senate bills provided that members of the National Security Training Corps would be paid $30 per month but that their dependents would be entitled to the benefits of the Dependents Assistance Act. This provision is contained in the conference report.

*7. Period of service*

The conference report provides that persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be trained for a period of 6 months. This was contained in the House amendment. The Senate bill provided that persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps would be trained for a period of not less than 4 months. The Senate conferees accepted the House language.

*8. Age of induction*

At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized, all persons thereafter registered who have not been inducted into the Armed Forces and who have not attained their nineteenth birthday shall be liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps. Since men are required to register at the age of 18, this will permit the induction of men into the National Security Training Corps after they have attained their eighteenth birthday. There will probably be an average period of approximately 3 months elapse between registration, classification, and induction.

The House amendment provided for induction into the National Security Training Corps at the age of 18 years and 6 months. The Senate bill provided for induction into the National Security Training Corps at the age of 18. The House accepted the Senate language in this respect.

*9. Initiating induction into the National Security Training Corps*

Induction into the National Security Training Corps may take place after (1) a code of conduct has been enacted, (2) death and disability benefits for members of the corps have been enacted, (3) the other legislative recommendations submitted by the Commission have been considered and any portion thereof have been enacted into law, and (4) at such time as the President or the Congress by the adoption of a concurrent resolution has reduced or eliminated the period of service required of persons who have not attained the anniversary of their nineteenth birthday.

Persons who are deferred for any of the reasons provided in the proposed legislation shall not be exempt from their liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps merely because they have passed their nineteenth birthday.

This is comparable to the House amendment except for the addition of the words "or reduced" which, as previously indicated, permits an orderly phasing of universal military training and the reduction or elimination of induction into the Armed Forces for men below the age of 19.

*10. Overseas assignment of members of the National Security Training Corps*

No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps may be assigned for training at any installation outside the continental

United States except that residents of the Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.

*11. Terminating inductions into the National Security Training Corps by concurrent resolution*

The House amendment provided that induction into the National Security Training Corps could be terminated by the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution to this effect.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

Since the duration of universal military training will properly be a question for consideration when the Commission submits its recommendations to the Congress, the House managers receded from their insistence on this provision, and it is thus not contained in the conference report.

MISCELLANEOUS

There are other technical changes contained in the conference report which do not affect the substance of the proposed legislation.

Two other minor changes involve the deferment of missionaries who are also physicians and adding Guam to the definition of the words "United States".

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

○

port on the universal military training and service bill immediately?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. It is my thought that we proceed with consideration of the report immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Hayden | McCarthy |
| Brewster | Hendrickson | McFarland |
| Bricker | Hennings | McKellar |
| Bridges | Hickenlooper | McMahon |
| Butler, Md. | Hill | Millikin |
| Butler, Nebr. | Holland | Moody |
| Byrd | Humphrey | Morse |
| Cain | Hunt | Mundt |
| Carlson | Ives | Nixon |
| Case | Jenner | O'Mahoney |
| Chavez | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Clements | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Cordon | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Douglas | Kem | Smathers |
| Duff | Kerr | Smith, N. J. |
| Dworshak | Kilgore | Sparkman |
| Eastland | Knowland | Stennis |
| Ellender | Lehman | Taft |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Watkins |
| Frear | Magnuson | Welker |
| Fulbright | Malone | Wherry |
| George | Maybank | Wiley |
| Gillette | McCarran | Young |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, beginning June 6.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Special Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 1.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the outset I should like to say that I feel the discussion on the conference report which occurred yesterday afternoon was very helpful. The debate appears in the RECORD, and Members of the Senate have had an opportunity to read the report and to consider it. We now have the printed conference report before us in the regular form as well as in the RECORD.

If I may have the attention of the distinguisher chairman of the conference committee for a moment, I should like to ask him one or two questions based upon some points which appear in the RECORD. First, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if section 2, title I, refers to the standing ceilings on the several branches of the armed services, and if such figures are suspended during the period of the emergency, or until some date in 1954?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The language is the same as that which was used previously. Soon after June 25, 1950, when hostilities broke out in Korea, Congress passed an act which suspended the ceilings. They are set forth in section 2. The pending bill would continue the present suspension of the ceilings within the over-all limitation of 5,000,000, which is contained in another section of the bill until 1954.

Mr. CASE. Does the recitation of the ceilings for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, respectively, necessarily fix any ratio for the several services within the 5,000,000 ceiling?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not. It would be up to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to decide which branches of service needed more or fewer men during the emergency.

Mr. CASE. With respect to the components within the Army, I notice that title II changes the 2,500 limitation for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army to 12,500. Does that represent a modification of the version of this provision as passed by the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a very considerable modification, I may say to the Senator from South Dakota. The Senate version of the bill called for an enlistment of 25,000 aliens a year for 5 years, or a possible total of 125,000 aliens. The conference agreement authorizes the enlistment of not to exceed 12,500 aliens by June 30, 1955.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask a question with respect to one other provision. It concerns conscientious objectors. It is my understanding that under the terms of the bill as passed by the Senate, conscientious objectors could have been directed to do work of a character similar to that which was done by conscientious objectors during World War II. In other words they were assigned to conscientious objector camps, which functioned similarly to the CCC camps.

As it is set forth in the conference report the language would seem to indicate that while they might be directed to do work necessary to national health, safety, or interest, it does not necessarily contemplate the establishment of work camps. I may say to the Senator, in connection with national interest, that some of us have been working on a proposal or plan to develop some useful work for conscientious objectors, which might involve the establishment of work camps, although not necessarily so. I am wondering whether the language would prevent the assignment of conscientious objectors to camps of that sort, if the camps were maintained for projects in the national interest.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that the language would specifically prevent it. However, I would be less than frank if I did not state to the Senator that it was the intention of the conferees not to have camps of that nature established on a national scale. The House conferees were very much opposed to the Senate provision, as were various organizations, such as the Society of Friends and others, who are interested in the question of conscientious objectors. We, therefore, arrived at this compromise, which leaves the question at the local level and permits draft boards to defer a person who is engaged in work which contributes to the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest, for a period of 24 months.

I may say that conscientious objectors have considerable advantage over men who are inducted into the Army. A man who is inducted into the Army serves 24 months. Upon discharge, he remains in the reserves for 6 years. Conscientious objectors, on the other hand, after 24 months of useful work, owe no further responsibility under the bill.

Mr. CASE. It happens that in my State of South Dakota there are three or four Mennonite colonies. Considerable resentment has been occasioned by the fact that members of that religious group are not subject to regular military duty. The use of such persons for some projects which are definitely in the national interest has commended itself to the people who have observed the situation. However, their straight deferment after induction and assignment to work at a local level, where they would be permitted the privilege of continuing in their normal occupation of farming, for example, and perhaps, be able to acquire additional lands and generally improve their economic status, while boys in the same community are called upon to abandon their farms and even sell their livestock at a forced sale, when livestock is not ready for market, creates a great deal of feeling.

I should certainly hope that the language of the bill would permit draft boards, or whoever made decisions in such instances, to see to it that conscientious objectors, who are granted deferment and have the benefits of the more lenient treatment which the Senator from Georgia has described, should

at least be required to do work which is definitely in the national interest, and not work which merely improves their economic status and their own pocketbooks.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from South Dakota makes a very strong argument in behalf of the provision of the bill as it was passed by the Senate. The Senate members of the conference committee undertook to make the same argument, although perhaps not so well as the Senator from South Dakota has made it, but we were unsuccessful. The House bill had no provision whatever with respect to conscientious objectors. It merely provided for their blanket deferment. Not only could conscientious objectors have remained on their farms and worked there, but they were not even compelled to work on the farms. They could have sat around pool rooms or stood around street corners, which would certainly have aggravated the feelings of the men who were compelled to go into the service, as the Senator from South Dakota has said. However, we could not prevail upon the House conferees to accept the Senate provision. This provision is another one on which we were compelled to compromise.

Mr. CASE. I may observe that so far as Mennonites are concerned, no deferred Mennonites would be found in pool rooms. I think they would continue to work on their farms.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator that I was not reflecting on the Mennonites in any way. I was referring to other conscientious objectors who might be so engaged. There are some Mennonites in my State, and I have never seen them hanging around pool rooms or street corners. On the contrary, they are very hard-working people. However, they do not contribute to the Armed Forces of the United States in a time of national emergency.

Mr. CASE. The feeling of the people of my State is that it is a matter of recognizing the fact that Mennonites have historically held to that point of view, and the deferment of such persons has perhaps been accepted. Certainly there would be considerable resentment if other citizens were told that Congress was making it possible for such people not merely to avoid military service but to avoid doing some work or making some sacrifices in the national interest. I certainly hope that the Senator from Georgia can honestly and frankly say that it is expected that the normal activities of such people will be sacrificed to some extent in the national interest, so that at least we will not feel that we are encouraging the avoidance of all national service.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is no question that considerable leeway is given the several draft boards in determining the type of work that such persons shall do and the measure of its contribution to the national health, safety, or interest. I regret that I cannot in all fairness and honesty assure the Senator from South Dakota that it is my interpretation of this measure that such persons could be placed in camps, as was done in World War II. Such a provision was contained in the bill as passed by the Senate, but we were unable to achieve the inclusion of that provision in the conference report. However, we did tie it in with deferments for essential occupations. The Senator knows that at the present time there can be some deferments for men who are in essential occupations.

In my judgment, the draft boards in the areas to which the Senator refers will see to it that some recognition is given to the fact that these persons have been accorded a deferment owing to their religious convictions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not intend to prolong this discussion. I think the Senator from Georgia has made a very fair statement and has set forth clearly what the situation is.

However, I wish to express the hope that if some of us attempt to work out a program whereby those who obtain deferment on this ground may be made more useful in contributing to the national interest during an emergency, we may have the support of the Senator from Georgia, for it certainly does not commend itself to the average person that those who are deferred from military service should, in addition to deferment, be directed by the draft boards to go into essential occupations where their economic status may be improved, where they may receive high wages, or where, in effect, they may profit by virtue of the fact that their fellow farm workers are taken from their homes and placed in the armed services, and thus it is made easier for those who are deferred in that way to increase their land holdings and to improve their relative economic status, as compared with that of those who make the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can only repeat what I said a moment ago, namely, that the Senator from South Dakota has very eloquently outlined the position of the Senate itself, the Senate committee, and the conferees on the part of the Senate. In the conference we discussed this matter on at least three different occasions, and the conferees on the part of the Senate endeavored to maintain the position which had been taken by the Senate. However, we were unable to do so.

I can assure the Senator from South Dakota of my wholehearted cooperation with him in every endeavor such as the one he has just outlined. Of course, the difficulty is that in that connection we must obtain some cooperation from the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his contribution and his courtesy in connection with this matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that the conference report contemplates the service of 3,500,000 men, whereas in World War II 14,000,000 men were in the service. I think the point was raised in the committee of conference that the question of establishing camps, and so forth, for the number of conscientious objectors who would be drafted in connection with the drafting of a total of 3,500,000 men is quite different from the question of establishing such camps in connection with the drafting of 14,000,000 men.

It is my opinion that the local draft boards will have to determine whether the jobs held by such conscientious objectors will help in the war effort. If the boards determine that such jobs will help with the war effort or the war work, then those who hold such jobs and who are conscientious objectors will be allowed to remain in that status; but if such is not determined to be the case, such persons must either suffer the penalties or transfer to such jobs.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has stated the provisions of the bill and also one of the arguments made by the conferees on the part of the House. It is my recollection that the position of the House conferees was that today approximately only 12,000 of the conscientious objectors have been deferred under existing law, and that that number is entirely too small to warrant the creation of national work camps in which to place them during the 24 months' period of their service.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the very able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who happens to be in charge of the conference report, is, as we know, also chairman of the joint hearings which two of our committees are now conducting in connection with the MacArthur controversy. I understand that those committees wish to return to their meeting as soon as possible, for they have important business to do.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not intend to take more than a few minutes to state the reasons why I would be forced to vote against the conference report if there were to be a record vote on the question of adopting it. I understand there will not be a record vote. I wish to state, first, that I would vote against the conference report if a record vote were taken on the question of its adoption; and, second, explain why I would vote in that way.

Mr. President, the enlistment period of many reserves is being extended. Many of them now have families and many have recently established themselves in business, and many of them served for 3, 4, or 5 years in the last war. We are now also passing a draft law to provide for an an Armed Force of 5,000,000 men.

Normally I would vote for the bill in view of the imminent Communist threat. However, a fantastic and dangerous situation exists. For example, even though General Bradley and General MacArthur have agreed on the wisdom of using the 600,000 troops on Formosa, the State Department, however, says "No, we will not use them; we will use only American boys; we will use the boys who will be drafted under this bill; we will use Americans to defend the soil

which those Chinese friends of ours are themselves willing and anxious to defend." That is the attitude of the State Department, even though the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur say, "Let us use the 600,000 troops of our allies, let us allow them to do some of the fighting and dying, as well as the American boys." The State Department says, "No, only American boys can fight and die." Add to that the fact that in Europe we are now excluding from the defense plans of Europe the 20,000,000 people of Spain and the 48,000,000 people of Western Germany, making a pool of 68,000,000 people, the two great wells of anti-Communist manpower.

The State Department says, "No, we cannot use them, because they are not peace-loving people; we must send American divisions to Europe instead of using those young men." We see the completely phony plans for the defense of Europe—plans built around the land army of France, plans built around 11 Atlantic Pact nations, and excluding the manpower which we must have if we are to defend Europe—we find our State Department saying, "No; but we will send 4, 5, 6, or 10 American divisions," when any man who can add 2 and 2 militarily knows that, unless we use all the resources of Europe to defend that continent, to pour 4, 5, 6, or 10 American divisions into that area, will mean, if and when Russia decides to move, that we will have signed the warrant condemning to death or to permanent slavery every American boy we send to Europe. I could not bring myself to vote to draft and condemn them. I hope no one misunderstands me. I think it may be necessary to use American troops in Europe. I feel that to keep Europe out of the Russian orbit is extremely important to us, even if only from the standpoint of selfish interest. I feel that if we were to turn over to Russia, or were to allow Russia to take over, the steel-making capacity of Western Europe, and if we allowed the 200,000,000 people of Western Europe to be swallowed up behind the iron curtain, it could be disastrous to this Nation. I do not argue that we should not send American troops to Europe. I think it may be necessary. But I do say that if we continue the present plan and decide to try to defend Europe under plans calling for a closed corporation of the 11 Atlantic Pact nations, excluding Greece, excluding Turkey, excluding Spain, and excluding Western Germany, then any plan to defend Western Europe is doomed to failure. Let me repeat, any plan to send American boys to Europe, without first saying we will utilize the manpower of all of Europe, means that we in the Senate, and the Representatives in the House, as of today are endorsing a warrant either of death or of permanent slavery, which has been planned and which has been signed in our State Department.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to say that I am very much in favor of the bill, particularly as it has been reported by the conferees. There are several features of the bill which possibly I do not like; but, in view of the world situation, certainly we need such legislation, and we need it now.

I should like to say, along with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that I regret, as I know he does, that the universal military training provision was effectively scuttled in the conference. There will be further steps taken concerning it in the future. I hope the day will come when we shall have a proper and adequate universal military training system.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not go so far as the distinguished Senator from Florida does when he says that the provision was effectively scuttled in the conference. The conference report does not go so far as the Senate bill, nor does it go so far as I should have liked it to go, because I have been, as I know the Senator from Florida has been, a supporter of UMT for some time. This bill lays the groundwork for UMT, and I may say that the distinguished chairman of the House conferees, who is chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, stated at the press conference, after this report was agreed to by the conferees, that there was no question in his mind that the House would adopt this code of conduct and the death and disability provisions, which would indeed give us an authorization for universal military training; because, under this bill, if the Commission provided for reports, as it is instructed to do, within 4 months, and if the committees of the House and Senate report to their respective bodies, as they are required to do, within 45 days, the only issues involved will be a code of conduct, the death and disability provisions, and the consideration of certain other items which are not essential to enactment; and if simply the code of conduct and the death and disability provisions are adopted, we shall have a UMT program. The bill as reported is not what I would like to have, but I do not think the program has been scuttled. As a matter of fact, the bill goes much further toward UMT than any other piece of legislation which has ever before been in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I must agree that the bill improves the situation over what it was. The fact that we must vote again on the UMT provision seems to me to reopen the whole issue and to postpone an actual and constructive program of universal military training.

Mr. RUSSELL. As a matter of fact, even under the Senate bill, which was preferable to the conference report bill, the Congress would have been compelled to enact legislation for a code of conduct before men could have been handled in a universal military training program.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator for what he has said. One observation I wish to make to the Senator and to his distinguished committee is that, in view of this bill, which could well be passed here today and become law, and according to the figures that I have read, there will be a plentiful supply of young men able to go into the service.

I hope the distinguished chairman of the committee will appoint a subcommittee to look into the possibility of releasing those men who have served overseas, so that those who have carried the burden of World War II shall not be required to carry a further and additional burden.

I read yesterday in the RECORD that the chairman of the committee has said that on several occasions the committee has requested the formulation of a program concerning the Reserves.

On last Friday representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who are handling the Reserve program were in my office. They admitted that today there are 600,000 reservists in the service. The only program under which they can release some of those now in service is by calling for more reservists who have already served. When we stop to think that in 1951 there will be 411,000 men available for service, and in 1952 some 906,000, certainly no one could possibly justify all the additional sacrifice and burden we are asking the veterans of World War II to carry. The only program is to call for more reservists who have already served.

I certainly hope that the distinguished Senator from Georgia will appoint a subcommittee of his committee to look into the problem, and see whether there is some fair and equitable way to handle the program so that reservists now on active duty can be returned to civilian life.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I share the Senator's concern. As a matter of fact, we had no reserve program on the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. There have been any number of hardship cases, many of which are inexcusable. The only excuse offered is that the armed services did not have information on the Reserves. They should have had, but they did not. However, under the program which the Department has approved all the reservists who served more than 12 months in World War II will be released within 12 months, in the case of the Army and the Air Force, and as soon after 12 months as trained replacements are available in the case of the Navy.

We are undertaking to move toward the consideration of a comprehensive reserve program which will be equitable and effective. As soon as the committee is able to direct its attention to legislative matters we intend to go into the reserve program. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services has been conducting hearings for several weeks. There can be no question about the many inexplicable aspects of the program as it was conducted for several months. I think the services now have more information, and I believe they will be a little more selective.

I share the Senator's feeling that there should be an equitable distribution of the dangers of combat, and that men who served more than 12 months in

World War II should not be called back to active duty short of an all-out emergency that would require their additional service.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. I know, from my association with reservists who served in the last war that they will be willing to serve again in the event of total war. Eighty percent of the officers in Korea are reservists. If we are cutting down the size of the draft it does not envision any relief for those men, or even any rotation. When the men in charge of the reserve program try to explain it they merely say, "We are going to call up additional reservists to take the place of those who are now in the service."

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator understands that there are many thousands of Reserve officers in the country who did not serve in World War II. The services always like to retain the men they know can do what is required. They are always reluctant to make a change so long as things are moving satisfactorily. But there is a rotation program in Korea; men are going to be rotated at the rate of 20,000 a month, and I think most of the hardship cases will be alleviated in the very near future.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator will agree that the program does not envision releasing the men back to civilian life, but will merely bring the boys back for duty here for a while, and then, if necessary, send them back.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. There is a provision which permits an inactive reservist who is a veteran to be released when he has served 17 months. That may be done on his own motion, if he so desires.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to read a letter which, among many others, I received a few days ago:

> We in Korea would like to know the answer to a few questions. Why is the Government calling reserves, extending the reserve program, and, at the same time, cutting the draft? When are they going to start sending reserves home from Korea?
>
> What happened to the 18-year-old soldier that they claimed was the best in World War II? Why do they now say that older men are needed? We veterans of World War II and this so-called police action are getting quite weary. We have fought one war and now completed 6 months over here.

It seems to me that we must build up from the bottom if these men are to be relieved. I am confident that the Senator agrees with me, as well as do the other members of the committee, that it is not fair, right, or just for the men who served so valiantly and made such sacrifices in World War II to have this burden placed upon them again.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

## CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous report of the Armed Services Committee on certain nominations, and, as in executive session, I ask that the nominations be confirmed and the President immediately notified.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the nominations are unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is correct; and there are very definite reasons why the nominations should be confirmed today.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, while the Senate is transacting business as in executive session, I wonder if we might confirm the one nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Storen, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

## THE CARTER BARRON AMPHITHEATER

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on May 25 last there occurred certain exercises in the District of Columbia dedicating the Carter Barron Amphitheater. The amphitheater was named in honor of Carter Barron, a man who lived in Washington for the past several years and who, I assume, was known to most Senators. My own relations with him were very intimate. He spent many week ends on the farm where I make my home, and in our back yard. He was one of the finest, sweetest, most unselfish characters who ever lived. It is very fitting that this amphitheater should be dedicated to his memory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I did not have the privilege of knowing Mr. Carter Barron as well as did the distinguished Senator from Georgia, but I knew him fairly well. I will say that I never knew a man who had a finer, a higher sense of public service, who tried to do more for his fellow men, with less regard for himself and how it might affect him, than did the close friend of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, about whom he has just spoken. I am delighted that the Senator from Georgia has paid this tribute to the memory of Carter T. Barron.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Carter Barron was selfless in his public service, and absolutely unselfish in his service to his friends.

Mr. President, I ask that the remarks of the President of the United States at the dedication of the Carter Barron Amphitheater in Washington, D. C., on May 25, 1951, and the eulogy to Carter Barron read by Mr. Walter Pidgeon on the same occasion be printed separately in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The remarks and eulogy appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

## THE ADMINISTRATION'S CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM OF FOREIGN SPENDING

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, some weeks ago, on March 30 of this year, to be exact, I warned the Senate that the administration was then planning to present to Congress, in a dressed-up form, a consolidated program of foreign spending which exceeds in size and scope even all those foreign hand-out programs we have indulged in during the past few years. I warned that this program would no doubt involve a continuation of ECA, even though Europe has now reached and passed the standard of living and prosperity which it had attained before the war even started. I said that it would probably include elements of point 4, military assistance, and all the other various foreign-aid proposals we have embarked on, more or less wrapped up in a single package. I pointed out that the proposal would probably encompass assistance to any nation on the face of the earth which managed to stay in the good graces of the United States State Department. I mentioned some of the rumors that had been floating around as to the gigantic size of the expenditures envisioned under this "Operation cosmic," as it has been termed.

Now we have before us the President's message on a so-called mutual-security program, and it is clear that my forecasts were entirely too correct. The amount requested for the coming year hits a record high—$8,500,000,000 for grants, plus $1,000,000,000 in additional lending authority for the Export-Import Bank, a total of $9,500,000,000. That figure is far in excess of total expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes during any of the years of Mr. Roosevelt's administration through the fiscal year 1940—up to the beginning of the war. And Mr. Roosevelt was considered a pretty good spender.

Mr. President, this program, if enacted, will far outstrip any of the previous foreign-aid programs which have been adopted. The most recent period for which we have detailed figures covering Federal grants and loans to foreign countries is the calendar year 1950. In that year, our total spending for such purposes amounted to four billion five hundred and thirty-one million dollars, compared with the nine and a half billion dollars the President now requests for next year. At this particular time, when the most stringent economy is absolutely essential in order to balance the budget and check the rising cost of living, the President seems to have thrown the very notion of financial sanity to the winds. Instead of cutting back the foreign assistance figure, he asks us to double it.

This program, if enacted, will have one further distinction. It will carry the

# DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued June 8, 1951
For actions of June 7, 1951
82nd-1st, No. 101

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7
Agricultural activities..26
Appropriations.2,3,21,27,28
Cotton.....25
Dairy products.....21
Defense production.....3,25
Education.....8
Flood control.....24
Foreign affairs, aid.....20
Forest and forestry.....5
Lands.....5
Legislative program.....7
Livestock and meat....4,19
Military training.....1,23
Personnel.....8,9,15
Postal rates.....6
Prices.....14,19
Prices, control..4,11,17,25
farm.....18
Roads.....16
Strategic materials.....12
Sugar.....10
Taxation.....15
Trade, foreign.....10,12
Transportation.....13,22

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on military-training bill. Senate debated Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. Senate subcommittee agreed to pay increase for Government employees.

## HOUSE

1. MILITARY TRAINING. Agreed, 339-41, to the conference report on S. 1, the military training and service bill (pp. 6399-409). This bill will now be sent to the President.

2. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 4329 (pp. 6410-19).

3. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Rep. Hill, Colo., criticized the amount of tax-amortization certificates which have been granted under the Defense Production Act (pp. 6414-5).

4. PRICE CONTROL. Rep. Dollinger, N. Y., recommended stronger action against black markets in meat (pp. 6397-8).

Reps. Andersen, Minn., and Mason, Ill., defended cattle feeders against charges that cattle prices are too high (p. 6398).

5. FOREST LAND. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3716, to authorize exchange of a tract of Forest Service land in Pueblo County, Colo. (H. Rept. 543)(p. 6428).

6. POSTAL RATES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 2982, providing for a general revision of most of the postal rates and fees (p. D486).

7. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 11 (p. 6427). Legislative program for next week, as announced by Majority Whip Priest: Mon., aeronautics research; Tues., Army civil appropriation bill; remainder of week, undetermined (p. 6419).

SENATE

8. LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 3709, which had been reported during the recess of the Senate, with amendments, by the Appropriations Committee (S. Rept. 386) (pp. 6377-87, 6389-95). Agreed to the committee amendments en bloc, except the amendments reducing salary items by 5 percent, but agreed that amendments may be offered later to the amendments agreed to (pp. 6389-91).

In reporting the bill, the committee struck out the House amendment (so-called Jensen amendment) to prohibit the filling of 25% of the vacancies which may occur during the fiscal year 1952, and inserted instead provisions (so-called Cordon amendment) "to reduce each appropriation by not less than 5 percent of the estimate for personal services, but not in addition to reductions already approved, and to make available with respect to each appropriation not more than 95 percent of the estimate for personal services for that purpose." The committee also increased by $610,459 the funds for Bureau of Employment Security, and increased by $12,000,000 the funds for payments to school districts, Office of Education. (For excerpts from the committee report see end of this Digest.)

Sen. Ferguson submitted (for himself and Sens. Byrd, Wherry, Taft, Bridges, Williams, and Dirksen) an amendment to reduce by 5 percent (in addition to the cut proposed in the Cordon amendment) each amount specified for personnel services in the budget estimates (p. 6391). Sen. Ferguson said that if his amendment prevails in addition to the Cordon amendment, it would have the effect of reducing the total amount for personal services by 10 percent.

9. PERSONNEL. The "Daily Digest" states that the subcommittees on Civil Service and Postal Service (of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee) "agreed to an increase in pay for Government employees, in connection with their study of S. 622... and S. 355...as follows: The subcommittees agreed to report to the full committee, at its next meeting, a proposed pay increase for Government employees embodied in the so-called Pastore plan, which provides for an 8.8-percent increase to the Classification Act salaries, placing a flat $800 ceiling on the increase. This 8.8 percent is applied to the entrance grades up to the first 15 grades, at which point the $800 ceiling takes over and is applied to the top 4 grades. For postal employees, the 8.8-percent increase was also agreed upon..." (p. D484.)

Sen. Byrd inserted the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on civilian employment in the executive branch for April 1951 (pp. 6370-4).

10. SUGAR TREATY. Received from the President a protocol prolonging until August 31, 1951 the international agreement of 1937 regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar; to Foreign Relations Committee (p. 6395).

11. PRICE CONTROLS. Sen. Moody inserted Bernard Baruch's letter urging the continuation of price, wage, rent and other mobilization controls (pp. 6376-7).

12. FOREIGN TRADE; STRATEGIC MATERIALS. Sen. Wherry spoke in support of the Kem amendment to the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, which prohibits economic assistance to countries which sell war-potential goods to Russia or its satellites (pp. 6375-6).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. TRANSPORTATION. S. 1603, by Sen. Johnson, Colo., to assure allocations for freight cars and locomotives; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 6374).

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to know if the gentleman has consulted the chairman of the committee on this proposition.

Mr. KEATING. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. RANKIN. The chairman of the committee that handled it.

Mr. KEATING. It is the chairman of the committee that handled it at whose request I am presenting the bill; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is the gentleman on this side of the aisle who is in charge of it?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is chairman of the committee and has requested me to present this matter to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD. Yesterday, on page 6350, I said in response to the lady from Illinois:

I would point out to the gentlewoman that the order wiping out segregation in the Armed Forces was the greatest victory that Stalin has won since Yalta.

The reporter left out the words "the order wiping out."

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRICE FIXING ON FOOD COMMODITIES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] gets up here and accuses, as he usually does, people who are trying to better the living conditions of the people of this country, of being Communists. Every time we try to do something constructive he calls it communism.

When we had TVA, that was not communism. When we try to help the consumers of this country, when we try to keep prices down, when we try to have rent control, the gentleman comes up with that eternal cry of "communism." He cannot have any constructive opposition. He therefore resorts to name calling. It is the old case of the boy crying, "Wolf, wolf" so often that nobody paid attention to him. That is the effect that the gentleman from Mississippi is having upon us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Angell | Gwinn | Moulder |
| Blatnik | Harrison, Wyo. | Murray, Wis. |
| Boggs, La. | Hoffman, Ill. | O'Konski |
| Boykin | Hoffman, Mich. | Poage |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Jones, Mo. | Poulson |
| Carnahan | Kearns | Powell |
| Cox | Kelley, Pa. | Preston |
| Crawford | Kennedy | Rabaut |
| Curtis, Nebr. | Kilburn | Reed, Ill. |
| Dawson | Kilday | Sabath |
| Dingell | LeCompte | Sheehan |
| Durham | Lyle | Shelley |
| Evins | McCarthy | Smith, Kans. |
| Flood | Merrow | Stanley |
| Fugate | Miller, Calif. | Taylor |
| Gillette | Miller, N. Y. | Winstead |
| Gossett | Morton | Wood, Ga. |

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 31, 1951.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, if the membership followed the Clerk as he read the statement of the managers on the part of the House, you no doubt gathered a full knowledge of what was accomplished in the conference which was held between the House and the other body. No bill in recent years has been considered as carefully as this bill. For 3 months the House Committee on Armed Services conducted extensive hearings on the matter. For 2 weeks it was debated here in the House. For 6 weeks it was considered by the House conferees. In my opinion, the conference report represents a better bill than that originally passed by the House, and, of course, a better bill than that originally passed by the Senate. By the free exchange of views which prevailed throughout the conference, I believe we have prepared legislation to which no one can find any serious objection.

I can state, with a certain amount of pride, that, generally speaking, the House position prevailed in most of the major issues at stake, particularly with respect to the draft age and universal service. There were approximately 25 major areas of disagreement, all of which have been settled satisfactorily. The most significant is the agreement with respect to the requirement that Congress must take another look at universal military training before it can be put into operation. I stated to the House originally that I felt that Congress should have another opportunity to examine this feature in greater detail and I am happy to say that the conference report requires such a procedure.

Before I explain the conference report in greater detail, I would like to express, publicly and for the record, my appreciation for the outstanding statesmanship displayed during the conferences held on this bill by my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT'S opposition to universal military training at this time is well known.

But, setting aside his personal convictions, and acting as a conferee of the House, he carried out the wishes of a majority of the House as expressed in the House bill that was sent to conference.

At no time did he let his personal convictions sway him from supporting the views of the House, and his contribution to the tremendous task of reconciling the two bills helped greatly in the preparation of what I consider to be an outstanding report.

He deserves the thanks of the entire membership, for he was placed in a difficult position. It was not an easy task to set aside sincere and honestly held views toward a vital subject, and act as an agent of the House in a matter that passed the House against his views.

I want to also express my personal gratitude to the other House managers, for their faithful attendance, their patience, and their very important contributions to the report.

Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. ARENDS, are entitled to the thanks of the House for a highly important job well done.

Now I hope that all of the Members will give me their attention while I explain the report in detail, for this is the most important measure that will be

considered during this session of the Congress.

I can say with sincerity that I believe it warrants the unanimous support of the House membership.

The universal military training and service bill agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees contains the following salient features:

DRAFT FOR SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

First. Termination of Draft Act: The authority to induct into the Armed Forces has been extended for 4 years and will terminate on July 1, 1955. When the bill passed the House we extended it 3 years. The Senate had no time limit on it. We took the position—and we think rightly so—that in all emergency legislation there should be a termination date. That had been the philosophy of the Committee on Armed Services where we enact emergency legislation.

Second. Period of service: The period of service for persons inducted in the Armed Forces is 24 months. When we passed the bill in the House it was 26 months. The Senate had 24 months, and we agreed to 24 months. Thus, draftees can only be held in the service for 24 months.

Third. Registration: This law applies to all male citizens of the United States and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States between the ages of 18 and 26. Thus the age for registration applies to all males between the ages of 18 and 26. Classification for induction purposes will take place as soon as practicable following registration

Fourth. Draft age: The age fixed for induction into the Armed Forces is from 18½ to 26, but no one can be drafted into the Armed Forces by any local board if there is available within that local board any person between the age of 19 through 26.

Fifth. Reduction of physical and mental standards: The physical standards for induction will be those that prevailed in January of 1945; the mental standards will be established on the basis of a percentile score of 10 which corresponds to a General Classification Test score of 65. The new mental standards, therefore, are a reduction of 3 from the present percentile score minimum of 13 and a reduction of 5 from the previous standard of 70 heretofore established by law as a minimum General Classification Test score for induction. The reduction should result in reclassification or making available for induction approximately 150,000 men who have heretofore or would shortly be classified as IV–F.

Sixth. Ceiling on the Armed Forces: When the House passed the bill there was no ceiling as to the strength of the armed services. An effort was made in the committee on several occasions to write in a ceiling, and we had one or two teller votes on the question, but no ceiling was put on. However, the Senate wrote a ceiling of 4,000,000 men. So we compromised by putting the ceiling at 5,000,000 men.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question relative to the provision in the House bill concerning the utilization of the schools and colleges of the country.

Mr. VINSON. I will explain that, if I may, a little later. That was Mr. ROGERS' amendment about schools. When I discuss UMT I will explain that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he goes to that?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. In connection with the deferment of students the report says that college students may be deferred until they complete their academic year, but they may get only one deferment.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly what the House bill said when it passed the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to have the gentleman state what is meant by that phrase "as far as further deferments is concerned."

Mr. VINSON. It means if he is deferred once, he cannot again obtain a statutory deferment. That is all it means.

Mr. HINSHAW. But it does not mean that he cannot go on with his studies if the draft board allows him to?

Mr. VINSON. No; if he falls under any deferment that the President may provide by regulation, he can, of course, qualify for further deferment.

Seventh. Total obligated service: Men will be required to serve a total obligated period of service of 8 years. This applies to all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or inducted into the National Security Training Corps. The total period of obligated service includes active duty, training duty in the National Security Training Corps, and active or inactive service in the Reserve components.

Eighth. Active duty for reservists: Reservists now or hereafter ordered to active duty may be required to serve 24 months. The authority of the President to order all reservists to active duty is extended until July 1, 1953.

Ninth. Release of reservists: Any reservist, officer, or enlisted man ordered to active duty from the Volunteer or Inactice Reserve shall be released to inactive duty upon application after 17 months of active duty if he served for 1 year or more on active duty during World War II.

All time spent on active duty since June 25, 1950, counts.

However, the Secretaries of the military departments are authorized to retain reservists on active duty for the period for which they were ordered to active duty if they possess a rating or specialty found to be critical, and if their release would impair efficiency.

This provision is not to be construed as a minimum period of active duty for veteran reservists ordered to active duty from the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve. The military departments plan to release many thousands of reservists prior to the completion of 17 months of active duty.

Tenth. Deferment of students: High-school students will be deferred until they graduate from high school or attain the age of 20. College students may be deferred until they complete their academic year, but if they are deferred to complete an academic year, they may not thereafter be deferred again to complete an academic year. No local board may be required to defer any college student based upon a Government-sponsored national test score or upon the student's class standing.

Eleventh. Overseas assignment: Every person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be given a period of not less than 4 months of training and may not be assigned for duty in any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories or possessions, until after this 4-month period has elapsed. In addition, no member of the Armed Forces who is enlisted, appointed, or ordered to active duty shall be assigned to duty at an installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories or possessions, until he has had the equivalent of at least 4 months of basic training.

Twelfth. Enlistment in the Regular Army: Men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 24 months and may not have their enlistment involuntarily extended except in time of war or national emergency.

Thirteenth. Extension of voluntary enlistments: The authority to involuntarily extend enlistments in the Regular and Reserve components of the Armed Forces is extended until July 1, 1953. That is, all enlistments which expire after July 9, 1951, may be extended by the President for 12 months, but no person shall have his enlistment extended more than once.

Fourteenth. Aliens: All aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall be immediately liable for induction into the Armed Forces of the National Security Training Corps of the United States. Aliens admitted to the United States other than as permanent residents who remain in the United States for 1 year or more shall be liable for induction unless they request release from service, in which case they will forever be debarred from citizenship.

Fifteenth. Conscientious objectors: Subject to regulations issued by the President, persons who are found by local boards to be opposed to noncombatant service shall be ordered by their local boards to perform civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, for a period of 24 months.

A conscientious objector's refusal to perform such work will subject him to the penalties of the Selective Service Act.

Sixteenth. Alcoholic beverages: The Secretary of Defense is given the authority to issue regulations controlling the use of alcoholic beverages at or near military camps. Persons who knowingly violate such regulations will be subject to fine and imprisonment.

Now, I would like to turn to the provisions concerning universal military training. When we had up the question of universal military training during the House debate, the House was of the opinion, I am sure, that Congress should know all about what the plan should be. Thus, we established a commission and we es-

tablished a training corps, but we wrote a provision in the House bill which stated that no person could be inducted until certain things took place. We felt that Congress should know all about the plan; and we have brought back a report that carries out the wishes of the House in that respect.

I may say that is one reason it was held up for six long weeks. If it had not been for agreement on that, instead of having this conference report here today there would probably be a resolution to extend the draft law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, it goes a little further than that. It is not simply that Congress has to know all about it, but the Congress has to approve the program?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. It has to enact legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the Commission reports a plan to the Armed Services Committee, and the Armed Services Committee in turn submits that plan as a bill to the Congress within the 45-day limit provision in the section, and the House or the Senate or both reject the plan or defeat the bill, then what is the situation?

Mr. VINSON. No man can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then what does the Commission do? Does it submit a new plan?

Mr. VINSON. The Commission, I would say, would try to work up something that is in accordance with the views of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And it would continue in operation even though Congress disapproved its recommendation?

Mr. VINSON. It would, and for that reason we did not put them on a salary; we put them on a per diem basis.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. With the thought that they would not work if they did not get paid.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly. We have a good bill, Mr. Speaker.

I must now continue with the UMT phase of this report. The recommendation of the Commission comes back; your Armed Services Committee will consider it just like it does other proposed legislation; it will be open to amendment on the floor of the House and it must be passed by a majority of a quorum; it must be signed by the President of the United States and become a law before any man can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps.

Mr. BARDEN. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am very much in favor of that as he heard me attempt to express myself for about an hour on one occasion. With reference to this matter of the utilization of educational institutions, when the Commission brings in its report as outlined under section 7 is it distinctly and clearly understood that an amendment or a proposal for the utilization of schools and colleges and the educational facilities of this country would be germane and would be considered?

Mr. VINSON. I may say that if they submit a plan any Member of the House, under the general rules of germaneness, would have the right to offer any amendment. Here is what we decided on that point:

The amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] would have directed the Commission to submit recommendations to the Congress for the utilization of the schools and colleges of the Nation in the universal military training program. Both the Senate conferees and the House conferees, after considerable discussion, agreed that this matter could be handled by the Congress when the plan was submitted. Its elimination from the Commission's report would not in any way preclude the consideration of such school utilization if the Congress deems it advisable when the program is being considered by the Congress.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what I want to appear in the RECORD, that the chairman believes that that should be done, that the House should have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. VINSON. When they submit it, if it is not in, I will raise that point for consideration myself. That is as far as I can go; I cannot guarantee that it will be passed, but it will be considered by the committee, and I am satisfied it can be considered by the House.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I should like to get the chairman's view with respect to one thing for the RECORD; that is, conscientious objectors.

Mr. VINSON. In the Senate bill they established work camps.

Mr. SUTTON. I am not referring to that; but in the extension of the draft it means that the conscientious objectors are subject to the local draft board; is that right?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. In the Senate bill, as I say, they created work camps; in our report we have worked out a method whereby a conscientious objector can be deferred by the local draft board provided he is engaged in some occupation that contributes to the welfare or the defense of the country.

Mr. SUTTON. That is subject to Presidential regulation; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct; it is subject to Presidential regulation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Georgia explain why the period of training for inactive and volunteer reserves was increased by 5 months over the House provision?

Mr. VINSON. The inactive reserves?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; the inactive and volunteer reserves. The period of active service was increased by 5 months to a total of 17 months.

Mr. VINSON. The Senate bill had no release provision with respect to veteran inactive and volunteer reservists. The House amendment required their release after 12 months. The Senate conferees objected to this provision, and felt that it should be part of the Reserve legislation soon to be considered. We finally agreed to the provision which requires their release after 17 months, but it is not to be considered a minimum. Under the system they are going to adopt, I doubt whether many of them will be held more than 17 months.

Let me briefly run through the high lights of the universal-military-training features:

First. The conference report establishes a National Security Training Commission composed of five members.

Three members must be civilians.

Two members must be active or retired member of the Regular components of the Armed Forces.

Not more than two of the three civilian members may be from the same political party.

The members must be confirmed by the Senate.

The Chairman must be a civilian.

The Commission to be appointed for a term of years.

Civilian members and retired members of Armed Forces to receive $50 per day while engaged in work of the Commission.

Second. At such time as the Commission is appointed, a National Security Training Corps is established.

Third. Duties of the Commission:

The Commission, subject to the direction of the President, is given the authority to exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps.

The training must be basic military training.

The Commission is authorized to establish policies and standards with respect to the conduct and training of members of the National Security Training Corps.

The Commission must make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of the members of the Corps.

The Secretary of Defense will designate the military departments to conduct the training.

The military departments must carry out the training in accordance with the policies and standards established by the Commission.

The military departments, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and the policies and standards of the Commission, will determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the corps.

Fourth. Legislative recommendations: Within 4 months after confirmation of the Commission, the Commission must submit to the Congress legislative proposals which shall include, but not be limited to (a) an outline of a program deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to make sure that the training will be of a military nature with the understanding that the Commission will not have the authority to authorize the basic type or types of training to be given to the members of the corps; (b) recommendations with respect to the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the corps; (c) a code of con-

duct; (d) recommendations with respect to the death and disability benefits and other benefits and obligations of members of the corps; (e) measures necessary to implement the policies and standards to be established by the Commission.

Fifth. Recommendations must go to the Committees on Armed Services: (a) within 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of Congress the Committees on Armed Services must report a bill or resolution to their respective Houses on the recommendations; (b) such bill or resolution will be privileged.

Sixth. No inductions to take place without further legislation: No person can be inducted for universal military training until after Congress has enacted: (a) a code of conduct and measures providing disability and death benefits for members of the corps; and the Congress (b) has considered and enacted into law all or a portion of the recommendations submitted by the Commission; (c) even after such laws have been enacted, no person can be inducted until either the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, reduces or eliminates the period of service in the Armed Forces for persons below the age of 19.

Seventh. Age for induction into the National Security Training Corps: At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized all persons then or thereafter registered at the age of 18 will be liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps. In other words men will be inducted into the National Security Training Corps after arriving at the age of 18. There will still be a period of time involved in classifying such registrants, however, so that generally speaking, it can be said that induction into the National Security Training Corps will take place for most of the young men eligible for that training at the age of 18 years and 3 months. Men who are deferred from induction into the National Security Training Corps may not escape liability for induction therein merely by remaining deferred until they pass their nineteenth birthday.

Eighth. Report required of the Commission: The Commission must submit comprehensive reports on the operation of the universal military training program and the Secretary of Defense must do likewise.

Ninth. Pay, period of service, and no overseas assignments fixed by statute: Members of the training corps will receive $30 per month but will be entitled to the benefits of the Dependents Assistance Act if they have dependents. Members will be trained for 6 months. No person can be assigned for training at any installation located on land outside the continental United States—except residents of the Territories and possessions may be trained in the area from which they were inducted.

Tenth. Termination date for universal military training: The conference report does not contain any termination date for universal military training since this matter will be subject to congressional action when the required implementing legislation is considered by the Congress.

I sincerely trust the report will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I can truthfully say never have I sat in a conference where legislation was more carefully and thoroughly considered as that which is now before us. I must pause just long enough to pay my respects and high admiration to the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, who acted as chairman of the conference, for his eminent fairness at all times, for his courtesy, his kindness, and consideration. Certainly, he does not excel the champion from Georgia, our own distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House [Mr. VINSON] who stood as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar, and in all the bitter wrangling that we had since April 17 I found out that whenever the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, makes a promise to a person, he keeps it, and he certainly kept his promise to the Members of this House. As you know, he accepted an amendment which would require, before UMT went into effect, Congress to take positive, affirmative action, and if he had not changed the original bill on this floor by accepting that amendment, it never would have passed this House. He promised us at the time the bill was passed that he would insist upon that chief primary provision in the legislation. He did, and the Senate—though some Senators were pretty stubborn for several days—finally yielded and accepted the House position.

I do not have to remind Members that always I have opposed peacetime military conscription. I know, too, that a great man once said, "to act contrary to conscience is neither safe nor upright." I signed this conference report, but I do not want anyone to think that I have surrendered or capitulated. I signed it because I was acting in an official capacity as a manager on the part of this House to maintain the House position. I think the House of Representatives is bigger than any individual or any party or any faction in it. Though I spoke against and voted against the bill when it passed the House, I felt duty bound and obligated to go along with the House conferees in maintaining the position of the House, and for that reason I signed the conference report. Because in the main the House provisions prevailed.

I am not going to press the matter or fuss much about it. Personally I do not care for a roll call; I do not think the chairman of our committee cares for it, though I am informed the distinguished majority leader will ask for a roll call on this conference report, and if we do have a roll call, of course, I would be compelled to vote against it, because I would be voting as an individual, my own personal convictions, in this matter.

From the start I felt that it was a grave mistake to mix UMT with the draft law. The only reason they were put together is because the proponents of this legislation realized, I think, that it is now or never, and taking advantage of the pressure from all sides and the emotionalism and hysteria of the hour they tied the two in together, mixing castor oil with the orange juice, sugar-coating the pill. Of coure the draft at this time must be extended. There is no argument about this. I thought when we first considered the legislation that it would have been much better for us to simply extend the draft for the time being and then after the crises subsided we could bring in a new, clean UMT bill and consider it on its own merits. I am happy to say that General MacArthur, since we considered this legislation, in his testimony before the Senate committee, agreed to this position. He thinks it would have been wise for us to have separated the issues. But, it has already been done, and you have no alternative in the matter and you are going to be called upon to vote on this conference report.

I am not going to quarrel with any man as to how he shall vote. You know, there is wisdom in multitude of counsel. You may be right and I may be wrong about this legislation. I think the chairman of our committee, and certainly most of our professional staff members, will tell you that I have wrestled with my conscience and judgment over this matter for several years, particularly in recent months, and they know that I will agree to have some type of military-training bill that would be acceptable, not only to me, but to many people who feel as I do about it. Certainly, I do not want this country Prussianized, and I do not think in the present conference report there is any grave danger of our falling completely under military control as long as three of the members of this Commission are to be civilians and the Chairman is to be a civilian, always under civilian control, though the actual operational part of the program must and should be and will be under the military. Unless the training is military, there is no justification for it at all.

There are two things in the conference report that I regret. One is the period of service which was extended from the present law of 21 to 24 months. The Senate bill provided for 24 months and the House bill 26 months. We yielded to the Senate, which I think was really a victory for us, so we cannot quarrel over that.

The period of obligated service for reservists is not 6 years but 8 years, a pretty long time, yet considering world conditions and the uncertainty not only of today but of the future, perhaps for several years to come, 8 years is perhaps not too much. Who knows? I don't.

The most objectionable feature in the bill is the treatment we give to the reservists, the release of reservists. The Senate had no provision in their bill at all about this. We had a provision in our bill that after 12 months of service these boys who have been dragged in, most of them in their late twenties and early thirties, with 2 or 3 years of combat in World War II, with two or three children, who have bought a farm or built a house or gone into business and had their education seriously inter-

rupted already, these fellows will not be released after 12 months as provided in the House bill but after 17 months.

Of course, we have to bear in mind that it usually takes a month to get a man from this country to the combat battle line, and it usually takes a month after he stops fighting to get him back home. So from the purely financial point of view this is a good provision, but it is pretty rough and tough on these reservists who had fought so valiantly in World War II.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making. In connection with the 17 months service of an inactive reservist, I note on page 18 of the conference report that there is an out for the military, so that they can continue these men in service for the full 24 months, if their release prior to the completion of such time would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned.

Mr. SHORT. That is true, and of necessity it must be that way, because you cannot yank men out of combat in Korea or any other section of the world unless you have replacements for them. It is a hardship, but war is hard. I think a great general once called it hell.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I apprecate the gentleman's answer to my question, but I assume that the conferees in interpreting this language will insist that the military use it strictly in accordance with the language laid down by the committee, that they are not going to abuse it, and will limit it to such ratings as radar specialists and people that they cannot get otherwise.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy the gentleman from Washington made that statement, because I share his apprehension, as do other members not only of our committee but of this House. We are going to see to it that we always keep the military under civilian control in this country.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Think of the inactive first lieutenant who is leading a platoon out in Korea, having led one in World War II. They cannot say they cannot get other lieutenants to lead infantry troops. I do not want that kind of interpretation placed on it.

Mr. SHORT. No, I do not think any such interpretation would be given. Certainly we hope not. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentleman ought to correct his statement to provide that the inactive and the volunteer reserve who has been called against his wishes is the one who will have to serve 17 months.

Mr. SHORT. Yes, that is absolutely right. I did not know I had said anything differently. They can be released after 17 months, including time on active duty since June 25, 1950, if they had served 12 months during the shooting war, December 7, 1941, to September 2, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain loopholes in this bill which I do not like but lack of time prevents my discussing them. I do hope we shall never accept the Prussian idea of a single Chief of Staff.

After all, this bill is more or less innocuous. It does not establish universal military training but merely sets up a commission which shall report not later than 4 months after the enactment of the legislation, a plan which will be considered by the Armed Services Committees of both Houses, as well as the entire Congress itself. No induction into the UMT Corps can take place until Congress first enacts a code of conduct, death, and disability benefits. The Congress must take positive and affirmative action and the ultimate outcome of this legislation will depend on the kind of program which is submitted to us. If it is a good and workable program that will not bankrupt the Nation, I predict that the Congress will pass it almost unanimously.

For the benefit of all Members I wish to call attention to the excellent analysis made and inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, June 6, page A3486 by our distinguished and able colleague from Michigan, the Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER.

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is the gentleman willing to state unequivocally that acceptance of this conference report does not make it mandatory upon Congress to adopt some type of a universal military training program if and when the proposed commission reports a program?

Mr. ARENDS. That is right; in my opinion, it is absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the so-called draft-UMT bill now before us is the end result in the long legislative process by which practically every phase of the Nation's mapower problem and every feature of this proposed legislation has been thoroughly considered. I do not know that any measure has been more exhaustively discussed than this one. The report now before us is the end product hammered out on the anvil of legislative debate over a period of several months.

The bill originally reported by our Committee on Armed Services, as a substitute to the Senate bill, was itself the result of extensive hearings and thorough examination. It was then earnestly and somewhat vigorously debated here on the floor under a liberal rule allowing 3 days of general debate and any amendment the House in its wisdom saw fit to adopt.

When the bill was sent to conference there were approximately 20 points of difference between the House and Senate bills. Some were minor and others were of vital importance. The pending report is the result of many meetings of the conferees and long hours of discussion. Every single point of disagreement was considered. This report is necessarily the product of compromise. It could not be otherwise.

While I cannot say that I personally approve every single provision of the bill, I am sure I can say that this report represents the collective judgment of the Congress. As one of the conferees I think I can also say with some pardonable pride, that the report embodies in large measure the basic wishes of the House. I accordingly signed the report. I hope that it will have the complete endorsement of the House.

You may recall that when this bill was originally before the House I was actively interested in having certain basic provisions adopted. One was that there be a fixed termination date both for the draft feature and the UMT feature of the pending bill. Another was that there be a definite ceiling as to the size of our armed services. A third was that there be a prohibition against sending troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact without specific authorization from Congress. And still a fourth was that the proposed UMT program be considered separate and apart from the draft program.

The bill as passed by the House embodied my views in these respects to only a limited extent. While not satisfactory to me in every respect I nonetheless voted for the bill when it passed the House by the overwhelming majority of 372 to 44.

As one of the conferees I earnestly sought, as did the other House conferees, to sustain the views of the House in every possible particular. We necessarily had to yield and compromise on certain points. Thanks to the able leadership of our distinguished chairman, I believe we enjoyed a large measure of success in having the views of the House as a whole adopted in their basic aspects.

Throughout the consideration of this bill one of the major points of issue, both in committee and on the floor, was with respect to the proposed UMT program. This was one of the major questions in conference. A great many of us believed that regardless of the merits of UMT, it was a long-range program and should be considered entirely separate and apart from questions relating to the present military manpower needs provided by the draft law.

When the bill was before the House we reached a more or less compromise result by agreeing to a provision to the effect that the so-called UMT program would not be put into effect until the Congress itself had had the opportunity to consider this matter in detail and to work its will on the subject. The House bill provided for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission which would report to Congress within 6 months its recommendations for the program. The conference report still embodies this important feature, except that the length of time within which

the Commission must make its report is reduced from 6 months to 4 months.

There is also another important change, with which I do not believe strong exception can be made. The conferees agreed that the Commission's recommendations shall not relate to the types of basic military training to be given but rather shall pertain to the program in broad outline and to measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the National Security Training Corps, as well as to a code of conduct and penalties. In other words, it was the decision of the conferees to leave the question of the basic type of military training to the military people themselves and general supervision and other matters to the Commission.

The point to be emphasized is that under the terms of the compromise on the UMT feature no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until the Congress itself has acted on the legislative recommendations to be submitted by the Commission. In other words, we have preserved in the pending report the views of the House that the Congress shall have opportunity to express its will on this UMT program. In my opinion, this was a distinct victory for the House conferees.

The bill that the Committees on Armed Services of the two Houses report on this subject shall be privileged but shall be subject to amendment any member may offer. In other words, we have preserved in principle the conviction of the House that regardless of the merits of a UMT program, the Congress should have the opportunity to work its will on this subject, independent and apart from our present military needs arising under the Selective Service Act.

Many of you will also be pleased to note that the report provides for a ceiling on the size of our armed services. The Senate bill contained a 4,000,000-man ceiling. The House bill contained no such limitation. The issue was compromised in conference by fixing the figure at 5,000,000 persons at any one time. While I personally feel the figure is too high, nonetheless the basic principle of Congress having full control over the size of our Armed Forces is maintained.

We reached another compromise to which I believe some special reference should be made because of the general interest in the reservists. Our House bill contained a provision which provided in substance that veteran reservists on active duty for 12 months after June 25, 1950, shall be released upon his own application. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The compromise reached in conference raises the length of active duty necessary for release to 17 months.

I know that many of us would prefer to have the period limited to the House provision of 12 months. That is my personal preference. However, I call your special attention to the fact that the 17-month period is not to be construed as the minimum period for which veteran reservists are to be held on duty. As a matter of fact, all the services have put into effect replacement programs for the release of veteran reservists who have been called to active duty. If these plans continue as originally contemplated there will be very few veteran reservists on duty at the end of this year who were called about a year ago. Moreover, we anticipate that at some subsequent date legislation will be reported dealing with the whole reservist program. As you may know, a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has been studying this subject of Reserves in detail.

In this matter of the release of veteran reservists it should be borne in mind that the provision in the House bill and in this report applies solely to inactive veteran reservists as distinguished from the veteran reservists who belonged to various Organized Reserve units, the members of which were paid for attending meetings or drills and received point credit for such attendance for retirement.

In conclusion, permit me to state again that while this conference report may not be satisfactory in every particular to each and every one of us, I sincerely believe that it expresses in basic principles the wishes of the House. It should therefore have the endorsement of the House.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. On page 23 of the report, after subheading (3), the conference report says the Commission shall have general supervision, and indicates a wide authority. Then, on page 25, a few limitations are put on.

I am making this very short. I voted for this bill, as the gentleman knows; but it seems to me that we may have UMT, in accepting the conference report, whether we want it or not, and I do not want to find that the only provisions brought back to Congress have to do with disability and death benefits, and any other questions the Commission itself may decide to ask us. Will the gentleman please explain?

Mr. ARENDS. No. Only through affirmative action of the Congress. In other words, we can adopt or reject any proposal that the Commission sends up here, regardless of what the Armed Services Committee may determine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I favor the conference report with the exception of the provisions that affect those volunteer and inactive reserves who have been called to active duty against their own wishes. Most of them are veterans of World War II.

When this bill was considered by the House Armed Services Committee we members of that committee spent many hours discussing the treatment accorded the Reserves. After a lengthy discussion the committee unanimously agreed as did Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of National Defense that the Reserve program had been poorly administered by the Defense Department and that the reserve himself had been mistreated. My personal opinion is that the word "mistreated" was mild and that word that should be used was "tortured," for it more aptly describes the treatment accorded reserves by not only the Defense Department but also by the component branches of our Armed Forces.

After the House Armed Services Committee had spent hours discussing the Reserve problem in general we wrote a proviso into the bill that any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served for a period of 12 months or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, shall upon application be released to inactive duty after he has completed 12 months of active duty. When I speak of an inactive or volunteer reserve I speak of one who did not attend drills, one who did not take his summer training and one who did not receive pay for being a member of the Reserve. This type of a reserve is one who was solicited by the various branches of the armed services and asked to join a Reserve unit with the understanding that he would only be called to active duty should his country become involved in a national emergency. At the time the reserve was solicited for membership there was nothing contained in any law that permitted the armed services to call him to active duty. Last year without warning the Congress of the United States amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 authorizing the call to active duty of any type of reserve. By so doing, Congress violated the contract that existed between the inactive and volunteer reserve and the Government of the United States.

With this authority the armed services launched a program of ruthlessly calling up the inactive and the volunteer reserve without considering the fact that the average reservist served anywhere from 2 to 5 years in World War II. The fact he had decorations including the Purple Heart was not given any consideration. There was no concern shown for the reservist or his family nor for his job or his efforts to complete his education. He was abruptly taken from civilian life and the hardships that resulted cannot be adequately described in words.

As the result of this inhuman treatment the reservist's mind is poisoned and his attitude so bitter that there is not a member of this Congress who has not received scores of letters containing violent protests over the shabby treatment accorded these veterans of World War II who made a stellar contribution in winning that conflict.

These reservists cannot understand why they have been conscripted and thrown into combat while thousands of organized reserves are still on inactive duty and Selective Service is monthly lowering the draft requirements. During the month of July draft quotas have been lowered to 15,000 and frankly there is

no answer to the criticism voiced by inactive and volunteer reserves. They are the victims of maladministration and the resulting injustice that follows in its wake.

As I have said before the House version of the UMT bill provided for release of these inactive and volunteer reserves after 12 months of active duty. Now we find that this conference committee report extends the 12 months of active duty to 17 months. In the vernacular of the armed services the reservists have been given another shellacking when this bill becomes a law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It does not make any difference how sweetly proponents of this report mouth the words "unless sooner released," the fact still remains that they have added five more months to the active service of Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Last fall the Department of the Army announced a point system, and distributed information throughout the services telling the men that after they had acquired a certain number of points they would be sent home. Then, within a matter of a week, the Department of the Army completely ignored the point system and the Reserves started asking the question, "Where is the point system?" The truth of the matter is that the Army had no intention of putting the point system in effect. It was nothing more than a sugar-coated promise designed to quiet the Reserves on the eve of last fall's general election.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not agree that someone in the Department of Defense has been dragging his feet concerning giving relief to the reservist?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Absolutely. Mrs. Rosenberg in her statement before the House Armed Services Committee stated the entire Reserve program has been mal-administered and the reservists poorly treated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman think in view of the fact that the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], which is now writing a Reserve program, that if there is any injustice done in this bill it can be dealt with and corrected by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is on that subcommittee?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly, but that is another sugar-coated promise because it will take months before any Reserve program can be written into law.

Mr. VINSON. With the gentleman's aid I hope we shall have it in less than 30 days.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Already we have been waiting and waiting for 18 months. We started consideration of it last year and nothing has been done about it yet, even despite Mrs. Rosenberg's report to us that the Reserve program was maladministered.

Mr. VINSON. I hope the gentleman is not trying to convey to the House that the viewpoint he is now expressing cannot be solved; we all recognize the force of the well-meaning criticism the gentleman is directing to this problem, and we are trying to correct it and will when we bring out a Reserve program bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. While it is our hope that a new Reserve program will be a reality in the near future we are losing a golden opportunity in this bill to regain the confidence of the reservists and to restore their faith in Congress.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Under the conference report can the enlistment of Volunteer Reserves, Inactive Reserves, be extended 1 year beyond the termination date of their contract?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It can be extended to July 1 of 1953.

Mr. FORD. Can the gentleman give any logical explanation of the right to extend the 4-year term or 3-year term enlistment contract of a volunteer or inactive reservist?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I cannot. Being brutally frank, the contract that the reservist has with his Government has been ruthlessly ignored so many times in recent months that it appears to be but a scrap of paper. Let me say in conclusion that in my opinion the great majority of all Reserves now on active duty are so sour and bitter over the treatment accorded them that upon discharge they will never have anything to do with the Reserve components of our Military Establishments. They have had enough and I agree with them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the remarks just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] are a stern indictment of this provision of the conference report.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is completely qualified to speak on this subject of the treatment of reservists not only because he has been a reservist himself and served in two World Wars but because he is a member of the House Armed Services Committee and he has first-hand knowledge of the shameful treatment that has been accorded reservists, particularly inactive and volunteer Reserves, since the fighting started in Korea.

Now the House members of the conference committee come here this afternoon and blandly admit they yielded and added five additional months to the 12 that were stipulated in the bill approved by the House, making inactive and volunteer reservists subject to 17 months of active service.

To whom did they yield in conference? Was it to Senate members of the conference committee or was it to the brass hats in the Pentagon? Up to this point in the discussion there has been no adequate explanation and there probably will be none.

As a matter of fact, members of the House conference committee yielded time after time on provisions which were written into the bill in the House. The result is that this legislation is even less acceptable, if that is possible, than when it originally passed the House.

The conference report emphasizes language now used in the bill which provides that inactive and volunteer veteran reservists will serve 17 months "unless sooner released."

That "unless sooner released" language amounts to an all-day sucker and nothing more. It sounds nice but it will not fool veteran reservists. If the House conferees believed as Members of the House did when they passed this provision that 12 months was an adequate period of service for veteran reservists then why did they join in passing out this all-day sucker?

This is only one of several rotten provisions in this bill as it now stands, and it is lamentable that the parliamentary situation is such that a recommital motion is not in order. We have no alternative but to vote to accept or reject this conference report and the law which it will establish.

I will certainly vote to reject it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

(Mr. BARDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago when the original draft-UMT bill was before the House I put up the best fight I knew how to make on several of the provisions of the bill, and think I was at least partially responsible for some beneficial changes. We are now up against the gun. The draft bill expires within a few days, we are in a shooting war. The boys are still fighting and dying in Korea, and unless somebody arrives at some kind of definite objective pretty soon it looks as though they will be fighting and dying there for some time to come. The men fighting need relief, and in order to secure these necessary men and maintain our national defense to a point of safety we must have in operation a selective-service law.

I am going to vote for this conference report, but I am no more of the opinion that it is wise to combine the two at this time than I was at the time I was fighting the bill. It might be a case of deciding when is it right to do wrong. The bill has been improved over what it was when it came to the floor. I was glad to hear the chairman make the statement he did a few minutes ago about the House provision dealing with the utilization of school and college facilities, for when the language dealing with this subject was stricken out in conference I was a little bit puzzled, especially in view of the fact that one of the great educational institutions of this country very properly and appropriately conferred a doctor's degree on him recently. I thought he had walked out on the educational institutions, but he declared emphatically that he will see to it that this Congress will have the opportunity to fully con-

sider the educational problem by amendment or otherwise, and so I think he is still entitled to hold the degree—congratulations, Doctor.

While on this subject let me say that up to now the educational people of this country have not been permitted to have very much, if anything, to do with either the drafting or planning for this all-important piece of legislation. I do not believe the Pentagon wants their ideas or will even allow the educators of this country an opportunity to help. In fact, about the only interest I have seen the military from the Pentagon exhibit in education, is in trying to get their own sons appointed to West Point, and they are usually successful in that. I think it can be truthfully said that the military of the Pentagon are determined to subordinate our school system to the military, and I am equally determined to fight that trend. I see no reason why they cannot be coordinated, for that would prove beneficial to both. But to subordinate our school system to the military would be a long step toward the abandonment of our American way of life, and in the direction of a military dictatorship or militarism, which is just as objectionable to me as any other ism, including communism. These military leaders are not bad men, many of them are great men—men who have bared their chests to bullets in defense of this country. But they are ambitious men, and it is as much the responsibility of Congress to keep them in line and see to it that they do not usurp more power than would be good for our form of government as it is for Congress to preserve the balance between the judicial, executive, and the legislative branches of the Government. Neither should be permitted to usurp power but be required to operate within their own constitutional fields.

As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have had correspondence with many educators all over the country, including officials of elementary schools, high schools, junior colleges, colleges, and officials of the various States. The following are some of the problems that they feel, virtually without exception, should be carefully considered in the writing of a universal military training law which will unquestionably affect every segment and activity carried on in this complicated economy of ours:

First. Careful study should be given to coordinating our military program with our educational system.

Second. To continue the flow of trained personnel in all fields and especially those in the professions and sciences.

Third. To utilize to the fullest extent the faculties and teaching personnel in the junior colleges, colleges, and universities.

Fourth. To provide wherever possible summer training in camps and some military training on the campuses so as not to interrupt more than is absolutely necessary the education and training of students.

Fifth. To expand and extend the ROTC program on an equal basis for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Sixth. Wherever practicable, construct necessary buildings on the campuses of our schools, colleges, and universities rather than build entirely new camps that are strictly military.

Seventh. To study carefully the results obtained in high schools, junior colleges, and colleges, including VMI, West Point, and similar institutions where military training is carried on at the same time they are securing their academic education.

Along with these suggestions came other comments, in which I concur, indicating their extreme interest in what I regard as the finest education system on earth. I do not believe this Nation can expect to compete with such a combine as the Soviet Union and its satellites in numbers alone. The strength of this Nation lies in its ability to produce equipment and weapons superior, in quality and quantity, to those of any of our enemies, or any combination of them. Under well-trained and well-informed leadership I believe our schools, colleges, and universities should be considered in the same way we consider our industrial structure and converted for production of well-trained technicians and scientists in the same way our plants are converted to produee weapons and equipment, insofar as it is consistent with our educational system. The utilization of our schools and colleges to the fullest extent is not only sound from a training standpoint, but also from an economic standpoint. The most irreplaceable defense resource is not the atom bomb but the scientist who makes it, and the fact that our schools and colleges are primary assets in the arsenal of democracy is only a natural extension of that phrase. It is proclaimed from the pulpit, the White House, by the press, and virtually every public speaker of any note that the country needs moral and spiritual strength as well as military and economic strength—and that it is essential to the defense of our freedoms to have an informed, intelligent, and resourceful people who have an awareness of our national obligations, capacities, and commitments, and certainly without full utilization of our educational institutions this goal can never be achieved. The educational people of America are willing to cooperate. I hope the military of the Pentagon will exhibit a desire to cooperate with them, but if they are unwilling to fully cooperate—then Congress should step in and see to it that they do.

If you will recall, I fought the 18½-year-old provision, but at that time I said that in case of all-out war or absolute necessity certainly we would say go to 18½ or 80 at the other end of the line if necessary, and this bill contains a provision that they will not take the 18½-year-olds until the others are exhausted.

I did not like the $30 per month pay provision. The American people are willing to pay the premium and they are able to pay the premium on the insurance policy that might be necessary to protect this Nation. This is not the place to try to save. We should stop some of these wasteful contracts that are now feeding the flames of inflation. I think it is inexcusable for us to make the distinction we are making. As I said a moment ago, I did not like the joining together of the two bills. It is difficult for me to conceive of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, able as he is, and having done the fine work he has in this House for these many years, to have abandoned the duty of writing a universal military training bill and agree to let a commisson be set up to write the bill. Of course the military is delighted to have this heavy job assigned them. It is a case of throwing the rabbit in a briar patch.

I think we have abandoned our responsibility a little bit too early but when we go back and think of the original bill, I am definitely of the opinion that when the military wrote that bill and presented it to the Committee on Armed Services, it was the boldest and most brazen stroke for dictatorial powers ever made on the continent of the United States. In effect I said the same thing before the Committee on Armed Services, and that committee, in its wisdom and under the leadership of its great chairman, ignored many of the things that were written in it. You say, "Well, why mention it now?" I mention it simply because it is indicative of a trend in the minds of men that we must guard carefully as we do other departments of this Government, and I have said before that they are ambitious men. I respect them, I trust them, but I want them to respect the rights of my people as well as myself.

It must be remembered that in the original bill there was a provision for the President to appoint a five-man commission to draw up a UMT bill and report it to the Armed Services Committee, who were not to have the right to amend or change it. And if reported to the House, the House of Representatives was not to have the right to amend or change it—and that was not all, if the Congress did nothing it would become law without even the approval of Congress or the signature of the President. I could not think of a more horrible and dangerous precedent for the Congress to set. Now, this proposal was not just made by the military, but was adopted by the House Committee on Armed Services and reported to the House, and was not changed by the committee—until after a bitter attack had been made on this provision by myself, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and others. Then after a careful check had been made of the membership when the Committee on Armed Services found it could only rally approximately 140 votes for it out of 435 Members of the House, the chairman then announced he would offer an amendment that would give the House an opportunity to consider, amend or change the report of the Commission. I make this statement simply for the pur-

pose of keeping the record straight. The chairman did offer the amendment, it was adopted, and is now carried in this conference report. I might say further if it were not in this report I most certainly would not vote for this conference report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is plain from the nature of the conference report that the House is being asked to concur in today that the House conferees know only how to make war. They know nothing and care less about mitigating the suffering of those men who have fought our previous wars.

Item 26 of the conference report reads something like this:

> The House amendment provided that no physician or dentist engaged in full-time employment at a Veterans' Administration hospital would be inducted, under the provisions of law authorizing the induction of physicians and dentists, after such physician or dentist attained his thirtieth birthday.
>
> The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The House receded from its position and agreed to the elimination of the provision from the conference report.

You will recall that just a few weeks ago when this legislation passed the House that the amendment sponsored by me was approved unanimously. It was offered as an amendment to the Barden substitute and approved practically unanimously. It was accepted without a vote as part of the original bill itself. Not a single one of the members of the committee of conference who have spoken this morning have offered one iota of explanation as to why the unanimous will of the House should be rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, the gentleman has 5 minutes remaining and I am expecting an explanation from him when the time comes.

Mr. VINSON. I will give it to the gentleman now.

Mr. BAILEY. But not on my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, without going into any of the details because they are fresh in your minds, that it was proven conclusively to the satisfaction of the House that the armed services are today raiding the medical staffs of your veterans' hospitals. Out of 4,020 members of the medical staffs in 140 hospitals 2,040 of them are reservists and over 500 of them have today already been called into service. I made the statement, in discussing the amendment when I presented it, that unless something was done half of your veterans' hospitals would be closed by the 1st of January 1951. There are 21 new veterans' hospitals under construction at the present time that will cost $317,000,000, and there is not a doctor in sight to man a single one of them. I ask you if we can justify that from the standpoint of economy, to say nothing about the service that thousands of veterans are demanding right now and pleading for admission to the hospitals. Yet, apparently this did not get even serious consideration from the conferees. I have spoken to two members of the conference committee and they said they were not present when that action was taken. I spoke to a number of Senate conferees and they said, "You better talk to your House boys about it." So, apparently the action to leave out this amendment was initiated by our own conferees despite the unanimous vote of the House. I am not exactly ready to accuse anyone of bad faith but I think that the distinguished chairman of this committee, who still has 5 minutes to conclude this argument, if he expects my vote in support of this report, had better offer a more logical explanation than anybody has offered so far as to why that amendment was left out.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to advise the House why the conferees agreed to the elimination of what was referred to as the Bailey amendment. The amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] would have exempted physicians and dentists from the doctors' draft law if they were over 30 years of age and if they were employed on a full-time basis at a veterans' hospital. The Senate conferees objected to the provision on the ground that it was discriminatory and would have provided an exemption for one group of doctors and dentists in veterans' hospitals and would not protect the hundreds of civilian hospitals which likewise must be maintained and staffed throughout the Nation. For that reason, the House conferees agreed to eliminate it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is a question which apparently has caused quite a bit of consternation, almost, in the West. On page 10, in the thirteenth line, the words "subject to order" have been inserted by the committee of conference instead of the words "subject to call." No reference to the change is made in the report, and it could be very important.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from California that in reexamining the law it was concluded that in the act of 1948 when we used the word "call" it was not the proper word to use, for this reason: You only call into military service the militia or National Guard in the event of threatened invasion as all other times all components are "ordered" to active duty. Therefore, we used the word "order" instead of the word "call." There is no hidden meaning in it. It is just using the proper word to carry out a proper method of placing people on active duty.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman here or in the RECORD make a definite statement that the word "order" is limited to his present definition of it on the floor? The word "order" unfortunately goes way beyond that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the UMT and the Selective Service Act is now before us for consideration. This conference report is the result of a compromise between the House and Senate bills. There are many points about this measure that I do not like.

I note that there are no work camps for conscientious objectors, as was the case during World War II, and I am informed that the reason for this is that the number of conscientious objectors is so small—approximately 12,000—that it is not enough to warrant the creation of national work camps to place them in during the 24 months of their service. The conferees have arrived at a compromise on the question of conscientious objectors which leaves the question at the local level and permits draft boards to defer a person who is engaged in work which contributes to the maintenance of national health, safety, and interest for a period of 24 months. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that this gives a great advantage to conscientious objectors over men who are inducted into the service. A man is inducted into the Army for 24 months' service and, upon discharge, remains in the Reserves for 6 years. Conscientious objectors, on the other hand, after 24 months of useful work, owe no further responsibility under the bill. This, I maintain, is decidedly unfair to those who are inducted into the service. Then there is the question of the Mennonites, who have been causing a great deal of concern in various parts of my State of Montana, and have been the result of considerable correspondence to me on the subject. I have urged the House Armed Services Committee to give this matter every possible consideration and to work out a solution which could be workable and which would not put to disadvantage those who were inducted into the service. However, as I understand this conference report, the Mennonites are given a straight deferment after induction and an assignment to work at a local level. They would be permitted the privilege of continuing in their normal occupation of farming, for example, and perhaps be able to acquire additional lands and generally improve their economic status, while boys in the same farm communities are called upon to abandon their farms and even sell their livestock at a forced sale when livestock is not ready for market. This, as you can well understand, and justifiably so, creates a great deal of feeling. I had hoped the conference report would permit draft boards, or whoever made decisions in such instances, to see to it that the conscientious objectors who are granted deferments and have the benefits already described would at least be required to do work that is definitely in the national interest and not work which merely improves their economic status and their own pocketbooks. While the Mennonites are conscientious, hard-working people, they do not contribute

to the Armed Forces of the United States in time of national emergency. These people, like the rest of the population, should expect that their normal activities would be sacrificed to some extent in the national interest so that they would not be avoiding all national service.

I wish to express the hope that the Armed Forces Committee will be able to work out a program whereby those who obtain deferment on these grounds may be made more useful in contributing to the national interest during this emergency. The present report does not commend itself to the average person.

Another question of concern to me, which I think is inadequately dealt with in this report, and to which I would like to offer an amendment which is not possible under the procedure covering the reporting of a conference report, would be to lower the terms of service of reservists from 17 to 12 months. It dismays me that the enlistment of reservists is being extended. Many of them now have families and many have established themselves in businesses and many served from 2 to 5 years in the last war. It is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will immediately look into the possibility of releasing those who have served overseas so that those who have carried the burden of World War II, are not required to carry a further and additional burden. I am informed that there are approximately 600,000 reservists in the service at the present time. The only program under which reservists now in service can be released is by calling more reservists who have already served. This is manifestly unfair and should not be allowed to continue. I understand that under the program which the Department of Defense has approved, that all reservists who served more than 12 months in World War II will be released within 12 months in the case of the Army and Air Force and after 12 months if trained replacements are available in the case of the Navy. The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee informs me that the committee has been conducting hearings for several weeks on the Reserves program. I sincerely hope that out of these hearings will come a directive that men who served more than 12 months in World War II should not be called back to active duty short of an all-out emergency that would require their additional service. I am glad to have the assurances of the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that under the rotation program in Korea, men are going to be rotated at the rate of 20,000 a month and that most of the hardship cases will be alleviated in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I am also glad to note that the provision, whereby aliens who, up to now, have not been forced to serve even though they are within the age group and have to register, has been done away with and that these people will have to take their part in the defense of our country.

In conclusion, I would like to again call to the attention of the Armed Services Committee the possibility of doing away with the classification of IV–F and the imposition of equal sacrifice in selective service. There are many IV–F's who could serve in some capacity in the Armed Forces of the Nation. Furthermore, the equality of sacrifice should, with extremely rare and extraordinary exceptions, be applied to all without regard to educational qualifications or abilities.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I realize as I rise to close this debate that this is a historic hour in the life of the Congress. This is a question which has been debated throughout the length and breadth of the country for 30 years. It has received as much attention and as much thought as any question that I believe the Congress has ever attempted to legislate upon.

We are in the closing hour of the handling of this bill, and the action we take today will finally lead to the adoption of this proposal and the sending of this matter to the White House for the President's signature.

While this conference report does not contain what I would like to have it contain, and I dare say that I speak the unanimous opinion of all the Members of the House, nonetheless it has my support and approval.

In reference to the universal military training that we have adopted the House view and went almost the whole length of the House view in presenting this program to you today. I look at this, Mr. Speaker, as being the action on a measure which will give us a permanent Military Establishment that we can depend upon in good and bad times. I look at this measure, Mr. Speaker, as being the means of building up our Reserves, so that the Military Establishment will not in times of war ascend the mountain peaks of power; and then when the war is over go down into the valleys and quagmires again to abandon real defense. If this report is adopted and the bill sent on for the signature of the President, we will have a Military Establishment which will not fluctuate with the crises throughout the world. We will have a Military Establishment that we can depend upon. Someone has said that the conferees are interested in war. I tell you, as one of the conferees, I am interested in peace. And in my judgment we can only have peace by having a tremendously strong Military Establishment. This bill will give us the authority for a strong Reserve Military Establishment which the Nation needs so badly at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the universal military training provision will mean that we will have a Reserve Establishment which will not fluctuate, depending upon conditions throughout the world. The Reserve Establishment, it is true, will have some element of compulsion in it, but it will give us a strong, dependable, efficient, and well-organized Reserve throughout the country.

I have spent as much time as any Member of the House working on the Reserve problem. It is a most knotty problem. In my judgment it is one of the hardest problems that we have in the Defense Department today. By the adoption of this conference report we will make it possible to help solve this problem in the future. I am interested in two things in the Reserve. First, that the present situation shall not repeat itself, and secondly, in removing, if it is possible at this late hour, to do so, the injustices, inequities, and unfair situations which have been visited on our Reserves and our Reserve Establishment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why the House conferees backed up and took off the commission for universal military training the Reserve officer? Under this conference report we are going to have two Regular Army officers.

Mr. BROOKS. The conferees did this. They required—and I think this is important, and I certainly fought for it—a civilian to be chairman. I think that is extremely important. They required three civilians, and one of those may be a Reserve officer.

Mr. GROSS. No, no.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me proceed, if I may, and then I will be glad to answer any questions.

In handling the Reserve question, we in the House, wanted the reservists, whether they were inactive or voluntary reservists, when they were veterans, to be released after 12 months of service. I think that was asking for much. The Armed Forces wanted them retained for 24 months, which was 12 months more than the House bill. In other words, it is twice as much as the House was willing to go along with. The law at the present time requires them to serve as long as 21 months. What we did was to scale off 4 months and reduce the time 21 months to 17 months. So that in the compromise—the reservists saved 4 months of possible service under the present law. But they also are required to serve 5 months more than we in the House hoped they would have to serve.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that you say the conferees respected the will of the House, I want to point out that the will of the House was 12 months. The Senate had nothing in their bill. Therefore, why did not the House conferees hold out for 12 months rather than permit the other body to raise it to 17 months? We all know that a grave injustice has been done to the reservists. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. BROOKS. I will explain my own views, at least. I thought they should not have been kept in even for 12 months. But we had to meet the exigencies of this situation. Before the reserve committee of the Committee on Military Affairs, which is now holding hearings, we have a program for the discharge of all of these reservists. I say to you that under the program given to us many of them, tens of thousands of them, should

be released far before the time set in this law. We wanted an over-all limit beyond which the reservist could not be kept and this over-all limit will guarantee that they shall not be kept beyond that time, except in extreme cases.

In the program before the Armed Service subcommittee on reservists, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] was present, and I want to point out that he is a very active and ardent worker who has the interest of the reservists at heart—as I have—as I say, in the program presented to us they told us that all of the enlisted and officer personel and volunteer and organized reservists, too, of the Marine Corps will be discharged within 13 months, which is a far better break than they would get under this bill. I hope that the releases proceed even better than promised.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I have today inserted into this RECORD the release of the Defense Department showing the program for the release of reservists. I hope that everyone interested will study this program and, by being familiar with its contents, may help to give our Reserves on active duty some idea of when they may be released back to their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I have led the fight for the reservists. I know what injustices and hardships they have suffered over being recalled to active service after their part in the Second World War. My deep regret is that I have not been able at an earlier date to give them more hope and more help in meeting these problems.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 41, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—339

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aandahl | Bates, Mass. | Budge |
| Abbitt | Battle | Burdick |
| Abernethy | Beall | Burleson |
| Addonizio | Beckworth | Burnside |
| Albert | Belcher | Burton |
| Allen, Calif. | Bender | Bush |
| Allen, La. | Bennett, Fla. | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Bentsen | Camp |
| Anderson, Calif. | Berry | Canfield |
| Andresen, August H. | Betts | Cannon |
| Andrews | Blackney | Carlyle |
| Anfuso | Boggs, Del. | Case |
| Arends | Bolling | Celler |
| Armstrong | Bolton | Chatham |
| Aspinall | Bonner | Chelf |
| Auchincloss | Bosone | Chenoweth |
| Ayres | Bramblett | Chudoff |
| Baker | Breen | Church |
| Bakewell | Brehm | Clemente |
| Barden | Brooks | Clevenger |
| Baring | Brown, Ga. | Cole, Kans. |
| Barrett | Brown, Ohio | Cole, N. Y. |
| Bates, Ky. | Bryson | Colmer |
| | Buckley | Combs |
| | | Cooley |
| | | Cooper |
| | | Corbett |
| | | Cotton |
| | | Coudert |
| | | Cunningham |
| | | Curtis, Nebr. |
| | | Dague |
| | | Davis, Ga. |
| | | Davis, Tenn. |
| | | Davis, Wis. |
| | | Dawson |
| | | Deane |
| | | DeGraffenried |
| | | Delaney |
| | | Dempsey |
| | | Denny |
| | | Denton |
| | | Devereux |
| | | D'Ewart |
| | | Dollinger |
| | | Dolliver |
| | | Dondero |
| | | Donohue |
| | | Donovan |
| | | Dorn |
| | | Doyle |
| | | Eaton |
| | | Eberharter |
| | | Elliott |
| | | Ellsworth |
| | | Elston |
| | | Engle |
| | | Fallon |
| | | Feighan |
| | | Fellows |
| | | Fenton |
| | | Fernandez |
| | | Fine |
| | | Fisher |
| | | Fogarty |
| | | Forand |
| | | Ford |
| | | Forrester |
| | | Frazier |
| | | Fulton |
| | | Furcolo |
| | | Gamble |
| | | Garmatz |
| | | Gary |
| | | Gathings |
| | | Gavin |
| | | George |
| | | Goodwin |
| | | Gordon |
| | | Gore |
| | | Graham |
| | | Granahan |
| | | Granger |
| | | Grant |
| | | Green |
| | | Greenwood |
| | | Gregory |
| | | Hagen |
| | | Hale |
| | | Hall, Edwin Arthur |
| | | Hall, Leonard W. |
| | | Halleck |
| | | Hand |
| | | Harden |
| | | Hardy |
| | | Harris |
| | | Harrison, Va. |
| | | Hart |
| | | Harvey |
| | | Havenner |
| | | Hays, Ark. |
| | | Hays, Ohio |
| | | Hébert |
| | | Heffernan |
| | | Heller |
| | | Herlong |
| | | Herter |
| | | Heselton |
| | | Hess |
| | | Hill |
| | | Hillings |
| | | Hinshaw |
| | | Hoeven |
| | | Holifield |
| | | Holmes |
| | | Hope |
| | | Horan |
| | | Howell |
| | | Hunter |
| | | Irving |
| | | Jackson, Calif. |
| | | Jackson, Wash. |
| | | James |
| | | Jarman |
| | | Javits |
| | | Jensen |
| | | Johnson |
| | | Jones, Ala. |
| | | Jones, Hamilton C. |
| | | Jones, Woodrow W. |
| | | Judd |
| | | Karsten, Mo. |
| | | Kean |
| | | Kearney |
| | | Keating |
| | | Kelly, N. Y. |
| | | Keogh |
| | | Kerr |
| | | Kersten, Wis. |
| | | King |
| | | Kirwan |
| | | Klein |
| | | Kluczynski |
| | | Lane |
| | | Lanham |
| | | Lantaff |
| | | Larcade |
| | | Latham |
| | | Lesinski |
| | | Lind |
| | | Lovre |
| | | Lucas |
| | | McConnell |
| | | McCormack |
| | | McCulloch |
| | | McDonough |
| | | McGrath |
| | | McGregor |
| | | McGuire |
| | | McKinnon |
| | | McMillan |
| | | McMullen |
| | | Machrowicz |
| | | Mack, Ill. |
| | | Mack, Wash. |
| | | Madden |
| | | Mahon |
| | | Mansfield |
| | | Martin, Iowa |
| | | Martin, Mass. |
| | | Meader |
| | | Miller, Md. |
| | | Miller, Nebr. |
| | | Mills |
| | | Mitchell |
| | | Morano |
| | | Morgan |
| | | Morrison |
| | | Multer |
| | | Mumma |
| | | Murdock |
| | | Murphy |
| | | Murray, Tenn. |
| | | Nelson |
| | | Nicholson |
| | | Norblad |
| | | Norrell |
| | | O'Brien, Ill. |
| | | O'Brien, Mich. |
| | | O'Neill |
| | | Ostertag |
| | | O'Toole |
| | | Passman |
| | | Patman |
| | | Patten |
| | | Patterson |
| | | Perkins |
| | | Phillips |
| | | Pickett |
| | | Polk |
| | | Potter |
| | | Price |
| | | Priest |
| | | Prouty |
| | | Quinn |
| | | Rabaut |
| | | Radwan |
| | | Rains |
| | | Ramsay |
| | | Reams |
| | | Reece, Tenn. |
| | | Rees, Kans. |
| | | Regan |
| | | Rhodes |
| | | Ribicoff |
| | | Richards |
| | | Riehlman |
| | | Riley |
| | | Rivers |
| | | Roberts |
| | | Rodino |
| | | Rogers, Colo. |
| | | Rogers, Fla. |
| | | Rogers, Mass. |
| | | Rogers, Tex. |
| | | Rooney |
| | | Roosevelt |
| | | Sadlak |
| | | St. George |
| | | Sasscer |
| | | Saylor |
| | | Schwabe |
| | | Scott, Hardie |
| | | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| | | Scrivner |
| | | Scudder |
| | | Secrest |
| | | Seely-Brown |
| | | Sheppard |
| | | Sieminski |
| | | Sikes |
| | | Simpson, Pa. |
| | | Sittler |
| | | Smith, Miss. |
| | | Smith, Va. |
| | | Spence |
| | | Springer |
| | | Staggers |
| | | Steed |
| | | Stefan |
| | | Stigler |
| | | Stockman |
| | | Sutton |
| | | Taber |
| | | Tackett |
| | | Talle |
| | | Teague |
| | | Thomas |
| | | Thompson, Mich. |
| | | Thompson, Thornberry |
| | | Tollefson |
| | | Towe |
| | | Trimble |
| | | Van Pelt |
| | | Van Zandt |
| | | Vaughn |
| | | Vinson |
| | | Vorys |
| | | Vursell |
| | | Walter |
| | | Watts |
| | | Weichel |
| | | Welch |
| | | Wharton |
| | | Wheeler |
| | | Whitaker |
| | | Whitten |
| | | Wickersham |
| | | Widnall |
| | | Wigglesworth |
| | | Williams, Miss. |
| | | Williams, N. Y. |
| | | Willis |
| | | Wilson, Tex. |
| | | Wolcott |
| | | Wolverton |
| | | Woodruff |
| | | Yates |
| | | Yorty |
| | | Zablocki |

NAYS—41

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adair | Chiperfield | McVey |
| Allen, Ill. | Crumpacker | Marshall |
| Bailey | Curtis, Mo. | Mason |
| Beamer | Doughton | Morris |
| Bishop | Golden | O'Hara |
| Bray | Gross | Philbin |
| Brownson | Hull | Powell |
| Buffett | Jenison | Rankin |
| Busbey | Jenkins | Reed, N. Y. |
| Butler | Jonas | Robeson |
| | | Shafer |
| | | Short |
| | | Simpson, Ill. |
| | | Smith, Wis. |
| | | Vail |
| | | Velde |
| | | Werdel |
| | | Wier |
| | | Wilson, Ind. |
| | | Withrow |
| | | Wood, Idaho |

NOT VOTING—52

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Angell | Harrison, Wyo. | Moulder |
| Blatnik | Hedrick | Murray, Wis. |
| Boggs, La. | Hoffman, Ill. | O'Konski |
| Bow | Hoffman, Mich. | Poage |
| Boykin | Jones, Mo. | Poulson |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Kearns | Preston |
| Carnahan | Kelley, Pa. | Redden |
| Cox | Kennedy | Reed, Ill. |
| Crawford | Kilburn | Sabath |
| Crosser | Kilday | Sheehan |
| Dingell | LeCompte | Shelley |
| Durham | Lyle | Smith, Kans. |
| Evins | McCarthy | Stanley |
| Flood | Magee | Taylor |
| Fugate | Merrow | Winstead |
| Gillette | Miller, Calif. | Wood, Ga. |
| Gossett | Miller, N. Y. | |
| Gwinn | Morton | |

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois, against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Polk with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Wood with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Harrison of Wyoming.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Fugate with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Angell.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. O'TOOLE and Mr. TACKETT changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on Senate bill No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 70, I am shown as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4329) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4329, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, general debate had been concluded.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, out of (1) the general fund of the District of Columbia, hereinafter known as the general fund, such fund being composed of the revenues of the District of Columbia other than those applied by law to special funds, and $11,000,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1951), (2) highway funds, established by law (D. C. Code, title 47, ch. 19), and (3) the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), and $1,000,000 which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1951), sums as follows:

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of discussing a problem that I think is of interest to this Committee and to the Congress, as well as to the people of the District of Columbia. In my opinion, it is appropriate during the consideration of the bill giving the funds for the operation of the District of Columbia government to inquire into what is being done to clean up the transportation system in the city of Washington.

For the past year and a half it is certainly obvious to even the most casual observer that the Capital Transit Co. has ceased to have as its primary objective the serving of the public, and now its objective is to earn money for the owners. In my judgment, some effective action should be taken to assure that the Public Utilities Commission of the District, for whom funds are provided in this bill, represent more nearly the public interest. It seems to me that they have been misled by the self-serving statements to the Commission by the Capital Transit Co.

As recently as December 20, 1949, following a wage arbitration settlement with the employees, the company issued a statement to the effect that regardless of the increase in fares, the company would continue to show a loss, since fares could not be increased to a point high enough to pay dividends without suffering a more than corresponding loss in patronage. The Capital Transit Co. was granted an increased fare to 15 cents and recently, on May 29, it was reported in the press that the Capital Transit Co.'s net income for the first 4 months of this year was over a half million dollars. This compared with a $62,000 net income for the comparable period the year before.

The new ownership, composed of a group of businessmen from another State, has produced not only a net profit for themselves by means of rate increases, service cuts, reductions in force, and the elimination of routes, but, as well, have experienced an increase in the value of their stock shares.

An article in a Washington newspaper recently summarized the stock profits of the new owners as follows:

> The new owners bought the Capital Transit stock at only $20 a share. Capital Transit has 240,000 shares of common stock and the new owners now hold about 55 percent control of the company as well as active control of the management. The current market value of the stock is around $35 a share. Thus the new owners in a year and a half have about doubled their money.

In addition it might be said that this new group of owners has gradually taken over the top paying management jobs in the company. It seems to me that it is about time that we have an effective Public Utilities Commission in the District. Certainly there is something wrong with a system that will permit the public to be gouged for additional fares while forced to tolerate reduced service and, at the same time, the company is exceeding all previous profits as well as increased stock values.

The new management of the company was entirely without transportation experience. An editorial in the Sunday Star of September 4, 1949 entitled "Absentee Transit Ownership" pointed out:

> A group of nine investors, none of them living in Washington and none of them having shown previous interest in the transportation field, is now in position to consummate its purchase of a controlling share of the Capital Transit Co.

The editorial further pointed out that it was clear that the purchase was considered as an investment as the only motive of the purchase of this company.

No one can deny the experience of the present ownership in making money. The majority stockholder in the company is reputed to have snowballed a $5,000 loan made in 1932 to a fortune of $10,000,000 in 1949. He apparently has a lot of surplus cash because he testified before the Kefauver committee and I quote from a summary of his testimony issued by the Congressional Library.

> When Wolfson entered the campaign—
>
> Governor Fuller Warren's of Florida—it was agreed that he would carry the bulk of the expenses along with C. V. Griffin and William H. Johnston. Wolfson was vaguely aware of Johnston's horse and dog race track interest but was ignorant of the Florida law barring persons connected with race tracks from making political contributions.

According to the summary, Mr. Wolfson further stated that he contributed $150,000 to that gubernatorial campaign.

I intend to go into this matter further of the affairs of the Capital Transit particularly with regard to the manner in which the Public Utilities Commission has permitted the public to become a pawn in a monstrous financial manipulation of speculators controlling this vital system in the Capital of our Nation.

I would appreciate it if the gentlemen of the committee could tell me to what extent this has been explored before giving the appropriations for the carrying on of the functions of the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Any person who has been riding on the busses and streetcars in this city today knows that they just keep crowding them in and crowding them in, old people and women and children, and the driver will shout, "Step back in the bus. Step back in the bus." And he will practically shut the door on people. I had the door shut on me just the other day. They give no consideration to the public whatever. Yet they raise rates and then declare dividends.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from New York makes a very valid and important observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, just what part of the bill is the gentleman addressing himself to?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Kansas is addressing this Committee with respect to funds expended under this bill, a part of which is used to pay the salaries and expenses of the Utilities Commission of the District, who in turn have a considerable amount of authority in dealing with the Capital Transit Co. that I am presently discussing. I trust the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, an industrious member of this Committee, will not only listen to what I have to say, but will give this particular problem the consideration to which I think it is entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 2, line 3, strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$9,800,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized in support of his amendment.

direction of the Ways and Means Committee, and also waives points of order against the bill. (pp. 6936, D535)

Rep. Mack, Wash., criticized the high taxes proposed in the new tax bill and urged reductions in appropriations to nondefense agencies (pp. 6917-8).

10. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Passed with amendment this bill, H. R. 4496, which provides funds for the Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, botanical gardens, and the Congress (pp. 6907-17).

Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Regan, Tex., to except the Digest of Public General Bills from the provision prohibiting the use of funds appropriated to the Legislative Reference Service for publications to be issued by the Library of Congress (pp. 6916-7).

There was discussion during the debate of the need for additional Agriculture Yearbooks by some Members of the House (pp. 6915-6).

11. PRICES. Several Members commended Rep. Patman, Tex., and the Robinson-Patman Act, to prevent unfair price discrimination in interstate commerce, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Act (pp. 6918-32). Rep. Deane inserted numerous letters on the subject (pp. 6919-29).

12. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Rep. Lorcade, La., defended Gen. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, against criticism for his activities in connection with this proposed project, and related the activities of Gen. Pick in connection with various river-basin-development and other projects (pp. 6933-5).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

13. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. H. J. Res. 271, by Rep. Ayres, Ohio, to continue in effect certain provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 through July 31, 1951; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 6937). Remarks of author (p. A3849).

H. Con. Res. 124, by Rep. Ayres, providing for the adjournment of the House from June 29, 1951, until July 9, 1951, to enable its Members to seek the views of the people concerning the operation of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to Rules Committee (p. 6937).

14. SHEEP INDUSTRY. S. 1696, by Sen. McCarran, to amend Public Law 587 of the Eighty-first Congress to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders; to Judiciary Committee (p. 6867).

## ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. PRICE CONTROLS. Rep. McCormack, Mass., inserted Governor Dever's (Mass.) telegram supporting the President's recommendations for price controls (pp. A3849-50).

Reps. Rodino and Addonizio, N. J., inserted 2 Newark (N. J.) Evening News editorials favoring the continuation of price controls and commending the Government for the beef price rollback order (p. A3855).

Sen. Bridges inserted Charles J. McGowan's (International Brotherhood of Boilermakers) statement favoring continuation of wage and price regulation and modification of credit controls (p. A3874).

16. MEAT PRICES. Sen. Butler, Nebr., inserted a Nebraska Farmer article, "Roll-Backs Won't Produce More Beef," which includes excerpts from letters from livestock men outlining the effects of the rollback order on their operations (pp. A3866-7).

17. FARM LABOR. Rep. Yorty, Calif., inserted Robert S. Allen's article reporting

that General Eisenhower "condemns" the practice of illegally importing farm workers from Mexico, and quoting from the General's letter to Sen. Fulbright on the subject (p. A3868).

18. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Norblad, Oreg., inserted an Oregon Statesman editorial agreeing with the reduction made by the House Appropriations Committee in appropriations for two Pacific Northwest flood-control projects (pp. A3869-70).

19. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Rep. Van Zandt, Pa., inserted a Houston (Tex.) Chronicle editorial suggesting that Canada build this project (p. A3857).

20. GOVERNMENT ETHICS. Sen. Douglas inserted Sen. Benton's testimony before the S. Labor and Public Welfare Committee favoring S. Con. Res. 21, providing for the appointment of a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government (pp. A3877-80).

21. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Bridges inserted a Council of State Chambers of Commerce article, "How the 48 States Would Share the Cost of the President's $8,500,000,000 Foreign Aid Program" (pp. A3858-9).

## BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

22. MILITARY TRAINING. S. 1, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which reduces the draft age from 19 years to 18½ years, but provides that no person shall be inducted below age 19 so long as eligible persons between 19 and 25 are available to a particular local board. Extends the authority to induct men into the armed forces for 4 years, until July 1, 1955. Provides for deferment of high school students until they graduate or become 20. Permits college students to be deferred until they complete their academic year. Authorizes the President to provide for deferment of persons whose activity in study, research, veterinary, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. Provides for a National Security Training Commission to exercise general supervision over a National Security Training Corps for basic military training; requires the Commission within 4 months, to submit legislative recommendations including a broad outline of such training; prohibits inductions for the Corps until Congress has considered these recommendations; and provides for training of inductees for six months. Approved June 19, 1951 (Public Law 51, 82nd Cong.).

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY G.P.O.

23. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. S. 1397, Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951, Part 1. S. Banking and Currency Committee.

24. FURS. H. R. 2321, fur labeling. H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

25. WEATHER. S. 5, 222, 798, weather control and augmented potable water supply. Jt. Hearings of S. Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Agriculture and Forestry Committees.

26. REORGANIZATION. S. 1166, administration of overseas activities of the Government. S. Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee.

oOo

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for June 20: H. Banking, Defense Production Act amendments (ex.); S. Labor and Public Welfare, ethics in government (Lawton testify) H. Interior, sea-water and rainfall research (Searles to testify); H. Civil Service, Federal pay bill; H. Delaney Committee, chemicals in foods (ex.); S. Appropriations, Interior Dept. bill (ex.); H. Judiciary, relating to patents.

- oOo -

Public Law 51 - 82d Congress
Chapter 144 - 1st Session
S. 1

# AN ACT

To provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

## TITLE I

SECTION 1. The Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended as follows:

Selective Service Act of 1948, amendments.

(a) Section 1 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 451(a). Short title of Act.

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act'."

65 Stat. 75.

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

65 Stat. 76.

50 U.S.C. Sup. IV, app. 452. Authorized personnel strength.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active-duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand. The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year."

(c) Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

62 Stat. 605. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 453. Registration.

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder."

(d) Section 4 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

62 Stat. 605. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 454(a). Age limits, etc.

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided*, That each registrant shall be immediately liable for classification and examination, and shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be so classified and examined, both physically and mentally, in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces: *Provided further*, That any male alien who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceed-

Post, p. 10.

Classification after registration.

Aliens.

ing one year (other than an alien exempted from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States, except that any such alien shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces.

Relief from liability.

Selection and induction.

65 Stat. 76.

65 Stat. 77.
National Security Training Corps.
Liability for training.

"At such time as the period of active service in the Armed Forces required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title, and except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States who is required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, and every male alien admitted for permanent residence who is required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any male alien who is required to register under the provisions of this title and who has not reached the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceeding one year shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps except that any such alien shall be relieved from such training under this title if, prior to his induction into the National Security Training Corps he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of nineteen years during the period of such deferment. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter provided such number of persons as may be required to further the purposes of this title.

Post, p. 5.

Post, p. 10.

Post, pp. 8-11.

Standards of acceptability.

"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or shall be inducted for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January

1945: *Provided further*, That the passing requirement for the Armed Forces Qualification Test shall be fixed at a percentile score of 10 points.

"No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations for such persons as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury to be essential to the public and personal health. Provision for shelter, etc.

"The persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps or the United States Coast Guard, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States. Assignment. 65 Stat. 77. 65 Stat. 78.

"Every person inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to the authority of this subsection after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall, following his induction, be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no such person shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, appointed, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone), until he has had the equivalent of at least four months of basic training: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining in violation of the provisions of this paragraph any person inducted into, or enlisted, appointed, or ordered to active duty in, the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title. Assignment limitation. Restriction on use of funds.

"No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth. Restriction on induction.

"No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States." Communication with Members of Congress.

(e) Section 4 (b) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 62 Stat. 606. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 454(b).

"(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title." Period of service. Post, p. 4.

(f) Section 4 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 62 Stat. 606. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 454(c).

"(c) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of eighteen years and six months and Enlistment in Regular Army.

twenty-six years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the regular army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistme extended without his consent until after a declaration of war o national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Ante, p. 3.

Reserve components. Application for active service.

"(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

65 Stat. 78.

65 Stat. 79.

Voluntary induction. 62 Stat. 608. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 455(b).

"(3) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"(4) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person after attaining th age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"(5) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, at such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."

Post, p. 5.

62 Stat. 607. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 454(d).

(g) Section 4 (d) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

Periods of service.

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component, for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on

release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force." 65 Stat. 79. 65 Stat. 80.

(h) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed. 62 Stat. 608. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 454(g),(h).

(i) Paragraph (1) of section 4 (i) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "subsections" the following: "6 (g)," and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four". 64 Stat. 826. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 454(i).

(j) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title. Reduction of periods of service. Authority.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated, the period of active service in the Armed Forces of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of active service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for registration under this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into

the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of six months.

National Security Training Commission.

"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

National Security Training Corps.
65 Stat. 80.
65 Stat. 81.

"(4) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be five years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of two years, one at the end of three years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of five years, after the date of enactment of this paragraph; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Members of the Commission, other than active members of the Regular components of the Armed Forces, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. The Commission shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission. The military department or departments so designated to carry out such military training shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps.

63 Stat, 954.
5 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 1071 note.

"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"(7) Not later than four months following confirmation of the members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to— Legislative recommendations to Congress.

"(A) a broad outline for a program deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provisions of this Act shall be of a military nature, but nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to grant to the Commission the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(B) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(C) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;

"(D) measures deemed necessary to implement the policies and standards established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and

"(E) disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted to or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps. 65 Stat. 81. 65 Stat. 82.

All legislative recommendations submitted under this paragraph shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services of the two Houses, and each of such committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in this paragraph are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to its House: *Provided*, That any bill or resolution reported with respect to such recommendations shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged.

"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after— Induction into Corps, restrictions.

"(A) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof, and measures providing for disability and death benefits have been enacted into law; and

"(B) such other legislative recommendations as are provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been considered and such recommendations or any portion thereof shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law; and

"(C) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(9) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding six months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted dur- Reports to Congress.

ing the preceding six months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

Pay and allowances of Corps personnel.

"(10) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of $30: *Provided, however*, That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E–1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus $40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

63 Stat. 802. 37 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 231 note.

63 Stat. 813. 37 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 252(f). 64 Stat. 795. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 2203; 37 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 252.

Restriction on assignment for training.

"(11) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

65 Stat. 82.

65 Stat. 83.

(k) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President: *And provided further*, That—

62 Stat. 608. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 455(a). Induction by age groups, etc.

"(1) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(2) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(l) Section 6 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

62 Stat. 609. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 456(a). Exemptions.

"(a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President who are not citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and

Ante, p. 1.

service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted." Ante, p. 1 et seq.

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1951,". 62 Stat. 610. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 456(c).

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Section 6 (d) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 62 Stat. 611. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 456(d).

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons, except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service, shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year. Deferment of certain ROTC members, etc. 65 Stat. 83. 65 Stat. 84. 34 U.S.C. 821, 1020-1020i; 1040, 1045a; Sup. IV, 61, 405a, 1020a-1020i, 1020m, 1032, 1039. Ante, p. 4.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty. Officer candidate programs.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any Student deferment. Post, p. 10.

category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

62 Stat. 611. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 456(h). Occupational deferments.

(o) Section 6 (h) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an Office (other than an Office described in subsection (f) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone, except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States or undergoing training in the National Security Training Corps shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors

62 Stat. 611. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 456(f).

65 Stat. 84.

65 Stat. 85.

Persons with dependents.

Deficient or defective persons.

Posting of list of classifications.

found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government."

(p) Section 6 (i) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 62 Stat. 612. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 456(i).

"(i) (1) Any person who is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. Certain high school students.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided*, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of such Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate." Certain college or university students. 65 Stat. 85. 65 Stat. 86. Ante, p. 10.

(q) Section 6 (j) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title", and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title". 62 Stat. 612. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 456(j). Ante, p. 3. 62 Stat. 622. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 462.

(r) Section 7 of such Act is repealed. 62 Stat. 614. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 457.

(s) Section 9 (g) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 62 Stat. 617. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 459(g). Reemployment rights.

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component)

and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

65 Stat. 86.
65 Stat. 87.

62 Stat. 623.
50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 463(a).

(t) Section 13 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

62 Stat. 697, 698.
18 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 281, 283, 284.

"(a) Nothing in sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. title 5, sec. 99), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections, or as a member of the National Selective Service Appeal Board."

5 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 118i.

62 Stat. 618.
50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 460.

(u) Section 10 of such Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States and within each Territory and possession of the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President."; and (2) by adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

Appeal boards.

Report to Congress.

"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."

62 Stat. 624.
50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 466(b).

(v) Section 16 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out the word "and" and inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following words: "and Guam".

(w) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 62 Stat. 625. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 467.

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict. Repeals.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense. Appropriations authorized.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1955, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist." Induction prohibition after July 1, 1955. Ante, pp. 8-11.

(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four", and (3) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Unless he is sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned, any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon completion of 17 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply to any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve ordered to active duty whose rating or specialty is found by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be critical and whose release to inactive duty prior to the period for which he was ordered to active duty would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned." 64 Stat. 319. 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 471. Release of certain reservists. 65 Stat. 87. 65 Stat. 88.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act." 10 U.S.C., Sup., IV, 628 note. Enlistment extensions.

(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953". 50 U.S.C., Sup. IV, app. 454 note.

SEC. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows: 10 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 20j note.

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2, title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954. Personnel strength limitation. 10 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 316a; 34 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 105a, 625h; 5 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 627a. Ante, p. 1. 34 U.S.C. 151,691. 10 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 20j, 20s.

"SEC. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel

of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of five million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this Act."

Increased periods of service.

SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active servi for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act.

Separability.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Intoxicating liquors. Regulation of sale, etc.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations as he may deem to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association who knowingly violates the regulations which may be made hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

65 Stat. 88.

65 Stat. 89.

Citation of title.

SEC. 7. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act".

## TITLE II

Enlistment of aliens.

64 Stat. 316. 10 U.S.C., Sup. IV, 621c.

SEC. 21. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by (1) striking out the words "until June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1955", and (2) striking out the words "two thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twelve thousand five hundred".

Approved June 19, 1951.

3540E